

Early Literacy Educator Preparation Council Meeting Notes | 10.18.23

NOTE: The goal of the Council is to develop recommendations for the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission, including their rules for approving elementary educator preparation programs that operate in Oregon and licensing requirements for elementary educators. These notes reflect only the conversation of the Council for these particular prompts for this meeting date and do not represent any final recommendations or decisions.

Further, the virtual audio and visual recording serves as the primary minutes per public meetings law. These are additional notes from breakout discussions which were not video or audio recorded. Council meeting materials and recordings can be found here:

<https://www.oregon.gov/gov/policies/Pages/Early-Literacy-Educator-Prep-Council.aspx>

Table of Contents

Breakout Session 1 Current Educator Preparation Standards.....	2
Breakout Session 2 Shared Analysis.....	5
Oregon Literacy Framework Section 4: Reading Models section.....	6
Oregon Literacy Framework Section 6: Writing, Reading, Vocabulary, Comprehension, Background Knowledge section.....	8
Oregon Literacy Framework Section 7: Core Instruction & Assessment.....	9
Oregon Literacy Framework Section 8: Reaching All Learners.....	10
Breakout Session 3 National Scan.....	12

Breakout Session 1 | Current Educator Preparation Standards

The notes below represent a compilation of feedback all breakout groups. The items in **orange** represent themes that were constructed upon analysis of the feedback after the meeting.

1. What are your observations about the current standards?

Overall (across standards)

- Current standards are vague, without examples, and lack clear guidance in terms of what needs to be taught.
- Having worked with other states I was surprised that these were our standards, these are so general, there is a range of specifics that we want to see there, we haven't always taught at the universities the highest level that teachers needed - we have not been giving guidance about how to do that - lack of specificity was my concern.
- Generalities leave room for interpretation. One of our goals needs to be specific guidance for EPPs.
- ODE's Early literacy framework is not mentioned in current standards.
- What does evidence-based mean? How is this defined?
- Knowledge of standards *and* practices to reach those standards.
- Too general, especially for new teachers
- Results of what we are seeing in our K-12 schools is a skill deficit. We will need to have "teeth" from Governor to EPPs to do what is needed.
- Assessments with examples of what happened in a teacher's classroom - be able to tell them what they need to do; not at the expense of innovation, but examples needed to support teachers; teacher *and* admin training - admin should not be evaluating teachers if they do not know the standards (i.e., SoR). Experiences in teaching to teach the standards.
- Dual language elementary school context - seeing science of reading intersecting with multilingualism. In bilingual settings, there are assumptions that science of reading only applies to English rather than also taking into account that neuroscience applies to all students. This should be in new requirements as applicable to all students.
- Standards written with assumption that there was clarity and shared understanding of about what good reading practice was and what best practices were
- Relies on educator prep program faculty expertise; less reliance on state prescription. Reliance on technical requirements, reliance on peer review.
- When kids start seeing themselves in the literature and way it's presented to them. Local control - lot of times hit it and a lot of times don't. Percentages are lower than peers but not a reflection of student's capacity. Rather not a chance for folks to come to table and say this is what we want for our kids. Now, we can build on tribal consultation we can be more aggressive on what we want for our kids so they succeed.
- Vagueness of standards, how do we ensure they are implemented.
- Where are the big 5?
- Other states have more prescriptive standards. Looking at Kentucky, they explicitly require phonemic awareness, vocabulary, comprehension are included.
- Evidence-based - where might this be clearly stated?
- It will be helpful to define the what not the how

