

## Item 14:

### COVER PAGE

#### **Type of Agenda Board Item:**

- ✓ **Discussion Only:** TEA staff will present board items with an update, potential future items, and/or seek SBEC direction on potential future board action items. TEA staff will draft future action items from the board's discussion and direction.
- **Board Action:** SBEC members will take action on the agenda item and the effective date will be immediately upon board approval.

#### **Summary:**

At the June 9, 2017 meeting, the SBEC approved the classroom teacher standards advisory committee. The staff began immediately working with the committee on reviewing the current standards for classroom teachers in the area of grade-banded pedagogy and professional responsibilities and early childhood through third grade. This item will allow the staff to update the Board on the work of the committee, gather direction from the Board, and provide next steps on the educator standards work for the classroom teacher.

#### **Statutory Authority:**

All of the relevant statutes, if applicable, pertaining to this item are listed for you on the agenda title page and the entire statutory language is on Attachment I. This is always helpful in referencing the law the TEA staff was working under when preparing this item.

#### **Relevant SBEC Core Principles:**

- *We believe well-prepared educators are essential.*
- *We believe high certification standards measured by rigorous and reliable assessments are essential.*
- *We believe student success is primary, and we must ensure the safety and welfare of Texas school children.*
- *We believe stakeholder input is essential, and we are accountable to all Texas stakeholders.*
- *We believe we must continually improve our policies and processes in response to changing needs.*
- *We believe we must ensure consistency and effectiveness among educator preparation programs.*

## Item 14:

### Discussion and Update on Classroom Teacher Standards Advisory Committee

#### DISCUSSION

**SUMMARY:** This item provides the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) with an opportunity to discuss an update on the Classroom Teacher Standards Advisory Committee.

**STATUTORY AUTHORITY:** The statutory authority for the classroom teacher class certificate structure is Texas Education Code (TEC), §§21.003(a), 21.031(a)(b), and 21.041(b)(1)-(5). The statutory authority for the appointment of advisory committee members is TEC, §§21.031(b), 21.040(4), and 21.041(b)(4).

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND JUSTIFICATION:** SBEC is statutorily authorized to ensure that all candidates for certification or renewal of certification demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to improve the performance of the diverse population of this state. SBEC is also statutorily required to appoint advisory committee members to recommend standards for each class of certificate. The standards are the basis for the certification examinations and set the requirements for educator preparation program (EPP) curriculum and delivery. The advisory committees include practicing educators, school district personnel, experts, and EPP faculty. These individuals collaborate to create new educator standards or review existing educator standards to ensure that the educator standards align with the commissioner's educator standards, reflect best practices, and where applicable, align with the current versions of the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) that are adopted by the State Board of Education (SBOE).

At the March 3, 2017 SBEC meeting, the Board directed Texas Education Agency (TEA) staff to review the current educator certificate structure and develop a comprehensive plan with stakeholder input to address any opportunities for improvement in the current educator certificate structure for the Board's consideration. At the June 9, 2017 SBEC meeting, TEA staff presented an Educator Certification Structure Redesign Framework for the classroom teacher class of certificates, Item 13 of this agenda, and approved the Classroom Teacher Standards Advisory Committee to begin the work of revising the educator standards to make recommendations for changes to classroom teacher certificates. Attachment II includes the committee members approved by the SBEC and a summary of the selection process.

The following development work prioritized by the SBEC is centered on three distinct grade bands; early childhood through 3<sup>rd</sup> grade (EC-3), 4<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> grade, and 7<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> grade:

- Early Childhood through Grade 3: core subjects content
- Science of Teaching Reading for Elementary Grades
- Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities, Early Childhood through Grade 3
- Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities, Grades 4 through Grade 8
- Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities, Grades 7 through Grade 12

The committee worked in these three groups to focus the respective work along the three grade bands.

**Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities Standards:**

TEA staff first sought to address the grade-bands of the Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) test. The current EC-12 structure of the PPR falls prey to the “mile-wide and inch deep” approach to a teacher’s preparation. The need to narrow and prioritize the standards for beginning teachers is rooted in the theory that by narrowing the grade bands for more focused, rigorous, and relevant content the preparation and support of candidates will improve, thereby producing more effective teachers that can improve student outcomes. The desired PPR grade bands would include EC-3, 4-8, and 7-12. The goal would be to allow the narrower grade bands the ability to focus on developmentally appropriate pedagogical approaches within their grade-band.

Attachment III provides a PPR update of activities with the timelines, committee’s charge, process used, status, and next steps in regards to the PPR standards for all three grade bands.

**Early Childhood – Grade 3 Core Subjects and the Science of Teaching Reading for Elementary Grades**

TEA staff also sought to address the development of an EC-3 Core Subjects test, which would focus specifically on the grade bands that serve students up to the age of eight, which defines the classification “early childhood.” In developing an EC-3 Core Subjects test, the goal would be to place a greater emphasis on the developmentally appropriate content knowledge and skills which are most critical for early childhood practitioners entering the field. This goal is rooted in the theory that by narrowing the grade bands for more focused, rigorous, and relevant content, the preparation and support of EC-3 candidates will improve, thereby producing more effective educators that can improve student outcomes.

TEA staff also sought to address the development of a Science of Teaching Reading test. The development of the Science of Teaching Reading test is grounded in the understanding that reading is an essential skill for every student’s future academic success, which requires effective instruction from students’ earliest years. The science of teaching reading, though, is comprised of complex knowledge and skills of which educators are not currently required to demonstrate a deep understanding as a bar for entry into the EC-3 classroom. This is due to the breadth of content that must be covered in the current certification pathway. Removing the content aligned with the science of teaching reading from the Core Subjects test and developing a separate test allows for the development of a wider breadth and depth of standards specifically addressing the science of teaching reading, while also ensuring that the standards are focused, rigorous, and relevant. The goal would be to establish a clear message that all educators must have a clear understanding of the knowledge and skills associated with the science of teaching reading as a bar for entry into the classroom, regardless of an educator’s assigned content area, ultimately impacting educator preparation and performance, and, thus, student outcomes.

Attachment IV provides an EC-3 and Science of Teaching Reading update of activities with the timelines, committee’s charge, process used, status, and next steps in regards to the standards.

**PUBLIC AND STUDENT BENEFIT:** The public and student benefit anticipated as a result of the work of the Classroom Teacher Standards Advisory Committee would be more rigorous, relevant, and reliable requirements for the preparation, certification, and testing of classroom teachers upon entry into the profession, and retention of these qualified professionals for years to come.

**Staff Members Responsible:**

Grace Wu, Project Manager  
Educator Support

Jessica McLoughlin, Program Specialist  
Educator Support

Christie Pogue, SBEC Manager  
Educator Leadership and Quality

**Attachments:**

- I. Statutory Citations
- II. Classroom Teacher Standards Advisory Committee and Summary of Selection Process
- III. Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities Update of Activities
- IV. Early Childhood through 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade and the Science of Teaching Reading Update of Activities

**ATTACHMENT I****Statutory Citations Related to Classroom Teacher Certificate Structure and Appointment of Advisory Committees****Texas Education Code, §21.003, Certification Required (excerpt):**

- (a) A person may not be employed as a teacher, teacher intern or teacher trainee, librarian, educational aide, administrator, educational diagnostician, or school counselor by a school district unless the person holds an appropriate certificate or permit issued as provided by Subchapter B.

**Texas Education Code, §21.031, Purpose:**

- (a) The State Board for Educator Certification is established to recognize public school educators as professionals and to grant educators the authority to govern the standards of their profession. The board shall regulate and oversee all aspects of the certification, continuing education, and standards of conduct of public school educators.
- (b) In proposing rules under this subchapter, the board shall ensure that all candidates for certification or renewal of certification demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to improve the performance of the diverse student population of this state.

