

**MINUTES
STANDARDS RECOMMENDATION COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 17, 2015**

The Standards Recommendation Committee met for its regularly scheduled meeting in House Hearing Room 30 at Legislative Plaza at 10:00 am CST.

Present.....10	Absent.....0
Dr. Lyle Ailshie	
Mr. David Pickler	
Ms. Shirley Curry	
Ms. Darcie Finch	
Dr. Sharen Cypress	
Ms. Tracy Franklin	
Ms. Amy Gullion	
Mr. Doug Hungate	
Ms. Cathy Kolb	
Ms. Shannon Duncan	

Chairman Ailshie called the meeting to order and asked State Board of Education Director of Legislative Affairs **Mr. Nathan James** to read the charge for this committee.

Mr. James reminds the Committee of their constitutional duties in article 1, section 19 from the Tennessee Constitution. He discussed the Sunshine Law.

Chairman Ailshie thanked the Committee for their work, the work of the review committees, and the State Board staff. He then went through a quick review of the October 2015 meeting. He explained that several organizations have completed analytical reviews of the standards as well as the State Board staff holding round table meetings with parents and educators across the state. **Dr. Ailshie** then explained how he saw the Committee's charge - to recommend high-level changes to the standards.

Chairman Ailshie called up the first presenter, State Board of Education Director of Policy and Research **Ms. Laura Encalade**.

Ms. Encalade went over the specifics of the agenda for the day.

Chairman Ailshie took a moment to welcome Rep. David Byrd to the meeting.

Chairman Ailshie asked for motion to approve the agenda.
ACTION: **Ms. Kolb** moved acceptance. **Ms. Gullion** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Encalade presented the overview of the public feedback report. The report contains data regarding the regional roundtables as well as feedback from the public review website. She went over the four roundtables held to date and their locations as well as specified feedback.

Dr. Curry asked if it was possible to review the same standard multiple times. **Ms. Encalade** explained that they try to do their best to make sure that doesn't happen. The data is reviewed to ensure that a reviewer only comments on each standard one time. If there is more than one review on a standard by the same reviewer, the SBE staff takes the most recent review.

Ms. Encalade dove back into specific data regarding feedback on the ELA standards. She explained that the slides from the PowerPoint presentation are available for the public upon request. Once **Ms. Encalade** was finished explaining the ELA feedback trends, she moved on to math.

Ms. Duncan asked how the Algebra 1 standards compared to the previous standards.

Mr. Hungate expressed concern about integrated math series and whether the standards can be cross-referenced to other series. **Ms. Encalade** answered that the feedback has been to give particular attention to the sequencing in the integrated math series.

Dr. Curry asked when the additional analysis will come out from the website. **Ms. Encalade** explained when the website closes, she can send the excel sheet out to all the members to see the specific feedback. **Chairman Ailshie** suggests letting **Ms. Encalade** know if any member wants the specific feedback from the website before it closes.

Mr. Hungate asked if the SRC will get the data and specific comments from the roundtable facilitators. **Ms. Encalade** responded that more detailed reports can be gathered for the SRC.

She then goes into the purpose of the roundtables and how the feedback has been very valuable. She explains the structure of the roundtable sessions as well as some feedback trends.

Ms. Finch asks about specifics regarding the supplemental documentation. **Ms. Encalade** explains that the Department of Education would be in charge of creating the supplemental documents that accompany the standards.

Dr. Curry asked if the glossary is considered a supplemental document. **Ms. Encalade** explained that the educators wanted the glossary to be part of the formal standards. She also said that when considering a supplemental document it is important to define who the audience is for that document.

Mr. Pickler mentioned the importance of not getting stuck in the jargon. He wanted the Committee to remember that outside stakeholders need to understand what is happening as well. **Ms. Encalade** replies that the SRC could recommend a resource be created specifically for parents.

Ms. Finch asked if the math layout could be changed to be more similar to the ELA format. **Ms. Encalade** responded with some specifics about the domains in math. She said that there could be another type of supplemental document about just progression about the domains or that clarifies the layout in math.

Dr. Curry asked if the state board staff has the money to redo some of the work or implement the recommendations into the standards. **Ms. Encalade** responded that they do but it wouldn't be the entire educator advisory team. A smaller team of educators from the advisory team would be convened to conduct the committee's requested revisions.

Ms. Kolb asked for clarification on the review timeline. **Ms. Encalade** explained the entire timeline and that there would be time to review.

