# **Colorado Literacy Council**

October 21, 2009 10:00 AM – 1:00 PM 1575 Sherman Street 6<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room Denver, CO 80203

#### **AGENDA**

Attendees: Ken Turner, Jeanette Cornier, Debora Scheffel, Nella B. Anderson, Jami Goetz, Barbara Medina, Cindy Gutierrez, Ian Macgillivray, Sandra Nance, Erika Carrillo, and Pam Hitt

I. Welcome and Introductions

## **MINUTES:**

- All attendees were introduced.
- II. Review the Charge and Goals of the Colorado Literacy Council (CLC)
  - A. The charge of the Colorado Literacy Council is to advise the Colorado Department of Education (CDE) on literacy initiatives including:
    - 1. Systems for the review of literacy content in educator preparation programs;
    - 2. Revision of the Program for Licensing Assessment for Colorado Educators (PLACE test);
    - 3. Topics for research forums and professional development with higher education;
    - 4. Innovative literacy preparation programs (both pre-service and in-service)

## **MINUTES:**

- J. Cornier gave an overview of the CLC for new member C. Gutierrez
- J. Cornier reviewed the charge and goals of the CLC (II above)
- III. Review Operating Agreements for Colorado Literacy Council Meetings
  - A. The Norms for Interaction are:
    - The Colorado Literacy Council (CLC) meeting minutes will reflect summary statements of what is discussed, both agreed and not agreed upon by the group, including individual opinions.
    - 2. The CLC members will utilize a consensus process versus a voting process when making decisions. Consensus is defined as the "will of the group."
    - 3. There will be an official agenda and minutes for each CLC meeting.
    - 4. The CLC meetings are meetings held in public but do not include public participation.

## **MINUTES:**

- K. Turner reviewed the Operating Agreements for C. Gutierrez (III above)
- IV. Race to the Top Teacher Effectiveness

- Governor Ritter is putting together a community engagement team
- Nina Lopez, Jo O'Brien, Jeanette Cornier and Rich Wenning are co-chairing committees

- J. Cornier suggested submitting proposed ideas for application
- C. Gutierrez talked about a committee she is a part of. The committee had a discussion regarding diverse student teachers and teacher preparation programs
  - $^{\sim}$  D. Scheffel commented that tools help with performance based outcomes and needs outputs. A continuous improvement model. Use data to drive instruction (growth and improvement plans account for all variability for each institution).
  - ~ David Steiner, the NYC Chancellor, is granting diplomas (MA's) to students that went into the field and were successful with students.
  - $^{\sim}$  K. Turner asked, "What is CDE doing beyond? Incentives follow results. Where are we doing this?"
  - ~ B. Medina discussed contextualizing ongoing support for novice teachers {Cannot compare apples and oranges (i.e., ASC vs. CU-Bldr)}. "Where as a state do we start to differentiate?" Let's look at teachers in year 3, 5, etc.
  - ~ Check a research/development system that is fair and results in increased outcomes for students that the teacher candidates teach
  - ~ J. Cornier suggested building these checks for student teachers/novice teachers in a safe place to make sure it works before it is implemented statewide
  - ~ Using teacher identifiers, teacher/student progress can be followed/observed (data)
  - ~ B. Medina would like all teachers to teach all students (not some teachers, some students)
  - ~ Discussion regarding how to get the student teacher/novice teacher piece in Race to the Top application. K. Turner will send P. Hitt the draft Race to the Top application. P. Hitt will send the draft to the CLC members.

#### V. Literacy Standards/Assessment Revision

# **MINUTES:**

- The timeline has been standards driven and is not now assessment driven
  - ~ The State will adopt new standards in two months
  - ~ CDE has scheduled stakeholder meetings
- The standards were used as a curriculum guide in the past. What does it mean to have mastered knowledge or a skill?
- J. Cornier discussed that CDE and CCHE adopt a PWR assessment tool
- A. What will the impact be for teacher preparation?