- Right now, the way they are written is ambiguous. Too much variability in what this looks like in practice. So much up to interpretation. Needs to have shared meaning, and what does this look like across the state.
- I agree - anything could fit here. That is too great an assignment for our teachers, they have to put all of this into practice in context - what have we given them that allows them to do that
 - **More specific, but not too prescriptive and room for new knowledge**
 - How we document the specificity and still provide the flexibility? We won't get this opportunity every year. We hold space to allow that we are not tying hands - let's give them many tools in their tool box.
 - I would agree but narrow tools to a highest level of proficiency, Ohio wasn't in our groups or CO, they took the main tenets and big five areas would be mentioned. They don't do it at all, even for interventionists. We have a good foundation - national panel on reading, and yes, additional ways. The big things don't change, but new things come along
 - Need to be careful in thinking about these standards - not too ambiguous but not too prescriptive or narrow that becomes banning things. Have other states found the sweet spot?
 - Agreed concerns for prescriptive standards
 - Does help to have standards be specific. If I'm under pressure to put them into state law, I want to resist that, but that they are aligned with national standards. But then these standards will be reviewed periodically and changed, but we will be under pressure to take it out of the hands of the professionals and into ours (lawmakers)

Dyslexia standards

- Dyslexia standards are more specific
- Dyslexia are separate - legislation has been disconnected
- Language around dyslexia - as a working teacher, all a school can do is identify risk, currently no special ed program that will say a student is dyslexic, labeling concerns.
- Dyslexia identification could be defined further. What does this look like?
- Dyslexia - good universal design for early literacy instruction - *just embed rather than separate, pre-k and k not included?*

Reading Interventionist standards

- Reading interventionist standard comment: I see the list and I don't feel like this is aligned. I can't tell what the coursework that is expected. People may feel like it is evidence-based but not necessarily up to date.
- Foundational skills point - how deep does this go regarding progression of skills and assessments. What does this look like in coursework and what assessments do the teacher candidates need to demonstrate?

Assessments

- Standards don't speak to assessments

- We need a mechanism by which we can assess what teachers are learning in their programs and how they adapt to any new standards. And, training for K-12 standards to ensure alignment.
- The university would have to cover that - so that it could be connected and matched to assessments to ensure that it would actually occur. What needs to happen to help ensure that.

Administrator Standards

- Where are the administrator standards? What do they need to know and do?
- Agree on administrator pieces that have been shared
- Principal makes such a big difference, I have seen that in practice. The power of doing the right thing, we have to make sure and come back and look at it. Should not be opinion based.

Bridging theory and standards into strengthening core instructional practices

- There are standards by which the state uses to approve educator preparation programs (EPPs), and there are standards by which the state licenses teachers. Which is important to tackle first and what other ways make a difference? [Note: Executive order deadlines specify program approval as the December deadline, licensing standards in March deadline]
- Clarification between program standards and licensure standards for candidates - goal is to be in alignment. Question of level of detail - TSPC has purview of both sets of standards. How are those different in terms of specificity? Clarification between what is required of candidates versus how EPPs must instruct candidates.
- Example - in a syllabus, they would require candidate to know the 3rd grade standards. In a curriculum instruction class, standards are assessed and memorized, so the teacher has that knowledge.
- How do we bridge what is happening in EPP classrooms and what goes on in practice with those teachers out in the world - there is an opportunity to make that deep connection with theory into practice when candidates get to practice, get into classrooms
- Constant struggle to have core classroom students who are put in interventions then excel, what if they were able to get that with core instruction in the first place

2. Are there technical changes (line edits) or structural changes (merging sections) that you're already starting to consider?

- Guidance for EPPs on explicit content
- Alignment to current reading intervention/special education language from ODE
- Deemphasize focus on dyslexia, but rather looking at potential reading learning disabilities
- Support for EPP faculty and staff ongoing professional learning- we trust content knowledge experts in ed prep- how are we ensuring that they are staying up-to-date
- Adding administrators to the list of programs that need to be focused on literacy instruction

3. Other questions for TSPC staff or about standards generally?

- How do we ensure that the standards are implemented
- Should we be focusing so heavily on program standards, if we don't have high quality licensure standards to come alongside

Breakout Session 2 | Shared Analysis

For this breakout session, there were 4 breakout groups and each group was provided with assigned sections of the Oregon Early Literacy Framework. All groups were asked to review the two “conditions for learning sections” (Belonging [Section 1] and Family Partnerships [section 2]). In addition to these, the groups were asked to review the following sections of the Oregon Early Literacy Framework:

- Reading Models (group 1)
- Writing, Reading, Comprehension, Vocabulary, and Background Knowledge (group 2)
- Core Instruction & Assessment (group 3)
- Reaching all Learners (group 4)

The review tool they used can be found [here](#), which includes the current Oregon standards related to reading that they were asked to review for alignment with their assigned sections of Oregon’s Early Literacy Framework. These were the questions to which each group was asked to respond:

1) What are your observations about the current standards in comparison to this section of the Framework? What do you see well represented? What isn’t?