**Texas Education Code, §21.041. Rules; Fees (excerpts):**

- (b) The board shall propose rules that:
  - (1) provide for the regulation of educators and the general administration of this subchapter in a manner consistent with this subchapter;
  - (4) specify the requirements for the issuance and renewal of an educator certificate;
  - (5) provide for the issuance of an educator certificate to a person who holds a similar certificate issued by another state or foreign country, subject to Section 21.052;

**ATTACHMENT II****Classroom Teacher Standards Advisory Committee and Summary of Selection Process****Summary of Selection Process:**

Nomination forms for participation on the Educator Standards Advisory Committee were first sent to all SBEC members on May 18<sup>th</sup> asking for outstanding educators, with an emphasis on current classroom teachers. The nomination forms required candidates to include evidence of measurable student achievement, years of experience, and professional development attended and presented, along with other pertinent information about their teaching assignment. The goal with the selection process was to emphasize diversity in the areas of grade-level, content, areas of expertise, years of experience, geographical representation, student backgrounds, and ethnic representation. After a thorough review process, TEA identified seventy-one committee members sub-divided across the three grade bands, representing over thirty-eight school districts (including urban, rural, and suburban), 14 different Education Service Center regions across the state, and 13 different institutions of higher learning and educational organizations. SBEC approved the committee at the June 9, 2017 meeting.

**SBEC's Charge to Committee:**

TEA staff began the work with the committee by sharing:

- The purpose of the SBEC: to regulate and oversee all aspects of the certification, continuing education, and standards of conduct of public school educators to ensure all candidates for certification demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to improve the performance of all students;
- SBEC's mission: to ensure the highest level of educator preparation to promote student achievement and to ensure the safety and welfare of Texas school children; and
- The charge from SBEC at the March 2017 meeting: to develop a comprehensive plan to address any opportunities for improvement in the current educator certificate structure for the Board's consideration.

**Classroom Teacher Standards Advisory Committee:****Grades EC – 3: Subcommittee**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>District/Organization</b>	<b>Region</b>
Alexander, Joseph	Principal	Waco ISD	12
Ashley, Allison	Teacher	Austin ISD	13
Bradshaw, Annah	Teacher	Northwest ISD	11
Brown, Amanda	Teacher	Austin ISD	13
Brown, David	Prof. of Early Childhood Education	Texas A&M University-Commerce	10
Church-Lang, Jessica	Asst. Prof. of Psychology	The University of Texas at Austin	13
Cockrum, Chelsea	Teacher	Grand Prairie ISD	10
Cogburn, Robin	Teacher	Judson	20
Cole, Shannon	Principal	Grapevine Colleyville ISD	11

Name	Title	District/Organization	Region
Edwards, Ceri	Teacher	Schertz-Cibolo-Universal City ISD	20
Garza, Julie	Teacher	Edinburg CISD	1
Hamman, Doug	Faculty and Administrator	Texas Tech University	18
Hill, Holly Baker	Implementation Specialist K-5 Literacy	San Antonio ISD	20
Holcomb, Tameka	Teacher	Alvin ISD	4
Kofron, Kim	Senior Program Director	TX Association for the Education of Young Children	13
Miller, Sherry	Teacher	Kileen ISD	12
Montoya, Maria	Teacher	Dallas ISD	10
Oliver, Tiffanye	PK Coordinator	Hillsboro ISD	12
Reed, Beverly	Senior Manager Provider Engagements	Collaborative for Children	4
Rodriguez, Jose	Teacher	Leander ISD	13
Summerville, Cody	Teacher	Pflugerville ISD	13
Uptain, Wendy	Manager of Advocacy	The Commit Partnership	10
Valdez, Selena	Teacher	North East ISD	20
White, Monica	Teacher	San Antonio ISD	20
White, Rhoda	Superintendent	Clifton ISD	12
Woerner, Kimberly	Teacher	Medina Valley	20

**Grades 4 – 8: Subcommittee**

Name	Title	District/Organization	Region
Braswell, Marci	Principal	Ricardo ISD	2
Bujan, Shelby Ottley	Teacher	Austin ISD	13
Eggleston, Jannie	Teacher	Klein ISD	4
Garcia, Nick	Senior Managing Director	Teach for America	20
James, Julia	Teacher	Spring ISD	4,
Lofters, Andrew	Program Director	Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board	13
McMahon, Lorie	Teacher	Panther Creek ISD	15

