

Your name and organization:	Comments on the proposed revisions:	AOE Response:
Sheena Strada, Hannaford Career Center	<p>540-19; 540-19A: This organizational system is an improvement; the numbered outline structure makes the requirements easier to read and comprehend in context. The addition of "challenging proficiency-based instruction" (4.1, p. 111) is an important addition. These standards more adequately capture the current demands of the English teaching profession. The addition of the "writing portfolio program" (p. 115) is important at the middle level and should be utilized in all ELA classrooms as part of a proficiency-based system. This is a welcome addition. I appreciate the final standard listed, "Uses the results of literacy assessments to adjust and/or target instruction..." (p. 115). The use of data is a professional responsibility.</p> <p>5440-05: These revisions are, overall, an excellent update. References to standards-based learning experiences, qualitative and quantitative means of evaluating text, promoting social justice, multiple pathways, and use of data are significant additions to these standards. I wonder about the assessment of standard 6. How will the AOE assess that we teachers of English are "demonstrat[ing] evolving knowledge of how theories and research about social justice [...] can enhance students' opportunities to learn in English Language Arts"?</p>	

<p>James Nagle Saint Michael's College</p>	<p>In the proposed science standards. "For the full endorsement, a candidate must have at least one course that addresses each content knowledge area; a single class could potentially address multiple areas." Point of clarification: What are the content areas? In the science standards, section 2 "Content Knowledge and Skills" refers to four areas: Physical Science, Life Science, Earth & Space Sciences, & Engineering Design Process. Are these the content knowledge area referred to in the above quote? If so, why not just list them. Also, the majors listed seem restrictive. How much discretion does "the equivalent in undergraduate and/or graduate coursework" provide? In the past, VT AOE representatives have been very conservative in their interpretation of "equivalent".</p>	<p>"For the full endorsement, a candidate must have at least one course that addresses each content knowledge area." Those content knowledge areas are Matter and Its Interactions, Motion and Stability, Energy and Waves, From Molecules to Organisms, etc...</p> <p>These are the same content knowledge areas that are named in the NGSS. It is important to note that this is (1) only if a teacher wants the full endorsement, and (2) that a single course could touch on a number of these content knowledge standards. (e.g., you could imagine a single course on environmental design that would address 2.1.4, 2.1.2.1, 2.1.2.2, and 2.1.2.4).</p> <p>This will result in some additional work at colleges/teacher education programs in that there will have to be a determination of which content knowledge areas are addressed in each class taken by a teacher education candidate; however, the committee felt that it was essential to align the content learning of prospective teachers with that required of students under NGSS.</p>
--	---	---