Department of Middle, Secondary, Reading and Deaf Education
Advisory Board Meeting
March 05, 2013

5:30pm Welcome & Introductions  Dr. James Martinez
       Mr. Scott Grubbs

5:35 – 6:00pm Dinner
6:00 – 6:45pm Content Groups Purpose  Dr. Barbara Radcliffe
                                         Common Core/PDS
                                         Content Discussion Groups  Dr. Derald Jones
                                         Mrs. Melanie Sainz

6:45 – 7:20pm Teacher Evaluation  Mrs. Debbie Paine
               Content Discussion Groups  Mrs. Melody Fuller
               Future Topic & Facilitator Cards
               Announcements  Dr. James Martinez
               Mr. Scott Grubbs

7:20 – 7:30pm Door Prizes
7:30pm Adjournment
MSRD Advisory Committee

The purpose of the Middle, Secondary, Reading, and Deaf Education Advisory Committee is to provide a forum for dialogue among department stakeholders, including public school personnel, Arts and Sciences faculty members, RESA personnel, students, and department members. The committee may review and recommend policies, procedures, and practices regarding the development, implementation, evaluation, and revision of teacher certification programs within the department.
Advisory Committee Objectives

• To support the global nature of initial teacher preparation and advanced teacher development, wherein members have a vested interest in improving the educational experiences of university candidates and middle and high school students within the partnering public school systems.

• To advise MSRD faculty on the various aspects of teacher preparation and ensure the various programs are preparing graduates who will be ready for the realities of teaching.

• To identify and address issues and concerns between or among the public schools, the Dewar College of Education, and/or the Middle, Secondary, Reading, and Deaf Education Department.

• To provide timely knowledge about trends and issues in education as well as identify upcoming DOE initiatives and legislative developments.
NCATE Update

Committees/Writing Groups
- Conceptual Framework
- Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, Professional Dispositions
- Standard 2: Assessment System & Unit Evaluation
- Standard 3: Field Experience & Clinical Practice
- Standard 4: Diversity
- Standard 5: Faculty Quality & Professional Development
- Standard 6: Unit Governance & Resources
Open Dialogue

• Immersing students in authentic school settings where they can observe and practice what they are learning rather than sitting in the college classroom void of the realities in public education.

• Designing and modifying our programs and curriculum based on the current trends and issues in education. (Common Core Conversation)

• Preparing future teachers properly for what’s required in public education. (Teacher Assessment Conversation).
Activity: Circle of Voices

• Individuals reflect on the Common Core/PDS topics (1 minute)
• Participants then go round the circle in order - each person has up to 30 seconds (group timer) of uninterrupted air time to give her/his viewpoint on the Common Core/PDS topics. No interruptions are allowed.
• Move into free discussion with the ground rule that every comment offered must somehow refer back to a comment made by someone else in the opening circle of voices. This need NOT be agreement - it can be a disagreement, a question, an elaboration or extension, an illustration, and so on.
• Determine **one or two common themes** from your group to share with whole group
Teacher Evaluations

Teacher Keys Effectiveness System

TKES
Race to the Top (RT3)

• RT3 systems piloted the new teacher evaluation system in 2011-2012.
• RT3 systems and 60 additional systems are using the revised version this year 2012-2013.
• Additional systems will begin using a version next school term (2013-2014).
• Current Georgia legislation – HB 0244 addresses the new system for all Georgia public and charter schools to begin using the new system in 2014-2015.
HB - 0244

- Current legislation as of Mar/01/2013 - Senate Read and Referred
- Contains language that supports the RT3 systems who are currently using the new evaluation tool
  - Multiple measures
  - Student Growth Percentiles
  - Student Learning Objectives (SLO’s)
  - Student perception data utilized for information
  - Teachers receive a Teacher Effectiveness Measure Score (TEMS)
  - Rubrics used to assess the Teacher Assessments on Performance Standards (TAPS)
Teacher Keys Effectiveness System

Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards
(Data sources include observations and documentation)

Surveys of Instructional Practice
(Primary, Intermediate, Middle, and High School)

Student Growth and Academic Achievement

Teachers of Tested Subjects
- Student growth percentile/value-added measure
- Achievement gap reduction

Teachers of Non-Tested Subjects
- DOE-approved district
  Student Learning Objectives
## TAPS Domains and Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **PLANNING**                                | 1. Professional Knowledge  
  2. Instructional Planning                                                      |
| **INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY**                  | 3. Instructional Strategies  
  4. Differentiated Instruction                                                   |
| **ASSESSMENT OF AND FOR LEARNING**          | 5. Assessment Strategies  
  6. Assessment Uses                                                            |
| **LEARNING ENVIRONMENT**                   | 7. Positive Learning Environment  
  8. Academically Challenging Environment                                          |
| **PROFESSIONALISM AND COMMUNICATION**       | 9. Professionalism  
  10. Communication                                                            |
Performance Standard 1: Professional Knowledge
The teacher demonstrates an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, pedagogical knowledge, and the needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.

Sample Performance Indicators
Examples may include, but are not limited to:

**The teacher:**
1.1 Addresses appropriate curriculum standards and integrates key content elements.
1.2 Facilitates students’ use of higher-level thinking skills in instruction.
1.3 Demonstrates ability to link present content with past and future learning experiences, other subject areas, and real-world experiences and applications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary*</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Needs Development</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition to meeting the requirements for Proficient...</td>
<td>Proficient is the expected level of performance.</td>
<td>The teacher inconsistently demonstrates understanding of the curriculum, content, pedagogical knowledge, and student needs, or lacks fluidity in using the knowledge in practice.</td>
<td>The teacher inadequately demonstrates understanding of curriculum, content, pedagogical knowledge and student needs, or does not use the knowledge in practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The teacher continually demonstrates extensive content and pedagogical knowledge, enriches the curriculum and guides others in enriching the curriculum. (Teachers rated Exemplary continually seek ways to serve as role models or teacher leaders.) | The teacher consistently demonstrates an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, pedagogical knowledge, and the needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences. | }
VSU COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Observation Instrument
Observation Instrument

- Developed by public school faculty, public school administrators, and university faculty.
- Last revision was August 2009.
- Indicators were chosen based on what could be directly observed during a lesson.
### 6 STANDARDS – 14 INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENT AND CURRICULUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Subject-Specific Content/Concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pedagogical Content (Instructional Methods)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Content Connections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KNOWLEDGE OF STUDENTS AND THEIR LEARNING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Students’ Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Classroom Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Classroom Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Communication (Spoken/Written Language)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Communication (Directions/Questioning)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSESSMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANNING AND INSTRUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Lesson Plan &amp; Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Instructional Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Monitoring &amp; Adjustments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFESSIONALISM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NATR – Rare – rater possibly missed a portion of a lesson

Evidence/Comments provide clarity of expectations.

Choose only one rating per indicator.
Table Talk

• At your table please compare and contrast the State of Georgia Teacher Performance Standards and the VSU College of Education Observation Instrument.

• Discuss recommendations for changes/additions/deletions to the COE Observation Instrument.

• Record on the sheet provided at your table.
Thank you for serving on this advisory board, and for helping us improve Valdosta State University.