Name	Title	District/Organization	Region
Muniz, Jacqueline	Teacher	South Texas ISD	1
Oeser, Kelvey	Partner	The New Teacher Project	13
Perez, Sarah	Teacher	San Antonio ISD	20
Phillips, Stephanie	Teacher	Frenship ISD	17
Pierce, Dennis	CTE Coordinator	Klein ISD	4
Pirtle, Elizabeth	Teacher	North East ISD	20
Rodriguez-Tovar, Rodrigo	Teacher	Austin ISD	13
Segura, Jennifer Belchi	Teacher	Dallas ISD	10
Siemonsma, Alayna	Teacher	Conroe	6
Steeber, Robert	Chief of Human Capital	Grand Prairie ISD	10
Stoebe, Stephanie	Teacher	Round Rock ISD	13
Telese, James	Prof of Mathematics Education	The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley	1
Vincent, Rhonda	Dir. of Educational Training	Momentous Institute	10
Wahlert, Melodie	Educational Consultant	ESC Region 11	11
Walker, Kelley Sue	Teacher	Grapevine Colleyville ISD	11

**Grades 7 – 12: Subcommittee**

Name	Title	District/Organization	Region
Alfaro, Frank	Asst. Superintendent	Alamo Heights ISD	20
Anderson, Lauren	Teacher	Bloomburg ISD	8
Burke, Angela	Teacher	Dallas ISD	10
Conlon, Jessica	Partner	The New Teacher Project	13
Cunningham, Garry	Teacher	Wichita Falls ISD	9
Dale Jensen	Teacher	Clear Creek ISD	4
Davis, Aicha	Teacher	DeSoto ISD	10
Fleenor, Elmer	Teacher	Taft ISD	2
Fraser, Chris	Senior Dean	Relay Graduate School of Education	4



Name	Title	District/Organization	Region
Gonzales Jr., Jose	Teacher	Levland ISD	5
Ham, Lisa	Dir of Instructional Tech	Highland Park ISD	10
Hill, Dorris	Teacher	Grand Prairie ISD	10
Howard, Carrie	Teacher	Petersburg ISD	17
Hunt, Teresa	Teacher	Seymour ISD	9
Kovacic, Kelly	Sr. Dir of Educator Initiatives	The Commit Partnership	10
Macha, Sarah	Teacher	New Caney ISD	6
Maphies, Alicia	Principal	Frisco ISD	10
Mata, Magdalena	Teacher	Alamo Heights ISD	20
McMahan, Angela	Teacher	Gregory - Portland ISD	2
Nelson-Archer, Michelle	Teacher	Fort-Bend ISD	4
Skidmore, Susana Troncoso	Assoc Prof of Educational Leadership	Sam Houston State Univ.	6
Wert, Linda	Career and Tech Ed Prog Coordinator	Klein ISD	4
West, Sandra	Assoc. Professor of Biology	Texas State University	13
White, Ashley	Campus Instructional Coach	Grapevine Colleyville ISD	11

**ATTACHMENT III****Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities Update of Activities****May 2017**

Because the current PPR standards are too narrow and are not prioritized for beginning teachers, TEA staff reviewed the existing Commissioner's Rules Concerning Educator Standards found in Chapter 149, Subchapter AA Teacher Standards as a starting place to ensure alignment as reflected in the Educator Certification Structure Redesign Framework. These 66 standards were created by a committee of Texas educators in 2013 and adopted into rule in 2014 with the intention of setting an aspirational bar for all teachers to strive. The desire to prioritize these standards by identifying the foundational competencies for a beginning or developing teacher is rooted in the belief that teaching is a complex endeavor and the knowledge, skills, and expertise develop over time through practice, reflection, and feedback. Sixty-six aspirational standards can seem overwhelming for a beginning teacher and many are unsure of what to work on first. The need to make recommendations on how to strategically sequence and scaffold the standards for beginning teachers would be the chief responsibility of the Educator Standards Advisory Committee.