Chairman Ailshie asked if there was a possibility to hold an extra meeting in January. He also reviewed the main points that he had heard from the meeting thus far.

Chairman Ailshie then called up the next presenter, **Ms. Erin Conley** from the Southern Regional Education Board, presented the SREB's external feedback report. SREB had convened a panel of experts to review the standards as they are right now. She gave general feedback on both math and ELA.

Dr. Curry asked what documents the SREB panel of experts used in their review. **Ms. Encalade** explained that they had access to the full standards document.

Ms. Conley then discussed specific considerations for improvement to ELA standards. An example is that the introductory narrative could be strengthened. She mentioned that adding coding would help reference the standards. Also, there is a need to ensure fluidity in the document and take a closer look at kindergarten and 1st grade for developmental differences between the two grades. Both sets of reviewers stressed an importance in preparing teachers adequately for the use of rigorous college and career-ready standards.

Mr. Pickler asked for clarification regarding 'teacher preparedness' in the recommendations from the SREB. **Ms. Conley** answered that there weren't specific examples in the report, just that it was an important part of the standards process.

Ms. Duncan asked if the report meant strategies and understanding the standards deeply. **Mr. Pickler** added that there are two important considerations, the basic content knowledge and the tools, in terms of teacher training.

Ms. Duncan replied that school systems bring in content experts for professional development and it was an important piece to recognize. **Dr. Curry** responded by saying the SRC needs to discuss the gaps and how to address those gaps. **Ms. Conley** responded that user friendly, supplemental documents are a great first step.

Ms. Duncan said that Kindergarten and First Grade standards may need to be sent back for further clarification from the educator advisory teams. **Ms. Kolb** added that the need for professional development in conjunction with the standards is important. **Mr. Hungate** agreed that teacher preparation is important, but stressed that the SRC must get the standards right first.

Chairman Ailshie asked if the SREB reviewers looked at the standards overall or if they looked at the specific strands. **Ms. Conley** explained that the reviewers looked at the standards globally.

Chairman Ailshie asked if the SREB has other resources to tap into concerning Algebra 2. **Ms. Conley** answered that the SREB could look into resources for that purpose.

Chairman Ailshie commented that it is important to keep in mind that there are no major problems with these standards and that SREB felt very positive about both the math and ELA standards.

Ms. Duncan asked about the coding for Algebra 1 and the concern and confusion over what students take, either the state test for 8th grade math or the EOC. **Ms. Tammy Shelton** from the Department of Education stepped up to give examples of different pathways and the ways that the local districts deal with those accelerated pathways.

Chairman Ailshie reconvened the meeting at 1:15 PM. **Ms. Leigh Cummins**, from the State Board of Education, presented on the Higher Education Feedback Report.

Ms. Cummins explained that she thought the Higher Ed feedback was a very integral part in this process. Ten different higher education faculty members helped with the review. This group had a deep content knowledge and familiarity with the current standards, which made them well positioned to provide a lot of feedback. The reviewers were given a survey that asked about specific standards as well as asked for holistic feedback.

Ms. Cummins then gave a brief overview of the math/ELA standards. She included specific statistics in her overview.

Mr. Pickler asked how the terms ‘not too rigorous or had the appropriate level of rigor’ was determined. **Ms. Encalade** answered what the expectation from higher education reviewers is as well as she gave an example of how to determine the level of rigor.

Ms. Cummins explained feedback on each individual literacy strand (Foundational, Reading, Informational, Speaking & Listening, and Writing) in ELA standards and give examples of specific feedback.

Mr. Pickler explained that he wanted to be on the record explaining that content knowledge in teacher preparation is what we should be striving for, not that these standards are easily accessible by anyone. **Ms. Encalade** responded by saying that there is a role for the SRC to make larger recommendations for the State Board and ultimately the TDOE around content knowledge, teacher preparation programs, or professional development opportunities.

Ms. Cummins explained the feedback on the math layout and format, the coding, the introductions, and the coherence and rigor. Then she went through specific feedback on the different grade bands (K-5, 6-8) in the math standards.

Dr. Cypress asked if there was research done regarding 7th grade able to complete specific skills. **Ms. Encalade** responded by explaining that she would have to ask that specific question to the educator advisory teams and get back to her.

Ms. Cummins then presented the feedback on high school math subjects (Algebra I & II, Geometry, Integrated Math I, II, & III, Precalculus, Calculus).