2) If our goal is to build a relationship between the two (standards and this section of the Framework), what would it look like? This could be answered by “big picture” structural changes (e.g., combine the standards into one and call them Literacy Standards) or additions or line edits.

Oregon Literacy Framework Section 4: Reading Models section

1) What are your observations about the current standards in comparison to this section of the Framework? What do you see well represented? What isn't?

- Question regarding this Reading Instruction Standard: "Provide classroom instruction that aligns with Oregon State Board of Education standards for early childhood, 1st, 2nd, and 3rd-grade literacy and reading standards."
 - Per earlier conversation, does early childhood belong here? Is this a different set of standards to be developed?
- Feedback regarding this Reading Instruction Standard: "Implement evidence-based reading instructional strategies to enable public school students to become proficient readers by the end of 3rd-grade"
 - This will need to be defined for specific assessment purposes (proficient on NAEP, for example, is a high bar that few ever meet)

2) If our goal is to build a relationship between the two (standards and this section of the Framework), what would it look like? This could be answered by "big picture" structural changes (e.g., combine the standards into one and call them Literacy Standards) or additions or line edits.

- More specificity
- Standards could specifically say follow the framework/find a balance
- Research is constantly evolving, so don't be too specific requiring repeated updating of standards - how to be specific enough without making too limited
- K and Pre-K mentioned, but not consistently
- Is it important to know the specificity or incorporate into all standards; find a middle ground
- Mindful of teacher autonomy and ability to attend to your [classroom's] context
- Include the big five and oral language (evidence-based standards that align to these); systematic and intentional phonics instruction, for example
- Current standards don't speak to culturally responsive or asset-based instruction/make explicit in standards
- Give teachers the what in these standards, but not necessarily the how
- How to align framework and TSPC standards
- Some concepts are hard to measure
- Hard to build the crosswalk with the vast differences
- Close loophole to finding research to support their confirmation bias
- Not too prescriptive because evolving field
- Teachers need to keep up with this evolving knowledge in practice
- Reference to "current" - current version of handbook, current version of framework (for this work), etc
- Using "English" in framework can allow some to think this doesn't apply to them if they instruct in another language (language of instruction?)

Thoughts around changes

- Would EPPs say they are already meeting these?

- Suggestion that TSPC would provide a crosswalk to demonstrate meeting the depth of the framework
- Support faculty/staff development will be critical
- Do practices listed in dyslexia need to be listed separately? Does it reflect the language used in schools? Thoughtful about words used when identifying potential disabilities
- 5 models - need to dig into, may not be in depth for pre-service, veteran teachers need
- All the items in the dyslexia standard should be for all kids
- Early identification of reading difficulties and assessment literacy
- Bring CORE instruction up to the level of interventionists/be experts rather than follow a boxed curriculum
- More important that educators know how to use the tools than what to call them

Oregon Literacy Framework Section 6: Writing, Reading, Vocabulary, Comprehension, Background Knowledge section

1) What are your observations about the current standards in comparison to this section of the Framework? What do you see well represented? What isn't?

- Reading standards are vague, need reading awareness, phonics.
- Both OARs state that alignment with OSBE Standards, so are we aligning with Literacy Framework or OSBE?
 - TSPC answered the question that OSBE is an old ODE framework. These standards/rules on reading were last reviewed 5-10 years ago
- These standards aren't producing learning outcomes, some schools/districts aren't teaching all of the evidenced-based strategies

Context from TSPC leadership about standards

- Strategies - The program standards should allow for various strategies to teach early literacy. These are not usually included in the TSPC program standards
- Evidence-based - The review of EPP standards depends on the EPP demonstrating the evidence for the effectiveness of their literacy curricula
- Dyslexia program standards are more recent and reflect a greater degree of specificity regarding the competencies.
- Regarding conditions for learning sections of the framework (Belonging and Family Partnerships), TSPC has specific standards in these areas (e.g., culturally sustaining practices). These standards are required for all programs.