**June 9, 2017**

SBEC approved the committee.

**June 13, 2017**

Once the committee was chosen, TEA staff conducted a webinar, and the committee members were assigned pre-work asking them to familiarize themselves with the Commissioner's Rules for Teacher Standards to internalize this vision of excellence for our teachers, as well as the T-TESS rubric, rooted in the Teacher Standards and used as the appraisal tool in over 90% of all Texas school districts, to serve as a guide for the progression of a teacher's development. Committee members were asked to focus their attention on the elements that distinguish a developing teacher to prioritize the standards for the narrower grade-banded approach to the Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) standards. For supplemental reading, the committee members were given the publication *Fast Start* (2014) by TNTP and the High-leverage Practices by Teaching Works of the University of Michigan School of Education. These documents provide two different perspectives on the need to prioritize the foundational skills for beginning teachers.

After completing their pre-reading assignments, the committee members were then asked to prioritize half of the 66 Teacher Standards and provide rationale and specification for what each of those standards could look like within their grade band sub-committee. This activity was intended to force committee members to reflect on what are the essential foundational skills a developing teacher needs to focus on in their preparation and what that would look like within each of the narrower grade bands.

Once all the pre-work submissions were collected, each grade band facilitator “rolled-up” their data detailing which standards were the most frequently prioritized within their respective sub-committee. This data then served as the starting point for a discussion within each grade band sub-committee at the in-person committee meeting.

**June 19, 2017**

TEA staff conducted an in-person meeting held at the American Institute of Research (AIR). Three staff members facilitated the committee and broke into three subcommittees. The committee members were encouraged to share their perspective, ask clarifying questions of each other, and engage in rich dialogue over which standards to prioritize. Committee members were then asked to review each other’s specification examples and provide feedback to be used later in PPR test development.

After the in-person committees met as separate grade bands, the three facilitators shared their respective committee’s prioritized standards, the highlights from each discussion, and then looked for similarities and differences across grade bands.

**June 30, 2017**

TEA staff sent out a second version of their prioritized list for another round of feedback.

**July 25, 2017**

TEA staff conducted a second webinar to review submitted feedback and next steps.

**August 4, 2017**

TEA staff presents advisory committee update and provides SBEC with next steps.

**ATTACHMENT IV****Early Childhood through 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade and the Science of Teaching Reading  
Update of Activities****May 2017**

TEA staff sought to address the development of an EC-3 Core Subjects test, which would focus specifically on the grade bands that serve students up to the age of eight, which defines the classification “early childhood.” In developing an EC-3 Core Subjects test, the goal would be to place a greater emphasis on the developmentally appropriate content knowledge and skills which are most critical for early childhood practitioners entering the field. This goal is rooted in the theory that by narrowing the grade bands for more focused, rigorous, and relevant content, the preparation and support of EC-3 candidates will improve, thereby producing more effective educators that can improve student outcomes.

TEA staff also sought to address the development of a Science of Teaching Reading test. The development of the Science of Teaching Reading test is grounded in the understanding that reading is an essential skill for every student’s future academic success, which requires effective instruction from students’ earliest years. The science of teaching reading, though, is comprised of complex knowledge and skills, of which educators are not currently required to demonstrate a deep understanding as a bar for entry into the EC-3 classroom. This is due to the breadth of content which must be covered in the current certification pathway. Removing the content aligned with the science of teaching reading from the Core Subjects test and developing a separate test allows for the development of a wider breadth and depth of standards specifically addressing the science of teaching reading, while also ensuring that the standards are focused, rigorous, and relevant. The goal would be to establish a clear message that all educators must have a clear understanding of the knowledge and skills associated with the science of teaching reading as a bar for entry into the classroom, regardless of an educator’s assigned content area, ultimately impacting educator preparation and performance, and, thus, student outcomes.

