

# CONTENT STANDARDS

**Name:** Pam Blundell  
**State:** Oklahoma

**Email:** Pam\_Blundell@sde.state.ok.us

Presentation Questions	Responses	Audience Notes
<p>As you began the development process of your current content standards, how did you involve the field (e.g., a taskforce, workgroups, etc.)? Talk a bit about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The kind of folks that functioned well on working groups</li> <li>• Who took the lead with the working groups – you, state staff, local person, etc.</li> <li>• The process used to keep them on task and on time</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A taskforce meeting made up of state staff, local program directors, and adult education teachers (about 20 people) met once face-to-face and once electronically. The group represented a cross section of Adult Education in Oklahoma including urban and rural programs and ABE and ESL teachers.</li> <li>• <b>First Meeting:</b> The state contracted with Kathy Polis to facilitate the taskforce meeting. The meeting was presented in a professional and well organized manner that included enough structure to stay on topic yet flexibility that encouraged the participants to express opinions. This process worked well and kept the taskforce focused and on task. Areas of focus included . . .             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. a general introduction to content standards;</li> <li>2. different approaches the state could take in the development of standards;</li> <li>3. critical formatting decisions regarding content areas and the creation of a teacher-friendly working document; and</li> <li>4. professional development implications of the whole process.</li> </ol> </li> <li>• <b>Decisions:</b> During the first meeting and through follow-up electronic communication the taskforce agreed that . . .             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Oklahoma would continue work already begun using the Equipped for the Future (EFF) standards as the foundation;</li> <li>2. further work was need to expand on the EFF work in the areas of reading, math, and writing;</li> <li>3. formatting decisions regarding such things as the use of strands, benchmarks, classroom examples at each learning level, etc. were</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	

Presentation Questions	Responses	Audience Notes
	<p>determined;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. the state staff would continue to work with EFF to develop curriculum frameworks in the areas of reading, math, and writing; and</li> <li>5. professional development was critical to the process;</li> <li>6. Oklahoma would take a “pilot program” approach focusing on quality rather than quantity, reflecting on the process each year to make needed revisions for program improvement and expand PD opportunities to additional programs each year.</li> </ol>	
<p>What resources did you use to guide the content of the content standards (e.g., input from the field, models from other states, K-12 standards, student input) to ensure that the standards were reflective of what adult learners needed to know and be able to do?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oklahoma partnered with EFF in the development of the reading, math, and writing curriculum frameworks (CF). Each of the CF’s Directors and adult education teachers gave feedback on the CF which was used to make revisions. Each CF was also reviewed by experts in content field and based on research conducted through EFF on what adult learners need to know and be able to do in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.</li> </ul>	
<p>How did you address the alignment of your content standards with the assessment instruments you are using?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The PD provided for reading, math, and writing, includes emphasis on the alignment of the standard with assessment both formal and informal. Evidence of learning is a foundational piece of what Oklahoma expects adult education to look like in the classroom. Therefore, teachers are trained to develop appropriate informal assessments aligned to the standard they are teaching, in the contexts of student’s goals, and in partnership with the adult learner. There are two goals in this process. The alignment of informal assessment to the standard and teaching adult learners how to self-assess their own level of learning and ability to perform the standard.</li> <li>• Oklahoma uses the TABE and BEST Plus for formal assessment. This fiscal year Oklahoma is one of six states participating in OVAE’s Standards-In-Action project. Part of this project is an</li> </ul>	

Presentation Questions	Responses	Audience Notes
	<p>extensive alignment of our math strands/benchmarks at each educational functioning level to TABE Forms 9 &amp; 10 at each Level (E,M,D, &amp; A). We have two local program directors and their teachers, along with state staff and an EFF consultant (about 25 people), involved in this project which will be completed by December 2007. The focus is currently on the math standard with plans to include reading and writing in the future.</p>	
<p>Once the standards were developed, how did you present them to the field (e.g., piloted them with a select number of programs first, regional approach, statewide training, etc.)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See attached Training Process</li> <li>• The first year there were 4 pilot programs (1 was a DOC site and 3 were ABE programs). At the end of this fiscal year we will have 26 of 36 local programs with a trained EFF Team. About 100+ teachers have been through the extensive training and about 4,000 students have been impacted by the training.</li> </ul>	
<p>What type of professional development was provided for instructors? For local managers? Is this training provided on an ongoing basis so new instructors and managers can access it?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See attached Training Plan</li> <li>• Local program directors are required to attend training with their EFF Team</li> <li>• New programs start the three-year training plan each fiscal year – about 4 to 6 new programs a year</li> </ul>	
<p>Did you find that other types of support were necessary to ensure implementation of the standards at the local level?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional training is needed for program directors solely focused on an in-depth look at systemic issues required of standards-based instruction. At present, it is planned that Pam Blundell, Assistant Director, will develop and conduct this PD during this fiscal year.</li> <li>• Additional PD available to program directors to bring part-time teachers unable to attend the extensive trainings up-to-date on</li> </ul>	

