Guidelines for Content Advisor Feedback

Please review the draft recommendations for the technology applications Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) for kindergarten–grade 8.

There is no specific format required for your feedback. When referencing specific portions of the TEKS, please indicate the grade level and the specific letter/number of the standard to which you are referring, as appropriate.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. Do the draft recommendations for the grade(s) adequately address technology applications concepts? If not, please give examples of how the standards might be improved.

2. Does each grade level follow a complete and logical development of technology applications concepts presented? If not, what suggestions do you have for improvement?

3. Is the level of rigor appropriate for each grade level?

4. Are the draft recommendations aligned horizontally and vertically? If not, what gaps or concepts are missing that should be addressed?

5. Are the proposed student expectations clear and specific? If not, please give examples of how the language might be improved.

6. Are there student expectations that are not essential or unnecessarily duplicative and can be eliminated? If so, please identify by grade level and student expectation number, e.g., 1.7.B (Grade 1, student expectation (7)(B)).

7. Do you have any other suggestions for ways in which the draft recommendations elementary and middle school TEKS can be improved?

Overall, it seemed to be well done. I commend the work groups for all of their hard work. One thing to note, specificity or as work group E says, clarity, or differentiation between grade levels should not impede a local entity's ability to implement. My recommendation then would be to remove some of the specific items into "such as "statements, this will allow for recommendations for rigor and challenge between grades levels when the action being taken is not different but the task or resource used would provide that rigor.

Page 1 Strand: Communication and Collaboration, I agree with the work group.
Page 2 Strand: Computational Thinking Substrand: Foundations Grade 3 and 4 NEW (A)
*   I would recommend removing story and real-world problems from the language included, I find this term in this context limiting.
Page 3 Strand: Computational Thinking Substrand: Foundations
*   NEW (A) I recommend revising the language for clarity and logical flow, once again story problems do not make sense.

- Grade 2-3 NEW (B) I recommend revising the language for clarity and vertical alignment flow, once again specific problem types do not make sense.
- Grade 6 NEW (B) is a great example of how the such as statements can be used to provide examples, and differentiate similar actions with varying degrees of difficulty or rigor.
- Grades 2-5 NEW (C), Grades 6-8 NEW (D) I agree with the rationale. Does this belong with Strand: Creativity and Innovation Substrand: Innovative Design Process?

Page 7 Strand: Creativity and Innovation Substrand: Innovative Design Process
- See note above
- Grade Kinder-5 NEW (A) I feel the original concept of goal setting was lost in the updated language. The personal skills are relevant, but do not supersede or were not explicit in the new language.

Page 10 Strand: Data Literacy, Management, and representation Substrand: Collect Data
- I feel the specificity is constricting, I would recommend using such as statements to recommend types of data the students should know by the grade levels proposed. In Kindergarten – Grade 3 they use this format, then switch in the older grades.
- NEW (A) and New (B) the Boolean expression does not fit into collect data (Grades 6-8) and terminology and use is covered in (B) Grades5-8) I would recommend focusing the (A) substrand on collection since the next 2 substrands cover demonstration, and visualization of data. We may even want to consider language similar to ISTE Knowledge Constructor 1.3.b Students evaluate the accuracy, perspective, credibility and relevance of information, media, data or other resources.

Pages 14 and 15 Strand: Digital Citizenship Substrand: Social interaction
- Grade 3 New (A), New (B), New (C) I recommend to revise or bring grade 4 down

Page 22 Strand: Practical Technology Concepts Substrand: Processes
- Grade 8 NEW (B) revise for clarity continue such as statements from previous grades into grade 5 and 8

Page 23 Strand: Practical Technology Concepts Substrand: Skills and Tools
- Consider revising Kinder- Grade 2 for clarity and verb usage, and consider whether (A) and (C) are independently relevant.

Page 30 Strand: Practical Technology Concepts Substrand: Skills and Tools
- I would not change the such as statement in grade 8 into including this does not increase rigor and therefore is unnecessary.

Page 31 Strand: Practical Technology Concepts Substrand: Skills and Tools
- Grade 6-8 NEW (I) The work group removed this, and then noted in the section they referred to that they removed it, they did not put them back in.

Introduction Draft- I do not have any further recommendations for revision.