2) If our goal is to build a relationship between the two (standards and this section of the Framework), what would it look like? This could be answered by "big picture" structural changes (e.g., combine the standards into one and call them Literacy Standards) or additions or line edits.

- Question regarding this Reading Instruction Standard - should we add the part in yellow: "Provide classroom instruction that aligns with [the ODE Early Literacy Framework and] Oregon State Board of Education standards for early childhood, 1st, 2nd, and 3rd-grade literacy and reading standards."
- Feedback regarding this Reading Instruction Standard - should we add the part in yellow: "Implement evidence-based reading [include big 5 here?] instructional strategies to enable public school students to become proficient readers by the end of 3rd-grade"

Oregon Literacy Framework Section 7: Core Instruction & Assessment

1) What are your observations about the current standards in comparison to this section of the Framework? What do you see well represented? What isn't?

- What is the definition of dyslexia?
- Identify, apply.. nothing there. Demonstrate- instructor must give the student a chance to demonstrate the skills
- Children have other difficulties that are hard to or not diagnosed (vision, hearing) when they come to school. Are they included in this definition? Many terms to describe other issues related to dyslexia.
- Many different ways that learners have needs related to reading, the dyslexia section needs development.
- Reading Instruction Standards - EPPs must train teacher candidates to teach to SBOE standards could mean the EPPs must train, put in place ODE Early Literacy Framework. TSPC language should be ensured, be updated, and refer directly to ODE's ELF. Or is this already required? Let's clarify, make it clear.
- How far should TSPC rules go to articulate what teacher candidates should be prepared to do, "set in stone"
- Section 7 - Beaverton struggling with assessments to understand where children are at. Teacher knowledge of how to progress monitor and use assessments
- No Oral Language Assessment Screener - gives clues to other problems children may have.
- Support for merging reading standards and dyslexia and other reading standards into one - yes
- Look at standards as they have developed with reading research
- How should assessments show up? Where and how - demonstrate characteristics, screener (3) "For all students" (3) and continue to progress monitor.
- (4) ability to take assessments to plot them on skills, develop a deliberate practice
- Wording - Evidence-based reading instruction, different interpretation (2) How do we connect it to the framework and call it out?
- Balance of local control, how much is prescribed vs. new evidence and new practice
- Tie to 5 cornerstones, EBR incorporates 5 cornerstones (2 Reading Standards)

2) If our goal is to build a relationship between the two (standards and this section of the Framework), what would it look like? This could be answered by "big picture" structural changes (e.g., combine the standards into one and call them Literacy Standards) or additions or line edits.

- Feedback regarding this Dyslexia & Other Reading Disability Standard - should we add the part in yellow: "Administer, interpret and apply screening and progress monitoring assessments for [all] students (who demonstrate characteristics that may predict or are associated with dyslexia.)"

Oregon Literacy Framework Section 8: Reaching All Learners

1) What are your observations about the current standards in comparison to this section of the Framework? What do you see well represented? What isn't?

Regarding Reaching All Learners section of framework

- What is evidence based?
- Is it enough to simply say EPPs will align with State Framework? (Probably not)
- None of the literacy framework components are explicitly addressed in the current standards.
- Has the absence of detail regarding Reading Instruction Standards lead us to our current results/outcomes?
- How can early learning (PreK) and literacy take a front seat in our work and conversation?
- Components are not explicitly spelled out - formative and summative assessments in home languages. Only available in Spanish and English.
- Characteristics of dyslexia -opaque and implications for different languages.
- There's a lot more to unpack re: multilingual learners
- Framework will give us more guidance to explicitly outline what needs to be in the standards. Embed across everything rather than an add-on
- Only 1 of 3 bullets on dyslexia actually speak to HOW to teach students. How do we flesh this out more. Says evidence-based but what does that mean? More explicit the better
- Don't want to just cut and paste the Framework because we know that there is much more than that. What is the right balance of what the teacher work looks like to meet these standards?
- Dyslexia requires long-term training. Do we expect initial teachers with the right level of knowledge? Should there be another level of endorsement?