Chairman Ailshie commented that getting some of these questions back to the educator advisory teams is ideal. He also explained that he thought it was interesting where the reports (SREB and higher education) differed in their opinions on the standards.

Ms. Encalade gave a specific example of the coding issue in the math standards.

Chairman Ailshie gave a recap from what the committee members have said so far in the meeting. This includes: 1) Content knowledge-most are very concerned about content knowledge as it pertains to elementary math teachers, ELA elementary teachers seem to be stronger than in math. Research tells us the deeper your content knowledge, the more you are able to work with students. 2) To ensure a clear understanding of rigor, grade-level, and developmentally appropriate terms. So there is no misunderstanding between parents, teachers, etc. 3) The issue of examples is somewhat different between math/ELA, there is one thing to give examples of works of literature to choose from and another to give an example of an equation. 4) Need to ensure that these standards are manageable.

Ms. Finch commented specifically on the recommendations from the SREB report concerning geometry.

Dr. Cypress expressed concerns about the geometry standards.

Ms. Duncan asked to inquire further in the feedback on geometry specifically since there has been a divide in the information about that content. **Ms. Encalade** responded that questions have been raised through the feedback and the staff will be taking those to the educator review teams.

Chairman Ailshie thanked **Ms. Cummins** and introduced **Ms. Encalade** for a brief presentation on overall feedback trends from all of the reports.

Ms. Encalade gave examples of trends that included: requests for supplemental documents and added direction, the need for parent-friendly documents to explain standards, requests for PD for teachers in conjunction with new standards, and the need for improved introductions to the standards.

Ms. Encalade then presented specific ELA standards trends. One theme that has been the biggest tension is the removal of the examples-divided among two groups. A big question raised in multiple feedback sources about what will happen to the content area literacy standards? Those will be tackled in the subject-specific standards.

Ms. Encalade then switched to specific math standard trends. There is some discussion that should be had about the coding situation with math-both camps (for/against) that needs to be considered in the SRC's decision-making process.

Chairman Ailshie explained that there are two layers of work for the SRC-recommendations to go back to the educator advisory teams as well as recommendations that will go to the State Board for approval.

Mr. Pickler expressed his concern that the committee be respectful of the time they would be asking the educator advisory teams to use with these recommendations.

Dr. Curry explained that she would motion to add a meeting in January.

Mr. Pickler asked **Ms. Encalade** if there is enough time for all the work to be completed. She explained a timetable that she had discussed with **Dr. Ailshie**.

Mr. Pickler asked if it would be possible to add a webinar before the December 15th meeting.

Dr. Curry also asked about the timeline regarding the two different sets of standards.

Ms. Duncan said that she thinks it is important that the staff conveys the overarching themes from the SRC's discussion today.

Chairman Ailshie agreed to a webinar to enhance the process and split up the time between the two sets of standards.

Mr. Pickler agreed that it would be best if the discussion was framed as ELA in the morning and mathematics in the afternoon.

Chairman Ailshe asked for motion to add a webinar meeting before the December 15th meeting.

ACTION: **Mr. Pickler** moved acceptance. **Dr. Curry** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Gullion asked if it was possible to create a document by the grade band that combines all the feedback from the different reports. **Ms. Encalade** said the State Board staff can work on creating the document.

Dr. Heyburn asked **Ms. Gullion** for more clarification so the staff would know exactly what she was asking. **Ms. Gullion** explained she was thinking a simple word document with different sections and headings.

Chairman Ailshe asked for motion to add a meeting in January, the date to be established at the close of business of Dec. 15th meeting.

ACTION: **Mr. Pickler** moved acceptance. **Dr. Curry** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Ailshie asked to focus the discussion on specific feedback on ELA.

Ms. Duncan gave some broad feedback on the standards documents as a whole. She encouraged the committee to keep the draft as it is.

Mr. Hungate expressed the need to keep the examples out so teachers do not pigeonhole themselves.

Mr. Hungate also suggested that today's SRC recommendations just be taken down in notes to take back to the educator advisory teams and for consideration for the conversation in December.

Ms. Kolb said she wanted to talk specifically about the Kindergarten and 1st grade developmental differences that were mentioned earlier.

Ms. Duncan added that she has gotten a lot of feedback concerning the 'developmental appropriateness' of the elementary standards. She read excerpts from a Forbes

magazine article. She discussed the need for better engagement out of students in high school and it starts with not getting burned out in elementary school.

Mr. Hungate asked if that is a curriculum or standards related issue.

