

Michigan Department of Labor and Economic Growth Curriculum Practitioners' Task Force

- Review of ALP Pilot Project
- Identification of Projects for Task Forces
- Review of Progress on ESL/GED Content Standards
- Identification of Critical Issues for Curriculum Task Force
- Brainstorm Session for Professional Development Ideas

Attendees: Lynn Aldrich-Spearing, Karree Ballard, Linda Colagross, Laura Gates, Sr. Mary Hemmen, Susan Ledy, Jeff McNeal, Kathi Polis, Marilyn Reichardt, Bob Rickard, Jane Rudisell, Jo Pamment, Pat Walstra, Carole Wells, Bonnie Vondracek

Patricia Walstra welcomed everyone to the first task force meeting for 2004-05. After introductions, Pat provided everyone with a list of the task force meetings for the year and the process for signing up for meetings.

The committee reviewed the minutes from the last meeting. A motion was made by Carole Wells to accept the minutes. The motion was seconded by Laura Gates. There was no discussion so Pat called for a vote. All committee members voted to accept the minutes.

Pat reviewed the agenda and asked for any additional issues or items to be added. No issues were added by the committee.

A review of the ALP Pilot Project process was provided by Pat. Committee members discussed some of their experiences with using the revised ALP form. Sr. Mary Hemmen and Susan Ledy discussed the need for Literacy Councils to be involved in the process. A list was read by Laura Gates on the participants in the pilot project. It was noted that there is indeed a Literacy Council involved in the pilot project. Laura Gates talked about how the ALP began as a student-driven piece, but that it now appears to be a MAERS type of form. Also discussed was the responsibility of districts because of the inclusion of the Barriers of Success into the ALP. The committee discussed how this addition may require districts to provide additional services. Pat stated that the Barriers to Success could be difficult for systems to implement.

The process of the state bringing information regarding this pilot project back to the committee prior to state-wide dispersal was discussed. Linda Colagross also discussed the inclusion of accommodations for special education. The discussion on the ALP ended with the committee agreeing that like most forms, it is a living, breathing document.

Linda Colagross was introduced as the committee's state level person. Linda will serve on the Curriculum Task Force and will provide professional expertise, as well as a linkage with the state office. Linda identified some of the projects that Dianne Duthie wants the different task forces to address. These included such areas as:

- Data Analysis
- Distance Learning
- ALP

- Content Standards
- Manual

The process of how products will be sent to the committee and back was discussed by Pat. Carole Wells requested information regarding the Administrative Handbook and its availability on the web as an entire document which can be printed in its entirety. Linda stated that one needed to print the handbook by sections so that as changes only those sections would need to be reprinted.

The topic of content standards was the next segment of the meeting. Linda Colagross discussed going to a content standards workshop in Washington, DC next week. She reviewed the agenda for the consortium in D. C. Linda will report back to the committee at the next meeting regarding the information obtained from the consortium.

Kathi Polis stated that the purpose of the meeting is to work on ABE standards and give support. The consortium will focus only on ABE. Kathi further discussed that other questions would be discussed, such as whether content standards are auditable, mandatory, etc. The committee discussed the need to wait until Linda's report at the next meeting before continuing to work on the GED and ESL content standards.

Carole Wells and Jo Pamment discussed the ESL content standards and the current progress from the subcommittee. Jo reviewed the draft technical assistance paper with the committee. She stated that benchmarks and applications were completed for all 7 levels through the use of four different strands. Carole and Jo discussed how CASAS and NRS standards, as well as content standards from different states, were used for the beginning draft. A working meeting with the ESL committee will be scheduled in the future.

The committee discussed the use of content standards in the field. Jane Rudisill discussed the usability of content standards. Bob Richard discussed how the MEAP does not always measure what is being taught, but content standards and assessment tools tied to them can. Bob further stated that if a curriculum is being set in place then we need to be cognizant of the measuring tool to assess such curriculum and advised the group to always keep measurement/assessment in the forefront.

Kathi stated that content standards are not currently in the reauthorization language. She supported the use of content standards as a framework for teachers on what needs to be taught. Jeff McNeal cautioned that individual districts have the authority to develop specific curriculum frameworks for their programs so governance would be an issue for anything that would be "mandated."

Kirk Sanford from Muskegon Heights joined the group for the rest of the meeting as a visitor.

Pat discussed the schedule for the year and the content standards project. It was agreed that everyone would read the draft standards that have been written prior to the next meeting. Ideas regarding the standards will be discussed at the next meeting. These standards will be placed on

the MAEPD website and password protected so that everyone in the committee has easy access to the material.

Pat lead the group in a brainstorming session on possible other items for the upcoming year. Pat started by reviewing the critical issues that were identified at the first meeting of the task force.

Lynn Aldrich-Spearing discussed the Adult High School diploma programs. She discussed that one issue with this program is how to award credits through a competency-based system that is credible. She further stated that some overarching outcomes and how to assess those outcomes would be a necessary piece of this type of framework, as well as how NCLB and certification work within the system.

The area of distance learning and how it is attached to curriculum was discussed by Jane, Susan, and Lynn.

Bob Rickard discussed assessment and asked whether or not an analysis had been done of the three tests that will be used in Michigan. Linda stated that a content type of analysis has not been done by the state.

Other issues discussed included how to bridge people out of Literacy into ABE/GED, including transitional teams, best practices, professional development on how to bridge the gap, etc. Linda stated that one resource for the group is the Administrative Guide Book which has the names of all of the Literacy Councils, etc.

The task force discussed types of professional development that they would like to see provided. This included:

- Individualization – one room school house piece
- Implementing GED/ESL/ABE content standards (upon project completion)
- Distance learning –being able to experience different types of learning and using different programs
- State train-the-trainer, such as was done for the GED 2002 where a state training was done and then repeated regional with resources to support the professional development activity
- Professional development bank of trainers who have specific expertise and have had train-the-trainer types of experiences
- Bridging people out of literacy into ABE/GED

Pat summed up the ideas of the committee and reviewed what needs to be accomplished prior to the next meeting at Tree Tops. In addition, Jane offered to bring information on grade level content standards. Bob will bring the Michigan Literacy Placement Profile (MLPP).

Pat stated that at the next meeting, priorities for the year's strategic plan will be discussed. She asked for additional comments from the group prior to adjournment. Jeff made a motion to adjourn. Carole seconded the motion. There was not discussion. A vote was called by Pat with all committee members voting aye. Meeting was adjourned.