Regarding Belonging and Family Partnerships section of framework

- The current standards also don't specifically and explicitly address these parts of the framework. My concern with this is that student belonging and family partnerships should be overarching standards covering all subject areas, not just literacy. I'm wondering if these are also being considered in other subject areas or are they being thought of more globally?
- These are overarching and need to be across all subject areas. Is the plan to address this within literacy rather than globally?
- This is a very different approach than our current standards and that's really important to name. We've been really focused on initial teacher prep, but many changes are going to be addressed by administrators (principals) and those seeking admin licensure. Should be included in initial teaching AND definitely admin.
 - Adjoining this comment-More attention will need to be given to administrators as they will be the supervisor of new and existing educators who may or may not need coaching to improve their literacy instruction. Specific instruction and learning related to observing and improving literacy instruction for Admin will be necessary if we are committed to success for our students.
- How do you teach re: families? Should EPPs be modeling this themselves? Should they have regular outreach to communities that become models to teachers and admin. To the extent they can model, and this becomes part of criteria for evaluation by TSPC is important.

2) If our goal is to build a relationship between the two (standards and this section of the Framework), what would it look like? This could be answered by “big picture” structural changes (e.g., combine the standards into one and call them Literacy Standards) or additions or line edits.

Regarding Reaching All Learners section of framework

- Current TSPC standards don't specifically mention multilingualism and emphasis on instruction considerate of individual student's family and cultural contexts.
- Language development is an early learning concept that needs encouragement, understanding and exposure supporting families.
- Formative and summative assessment may not be available in children's home language.
- Initial licensure expectations not enough. A lot of states have a professional license so you have to gain more expertise. In Oregon, we state that to get to a professional license, you just need a professional growth plan with your principal. However, these are “no one monitors those.”
- Not talking about theoretical knowledge but demonstrable competence. Not that you've taken a certain number of courses

Regarding Belonging and Family Partnerships section of framework

- Need to add more connection to family experience.
- What about a disposition that all students can learn and have high expectation
- Shared responsibility between TSPC and ODE
- Absence of detail have led us to current outcomes. Are we going to get the same thing we always gotten?
- Big absence of preK. Front seat rather than adjoining seats.
- Language development is a big critical piece - cell phone role. Opportunities missed due to technology
- Teachers often voice nervousness around family engagement - how do we ensure teachers are prepared to tap into families' funds of knowledge and bring that into the classroom?
- There is a presumption that teacher dispositions are included in this, but they don't show up explicitly. Need to make this explicit - what are the dispositions we need (e.g., recognition of funds of knowledge (appreciation for what students bring into the classroom); rejection of deficit thinking).
 - Need to reject those that don't have the right dispositions?
 - Dispositions have not been defined; they've been assumed. Can't assume though.
 - Wonder if the key disposition pieces that are addressed in section 1 of the Framework could be linked in the standards for all subject areas? +1
- I wonder if those key dispositional pieces that are addressed in section 1 of the literacy framework could be linked in standards for all subject areas.
- Dispositional expectations need to be an overarching umbrella.

Breakout Session 3 | National Scan

1. What were some of your takeaways from what you read?
2. How does this information shape what you think is needed in Oregon standards?
3. What additional questions do you have?