With this call to narrow the focus of the Core Subjects test and develop a Science of Teaching Reading test, TEA staff began with the EC-6 Core Subjects standards, which serve as the foundation for the current certification pathway for educators who teach in grades EC-3. After an initial examination of the standards, TEA recognized that some language of the standards would need to be removed due to its reflection of content in grades 4-6. In addition, they recognized that additional standards would need to be added to reflect the increased depth of focus on developmentally appropriate EC-3 content and content pedagogy. Finally, they noted that further review and revisions would be required to ensure that the EC-3 standards reflected the current TEKS, which had been updated in multiple content areas after the development of the EC-6 Core

Subjects standards. From this reflection, a framing question arose: “What needs to be added, removed, or adjusted to ensure: alignment with EC-3 student expectations (TEKS and Pre-K Guidelines), rigor and relevance, and incorporation of best practices in early childhood education?”

Addressing this framing question in relation to the current EC-6 Core Subjects standards would be the chief responsibility of the Educator Standards Advisory Committee.

**June 9, 2017**

SBEC approved the committee.

**June 13, 2017**

Once the committee was chosen, TEA staff conducted a webinar and the committee members were instructed to select a content-specific sub-committee to serve on within during the final two days of the committee work at the in-person meeting on June 20-21, 2017. The content-specific sub-committees included English Language Art Reading/Science of Teaching Reading, Math, Science, Social Studies, and Fine Arts, Health and Physical Education. Groups were limited to five committee members to have equitable distribution across sub-committees.

Committee members were then assigned pre-work asking them to familiarize themselves with the EC-6 Core Subjects standards to internalize the current vision for educator expectations across the EC-6 grade band, with the understanding that this document would be used as a springboard in the development of EC-3 Core Subjects Standards for their chosen content area. Committee members were then asked to read the Prekindergarten Guidelines and TEKS for their chosen content area to internalize the vision for student expectations across the EC-3 grade bands.

After completing their pre-reading assignments, committee members were then asked to re-read the EC-6 Core Subjects Standards for their chosen content area with the lens of aligning these educator expectations with the expectations of students in grades EC-3. As they read, committee members were instructed to capture notes, in whatever form was most useful for them, as to where the committee may need to adjust, remove, or add standard language to align to EC-3 TEKS expectations.

**June 20-21, 2017**

TEA staff conducted an in-person meeting held at the American Institute of Research (AIR). During the in-person committee meetings, committee members met in their content sub-committees to share their perspectives, ask clarifying questions of each other, and engage in a rich dialogue over the addition, removal, and revision of the current EC-6 standards to make recommendations for the development of new EC-3 Core Subjects standards. In addition, the English Language Arts and Science of Teaching Reading sub-committee made recommendations regarding the distribution of content across the English Language Arts Core Subject standards and the new Science of Teaching Reading standards.

While some sub-committees found this work straight forward, others encountered challenges when it came to making their recommendations, due to the extent to which the TEKS have changed since the development of the EC-6 Core Subjects standards. One content-area sub-committee requested to approach the work differently to ensure better alignment with the TEKS and incorporate developmentally appropriate content pedagogy more intentionally. They did this by naming the TEKS and Pre-K guidelines as the content standards and drafting new content pedagogy standards aligned to their content area.

The facilitator shared the work of the sub-committees with TEA staff after the in-person committee meeting, who recommended approaching the development of EC-3 Core Subjects standards in a manner aligned with the second approach of adopting the TEKS as educator content standards.

TEA staff then drafted a potential pathway forward for the development of EC-3 Core Subjects standards, which would include establishing the Pre-K Guidelines and TEKS as educator standards. Rationale for this approach includes the understanding that the Pre-K Guidelines and TEKS are developmentally appropriate, rigorous, and research-based.

**June 30, 2017**

After the in-person committee meeting, the facilitator shared the work of each sub-committee with the committee at large to provide everyone with the opportunity to further refine the recommendations of their sub-committee and lend their perspective and insight to the work of additional content-area sub-committees.

**July 25, 2017**

TEA staff conducted a second webinar to review submitted feedback and next steps.

**August 4, 2017**

TEA staff presents advisory committee update and provides SBEC with next steps.