Ms. Duncan explained again that it is important to let students develop over time.

Dr. Curry explained that it is very important to have public support for these standards.

Dr. Cypress asked if there was research that the committee could look further into.

Ms. Finch expressed her concern from veering from the SRC's charge. She also cautioned about removing any standards without carefully considering the backwards progression to Kindergarten from that one standard.

Chairman Ailshie said it was important to get everything that was on the committee's mind out on the table now. **Ms. Encalade** responded by giving an overview of what she has captured from their discussion.

Mr. Hungate said that the layout for both math and ELA had presented concerns in the overall trends. **Dr. Curry** agreed that it was a problem that the math standards documents had to be turned sideways to read.

Chairman Ailshie asked if there were any more overarching concerns from the group.

Dr. Curry suggested that the committee recommend removing some standards because there are just too many.

Ms. Finch asked for clarification on where the math domains were listed.

Ms. Encalade explains that the way the domains show up currently in the standards is on the box on the side. There is no progression of where the domains listed grade level by grade level.

Ms. Finch added that it would be more helpful to include the domains in the math introductions instead.

Mr. Hungate added that the need for training and supporting documents has come up in the conversation often and didn't want to lose that.

Mr. Pickler added that he thinks it is very important to point out any small change in the standards that is different from the common core standards.

Dr. Curry gave an example of a conversation she had with her math teacher and stressed that it needs to be as different for the public as possible.

Ms. Duncan agreed with both **Mr. Pickler** and **Dr. Curry** by saying that there has been a tremendous amount of work done to the standards and it needs to be promoted that they are vastly different from common core.

Ms. Gullion said that she thinks the committee needs to look at more independent research about the developmental appropriateness in the K-2 standards.

Ms. Duncan commented on specifics in the K-2 literacy standards, such as the need for 150 minutes of reading and how teachers could differentiate that in their classrooms.

Ms. Gullion said that will lead the conversation into curriculum vs. standards.

Ms. Franklin said the training on differentiation for different types of kids will be the key for the teachers and these standards.

Ms. Gullion said it is essential to do more research so the standards don't lose the rigor but are also developmentally appropriate.

Mr. Pickler said the legacy of this work will be the literacy standards.

Ms. Encalade gave an overview of what the committee is asking for.

Chairman Ailshie asked for any more specific feedback on the ELA standards.

Ms. Gullion pulled out a specific standard that concerns the different in writing language. She also added that there needed to be specifics about text features in K-5 literacy standards.

Ms. Finch asked if that clarification would be in the supplemental documents.

Ms. Kolb also pulled out a specific standard to compare across K-3 to keep the rigor high.

Ms. Encalade asked for some clarification about the overall recommendations from a previous report.

Mr. Hungate asked if there would be a way to create a working document for the SRC members to capture their thoughts as they dive independently into the standards and the review reports.

Ms. Encalade explains that staff will create a report for December 15th that is separated into content standard documents.

Dr. Curry said the committee needs to talk more about the math standards.

Mr. Pickler asked a specific question about the sunshine law clarification.

Ms. Encalade explains the webinar will be open for the public to listen in and see the slides.

Chairman Ailshie said he thinks the input and recommendations have been captured expect for standards-specific comments. He said that **Ms. Encalade** will work on creating a working document to gather that input from the SRC members.

Ms. Encalade asked if the committee could give more direction on the math coding issue.

Mr. Hungate said that his personal opinion was to change the coding so that it took it as far away from common core as possible but also understood that teachers need a reference.

Ms. Gullion said that she agreed that keeping the coding the same is essential for teachers to find the complementary resources.

Chairman Ailshie expressed his concern that if teachers are using the same resources as before, and not adapting them, then they aren't teaching to the new revised standards.

Mr. Hungate said to potentially put the old coding in the supplemental documents for teachers to reference.

Ms. Finch asked for input from the educator advisory teams about the color-coding and layout of the math standards.

Chairman Ailshie summarized that the reason to keep the current coding is for references purposes but added his hesitation that teachers would utilize a wrong source.

Ms. Encalade summarizes what recommendations she has heard.

Ms. Duncan said they could add flags to the documents where the standards have been changed.

Chairman Ailshie gave a review of what was accomplished today. **Ms. Encalade** reviews what the staff will need to get to the SRC that was specified in the meeting.

Chairman Ailshe asked for motion to adjourn.

ACTION: **Ms. Kolb** moved acceptance. **Mr. Hungate** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.