Specificity Varies

- California standards were very specific on language acquisition and development, as well as linguistics, which is missing in Oregon standards (a gap that really needs to be addressed)
- Colorado's included requirement to submit evidence that principals and administrators have to demonstrate training in these areas
- Colorado requirements are falling heavily on the districts - EPPs are teaching and schools/districts are confirming that it has happened and verifying
- Concern about additional requirements for districts and schools to manage
- The other states have more specificity to the standards. InTasc, which is what a lot of these (Oregon's standards) were based on, were very general. There is variability in where these standards are housed (e.g., CA is in teacher performance). There is more room for specificity today in comparison to 10 years ago
- Concerns that some states call out specific curriculum. That would be limiting and should not be replicated
- Could we provide details on how to meet these standards in a supplemental document (such as Program Review and Standards Handbook) - see Utah
- If we look at where we are in K-5 reading, we have to be more prescriptive. Especially the administrators
- MA - includes importance of high quality feedback
- Would err on side of what MA has which is super clear versus what we have
- Florida - "You Fly Progression" is really good, components and endorsement standards are great, prior to student teaching, use the curriculum to tutor a student
- We seem to notice that we need more prescription. MA example - page 5 cites 42+pieces: [W early-literacy-criteria-draft.docx](#) . This is a big culture shift for us in Oregon.
- RI - Elem. lit standards were well lined out - what they need to know vs. what is taught
- Pennsylvania - reading standard for specific area

Demonstrating teacher candidate knowledge and skills

- Utah lists requirements for assessments/evaluations with specificity
- Rhode Island embedded their educator evaluations to this framework; ensures it's considered every time an evaluator/administrator enters the classroom
- In Utah, teaching candidates have to take a test regarding literacy. Maybe include additional information in this regard and any other nuts and bolts that may help in the decision making/recommendations. Example language.
- What data is available in terms of diverse candidates and their success rate on these assessments?
 - Providers have provided some data
 - Oregon offers multiple measures options for demonstrating content knowledge; note that this has been helpful for current candidates across programs
 - Oregon working with Pearson on a FLEX program pilot opportunity
 - Need for SPED multiple measures noted

Relationships between State Standards and Educator Preparation Program & School classrooms

- Recognition that a state standard does not always have a linear or direct relationship to what happens in higher-ed classrooms.
- Gaps between students' experience and what's in the syllabi. System is loosely not tightly coupled and lots of room for discretion - which we want to preserve but not to extent that things are getting missed
- Reluctant to put what methods should be used as state statute

Role of Ongoing Professional Development for current teachers

- Professional training/continuous development of the educator workforce is essential; what should that include to emphasize literacy.
- We need to support the new teachers as well as the teachers who have been in the field for years and years.
- Whatever we do in ed prep has to be relevant for current educators
- Expense for teachers to go to school to complete reading programs

Recency of Other States' Work

- Dates of implementation show a lot of states are doing this work recently; noted Rhode Island started this work earlier (Anita suggested this state and could provide more context)

Unique State Context

- Union vs non-unionized states and ability to push standards at district level
- Oregon/Washington/Alaska region of Native Educators is currently reviewing these kinds of frameworks and needs; NEIA occurring this week that may also provide input

Considerations for how we engage with other states and questions we have for them

- What are Native Nations doing in this area? What works and what doesn't?
- If changes are made only in Ed Prep and licensure, we miss veterans. How do we bring them and educators from out-of-state up to the same level?
- Can there be requirements specific to Oregon in "transferring" licenses (similar to Civil Rights)?
- Noted concerns over limiting educators from coming into the state
- How are they assessing their standards? Using national assessments or create alternative assessments aligned to their systems?
- Data analysis?
- How long have standards been in place? Where should they be at this point?
- What outcomes are being seen from this work? Disaggregated outcomes?
- What have teachers on the ground found helpful in other states? Could be standards, training, etc. What has your state implemented that has been helpful to you as a classroom teacher?
- Does CA (or other states) have literacy licensure assessment?
 - Don't necessarily want to add cost, but could that be included in the overall assessment of whether standards have been met?
 - Noted that candidates can choose from either NES/Pearson or ETS exams for content knowledge assessment if approved by the Commission
- It would be lovely to include other examples
- Find the very best state practice, and look into that
- Find the best examples and use them for Oregon
- We can learn so much from examples and nonexamples. We need to be specific but not overly prescriptive. Witness to NC nonexamples that may help us. Be thoughtful about who we talk to and not just who made these rules. Universities did self studies and everyone scored poorly. If they didn't see or hear the exact words, that impacted scoring. Oregon is doing it the right way. Building the framework and relationships first.