- Place this item on the January 2010 agenda for further discussion
- N. Anderson inquired if (student) teacher preparation standards can be changed?
  K. Turner suggested this may be a discussion at the CCODE (Deans of Education) meeting
- Gutierrez suggested if the teacher standards are changed that the new K-12 standards be used (for focus) on rewriting teacher prep standards.
- N. Anderson state that CDE's Scoop has greatly assisted with informing the public about trainings offered by CDE

- D. Scheffel talked about a Global Performance Score (private college in FL uses this) for student teachers. As students receive feedback on their performance it is recorded on a card
  - ~ K. Turner talked about IMMEX (at the University of California/Santa Barbara). It is an online way to train and assess young doctors. It assists the doctors to learn to diagnose patients. Could something like this be used for student teachers? Cambridge has a similar program.
- D. Scheffel talked about working on draft of language for a research to practice center to be include in the Race to the Top application.
- D. Scheffel discussed giving some student/novice teacher training a "gaming" face.
- Discussion about what would be different in preparing teachers?
  - ~ Induction seems to be the weakest link in the programs (including alternative programs)
  - ~ A coaching/tutorial/online mentoring program might be helpful
  - ~ Need both rural and urban ways of turning schools around. Resources are needed!!
- B. What support will be needed to implement effectively?

#### **MINUTES:**

- D. Scheffel suggested that teachers could benefit from a virtual place to get up to date information about teaching
- B. Medina suggested a demonstration site that honors the continuous training of teachers
- C. Gutierrez noted some face to face training is necessary , too
- VI. Higher Education Collaborative Update

## **MINUTES:**

- An advisory committee is meeting on October 22, 2009 to explore what the collaborative is, what does it might look like, and does Colorado want to create/have one?
- Susan Smartt has some grant monies and has offered to head a meeting regarding forming a collaborative.
- VII. Literacy Content Review Process and Tools

- Internal tools have been revised
- Discussion regarding how to improve the efficiency of the review time. (arrival at CDE and when the reviewers have all the documents) CDE is building a tracking system for follow up with programs (communication with the universities/colleges)
- N. Anderson inquired if a timeline is involved with getting a program through the review process. (Additional time is given if a program does not initially pass their review)
- CDE is looking toward an electronic submission process
- CDHE visitor suggested including a CDE content review be completed before the site review. Could a CDE content specialist assist with site reviews?
- Discussion around what could be done if a college/university program has not sent their program 60 days in advance? A suggestion was offered that that college/university may

be required to pay for content reviewers to work with them if the program is not sent in a timely manner

## VIII. PLACE Review Schedule

# **MINUTES:**

- With adoption of new standards, all content tests will be reviewed and possibly revised.
  - ~ The elementary test may be one of the first tests evaluated.
  - ~ Discussion regarding creating a literacy test
    - Bring suggestions to CLC.
  - ~ Changing the tests takes approximately 18 months.
    - Looking for individuals to help with the process of review and revising
- Praxis tests are only the five core content areas. It is a nationwide test
- Discussion about offering a literacy test with Colorado
  - ~ Will check alignment with our new standards (test will not be offered if not aligned with the new Colorado standards)
- IX. Past Items (TABLE for next meeting)
  - A. School Speech / Language Pathologist (SLP) review
    - At the July 22 meeting, CLC Members agreed to no longer require the SLP Endorsement to receive a (separate) literacy review with the Rubric and Checklist.
    - 2. A discussion concerning the use of the 11.08 Endorsement Standard was deferred until this meeting of the CLC.

## **MINUTES:**

- Place this item on the January 2010 agenda for further discussion
- X. Consensus Items

#### MINUTES:

- July 22, 2009 meeting minutes approved
- No other items required voting
- XI. Future CLC Meeting Dates and Other
  - A. Thursday, January 7, 2010

- The meeting will be schedule from 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.
- Discuss offering a higher education forum?
- Check if Reading First has available resources for a higher education forum?
- Waiting for bill to be introduced (in Washington, D.C) for literacy, it could be double the monies that were available to Reading First
- Handouts for this meeting have been scanned and are saved in <u>J:\HEI\Colorado Literacy</u>
  <u>Council (CLC)\Meetings\2009-10-21 Meeting</u>