

Quality Initiatives and Curriculum Committee
January 21, 2004
Marshall University Graduate College

Present: Karen Duckworth, Marty Davis, Mimi Davis, Jacqui Dudley, Ginger Huffman, Julia Wright and Ann Nutt

KEY DISCUSSION POINTS	KEY DECISIONS
<p>Approved Curricula The approved curricula list has been distributed to counties and was presented at regional technical assistance sessions.</p> <p>Two publishers that were not approved have been in contact with Ann. High Reach was offered the opportunity for an appeal but no word has been heard that they wish to pursue. Pebble Soup understood the decision but wishes to be considered for supplement list.</p>	<p>Ann and Ginger will follow up on opportunities for the publishers to be available at Celebrating Connections.</p> <p>Clarification will be needed on the purpose of a “foundational” curriculum in relation to ELSF. There is some disconnect relating to the ELSF being the curriculum vs the framework curricula used as the basis for the ELSF.</p>
<p>Early Learning Standards Framework (ELSF) The ELSF has been out for comment. Comment period ended January 11. Limited comments were received. Comments received primarily related to the “experiences” column, and teacher’s ability to offer “daily” the experiences. Some of this relates to lack of understanding of an integrated approach.</p> <p>After minor revisions the ELSF will hopefully be presented to the State Board of Education on February 11, 2004 for final approval.</p> <p>Some positive responses from individuals involved in early review and feedback of CSO.</p>	<p>Will probably need to do some clarification/FAQ regarding “daily opportunities” definition.</p>
<p>Literacy Supplements Policy 2525 calls for use of “approved enhancements.” County feedback indicates the need for literacy supplements to be reviewed initially. The committee needs to consider process for completing this.</p> <p>Considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ask counties what is currently in use to try to review • What is the difference between a “supplement and a “resource”? How do 	

KEY DISCUSSION POINTS	KEY DECISIONS
<p>we determine the difference? How many can we realistically review?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supplements should relate to the ELSF content area and support the philosophical approach. • Supplements should provide additional information to support or expand on the foundational curriculum for specific content areas. • Do supplements need to restate the philosophy? • How much of the ELSF area do they need to cover – some might be on just one area such as phonological awareness while others might cover all language/ literacy areas? • If there is an “approved” list that limits use to particular supplements, how do we keep up with new resources? <p>Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determination of exactly what to evaluate in a consistent manner for a supplement. Information within a supplement could be variable yet still be valid and supportive of foundational curricula. • Effectiveness rests with the teacher regardless of what might be on a “list”. • Limitations of use of new materials as they are published. • Vast array of resources available with no apparent concrete/ consistent manner to differentiate an “enhancement” from a “resource.” • Variable kinds of information that might be in a resource, therefore determining a consistent way to evaluate. • Supplements should not become the curriculum; a foundational curriculum should drive decision-making while resources can give teachers additional information. 	<p>Committee Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contact counties to determine what supplements for literacy/ numeracy are currently in use. • Develop a list of suggested resources based on the ELSF and committee’s knowledge of support to foundational curricula. This list would not be exhaustive but a support to staff to identify appropriate resources. • Target energies on professional development for classroom staff to understand appropriate curriculum and instruction for early education classrooms.

KEY DISCUSSION POINTS	KEY DECISIONS
<p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Email counties to see what supplements they are currently using. • Next meeting review and suggest literacy resources. • Pursue selection of assessment through comparisons with ELSF. • Pursue development of a professional development module regarding early childhood curriculum and assessment. 	<p>Ann to present recommendation to TA Steering team and PIECES Advisory for support.</p>
<p>Next Meetings: Next meetings tentatively scheduled for: February 20 March 15 Locations to be announced.</p>	