- Trend is to be very prescriptive. There are concerns with this approach and what this will look like. Personal perspective shared that some of the evidenced-based strategies may not work for all students.
- Rep Wright has contacts in CO Dept of Ed - in 2012 they did what we're doing right now but didn't put any teeth into it. We are making recommendations now but I hope the next group at TSPC makes them requirements, which will give them teeth. In CO, not much happened until 2019 when they required teacher prep to do certain things. And in K12 they paid for upgrading training for admin and teachers.
- Science of Reading can mean different things in different locations; we should be looking at how we are interpreting the science of reading. Some may argue that what we have is not completely science of reading.
- Whether standards are enforced depends on political context to create conditions for true and meaningful oversight. If agencies don't have the capacity and resources to enforce, they're not going to be in a position to have a certain level of enforcement
- Utah has made positive changes to look at, Science of Reading Expert at every College of Education to provide support
- We can learn lessons from states where it didn't work while also using the good stuff and doing what's needed to benefit our students
- There is potential for some direct copy/paste in regards to pillars of reading and connects to our previous conversation.
- Mississippi - would like to have a better understanding of their system
- NC- did a teacher prep review to see what was is being taught

Administrators

- The CO Read Act, each principal and admin, are required to be trained in these same evidenced-based models. Those administrators in the field haven't had the training and yet they are making decisions that are not aligned with the evidence-based practices.
- There will be a need for TSPC to think about the professional learning and requirements related to those in practice, namely administrators. For example, supervising and evaluation and how that should look to support the literacy framework.
- Colorado- Principal knowledge
- Community engagement, reaching all - role for administrator licensure

Alignment to Oregon Early Literacy Framework

- Ensure content knowledge exams approved for Oregon are aligned to literacy framework needs.
- Utah's competencies are not necessarily aligned with framework; might be helpful to discuss with them to understand why these are handled this way and how they came to this decision.
- We are not saying that everyone has to do everything exactly the same, but rather here's a framework.
- Florida - Oral language included
- With section 4 reading models - how might we take those into standards. And if we do that, what percentage of EPPs would say they meet them

Additional overarching comments & questions

- How do we prepare teachers for the students that they see tomorrow vs. the child that they have in five years? How do we write [rule/expectations] so that others understand it?
- How does change occur in ed prep programs - it would be good to know this from EPPs themselves. Might not be direct and linear how the state standards actually translate.
- Colorado has special license for mentors - is there a role for Oregon along those lines?

- Licensure requirements versus EPP standards - which of these is doing “the work”--perhaps a question for TSPC and the legislature. If this is about accountability, implementation and enforcement, where do we want to place primary energy. Is it that licensure requirements entail X versus EPPs? Clearly a call to do both. What is the priority? Where do the teeth need to be. Questions this document is stirring wonderings about
 - How do you distinguish between the 2
 - What are the EPP inputs? What the state can require is that colleges need to do certain things. Standards for licensees requires exhibitions of skills and knowledge.
 - Where does accountability lay - easier to hold that at the EPP level rather than the individual educator level
 - Is the review rigorous? What happens if they don’t meet requirements?
 - Does TSPC have the staff needed?
- MTSS use by educator improved and deepened; ensure all understand; emphasis in this model and ensure not always pulling out (providing necessary time, etc)
- Understanding there is value in a multi-tiered system without specifying programs necessarily
- Depth of knowledge for each type of license
- Washington offers a lot of free professional development aligned to standards and targeted toward; great PD to any educator; speaks to the need for ongoing training and association to levels of licensure
- We are not training enough teachers
- What about online programs, out of state programs?
- How do we hold accountable?

Overall feedback on the scan

- Hard to find what the standards were covering in the areas
- Ohio not listed, has strong lit framework and standards
- Why was New Mexico not included in the list of those states reviewed
- AA will share Ohio and Colorado with the group
- Reach out to agencies that have reviewed university programs to see what has lead to higher outcomes for students
- Practice - what is taught in regards to tier 2 and 3 interventions, should they be linked to the standards document?