Presentation Questions	Responses	Audience Notes
	<p>standards-based instruction and use of the CF's. The next bullet addresses this issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The state is training three state EFF Specialists in reading and three in math. These specialists will expand the state's capacity to provide PD in two ways: First, a short EFF Orientation on standards-based instruction and the EFF Framework (1 or 2 day training has been developed which they will implement either on a regional basis or for a local program. Second, the state specialists are being trained by our EFF national trainers to conduct the content trainings by FY2009 for the reading specialists and FY2010 for the math specialists. Writing specialists will be selected to begin training this year.</li> <li>The state plans to use the SIA project as another vehicle for the development of PD trainings available to local program directors and their part-time teachers.</li> </ul>	
<p>What methods have you found to be most effective in making sure that instructors are actually using the content standards for their intended purposes? What evidence do you have of that?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Using National EFF trainers has been instrumental in this process. These trainers, along with state staff, integrate local program conference calls and onsite visits between training sessions. The state has found both of these to be critical in transferring training to the field</li> <li>Requiring local program directors to attend the training with their teachers helps ensure that teachers transfer the training into the classroom. It also supports systemic changes necessary for the teachers to teach in this manner. Example: materials purchases, how student intake and assessment is conducted, student goal-setting, etc.</li> <li>State Coordinators attend all the EFF training so they can monitor what is being done in the field.</li> <li>Consistency on the part of the state in stressing our commitment to standards-based instruction and integrating it into all PD we provide is important. The message must be clear, consistent and continuous.</li> <li>Evidence is being collected through our MIS data at the state level</li> </ul>	

Presentation Questions	Responses	Audience Notes
	<p>on student retention rates and student achievements of EFF trained programs vs. non-EFF trained programs. It has taken several years to feel like we have enough consistent data to make a fair comparison. We feel like 2007 &amp; 2008 data will be our best years to do this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Coordinators will monitor programs throughout the year and report what is being done in the classrooms.</li> </ul>	
<p>Have you changed or developed any particular policies, guidance, or expectations related to the use of the content standards?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oklahoma's Student Goal Setting Policy came out of this work. We are in the second year of this policy. PD on how to teach goal setting to students, facilitate students in setting goals, and using student goals to direct instruction was offered during 2006-07 for all teachers across the state in hopes that when they participated in any of the standards-based trainings, they would already be familiar with student goal-setting.</li> <li>• Performance-based funding has been introduced to program directors with an emphasis on their need to get on the "standards-based instruction bandwagon" so their programs can become even more effective and efficient. It is expected that standards-based instruction will have a great impact on programs when the state moves to PB funding in the next couple of years.</li> </ul>	
<p>What methods do you or will you use to revise the content standards in the future to make sure they are relevant to your state's needs?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As part of the S/A project we will analyze and revise standards as deemed necessary. We will be doing that this year in math with plans to address reading and writing in the future.</li> </ul>	
<p>If you had it to do all over again, what would you do differently?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To be honest, I can't think of too many things we would have done differently. Every year we have reflected on the previous year and made adjustments in our training, added PD opportunities, added state specialists as needed, etc. This is an on-going process that is ever growing and changing. Every year has been an invaluable learning experience that has only made the process better the following year.</li> <li>• A few things I am glad we DID do are:</li> </ul>	

Presentation Questions	Responses	Audience Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-contract with EFF and use their national trainers</li> <li>-start small (4 pilots) and add programs each year</li> <li>-require program directors to attend with their teams</li> </ul>	