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“It is overly simplistic to think of Common Core providing the “what” and teaching frameworks supplying the “how.” Common Core does possess new content, but also possesses clear and important implications for instruction.”

-Ross Wiener
Draft white paper on Integrating the Common Core into Educator Effectiveness Work

Building the Context:
Connecting Instructional Bodies of Work

Academic Priorities
Rigor, Engagement and Intervention

Teacher Effectiveness
Instructional Framework and Rubric

Common Core State Standards
Mathematics, English Language Arts and Content Literacy

WHAT
HOW

Baltimore City Public Schools
“It’s not adequate to determine that a teacher could teach to the Common Core and meet the expectations in teaching frameworks. Rather, system leaders must determine whether performing well against teaching frameworks demands instruction in which the Common Core is delivered.”

-Ross Wiener
Draft white paper on Integrating the Common Core into Educator Effectiveness Work

Overcoming Oversimplification...

Baltimore City Schools will revise their Instructional Framework and Rubric 1.0 in order to make it a more accurate and powerful tool to support instruction by:

- More closely align the instructional shifts necessitated by the Common Core State Standards in English/Language Arts, Content Literacy, and Mathematics
- Incorporate feedback received from teachers and school leaders throughout the first year of implementation (SY11-12)

A Closer Look at the Challenge...
Overview of the Revision Process

**Secure Stakeholder Feedback**
- Focus groups with teachers, school leaders, Principal EDs, CAO Leadership Team, External partners (including BTU)
- Work group with strategic district staff and partners

**Vet and Field Test Revisions**
- Methodical “close reads” for content (CCSS infusion), student centered focus, examples/footnotes, level 3-4 distinctions
- Field Test revisions using video and classroom observations

**Rollout Rubric 2.0**
- CAO Summer Institute June 19-22, 2012
- Onboard new school leaders in summer/fall 2012

---

**Stakeholder Involvement**

**Teachers**
- Six 2-hour focus groups
  - April 17-19 (150 teachers)
  - Strategic outreach to specific teachers

**School Leaders**
- Voluntary focus groups at April CAO Institute
- Strategic outreach to specific school leaders

**Principal EDs**
- All-day meeting with Insight Education April 30

**Central Office/BU**
- Workgroups focusing on Instructional Shifts

**Partners**
- Strategic selection of partners to provide feedback
  - TFA, FEE, BCTR, Aspen, Dana Center

**Ongoing Rubric Revisions** (version 1.2 → 1.3)

---

**Overview of the Revision Timeline**

- March 12-23: Create and share revision project plan
- March 18: Central Office/BU and BTU workgroups discuss CCSS Instructional Shifts
- March 12-23: Create and share revision project plan
- April 17-20: Teacher and School Leader focus groups
- April 20: Rubric draft delivered
- April 22-28: Central Office check-in
- April 30: ED focus groups

- May 11: Rubric draft delivered
- May 21: CAO provides feedback
- May 22-23: Teacher focus groups on WBEU 4 implementation
- May 23-24: Conduct classroom and video observation for “field testing”
- June 13: Rubric draft delivered
- June 15: Review and revise rubric
- June 19-22: Rubric draft delivered
### Documents Supporting the Revision Process

- Feedback from Teachers and Schools Leaders collected throughout SY 11-12
- Instructional Shifts required by the Common Core State Standards
  - Engage NY Instructional Shifts for ELA and Mathematics
  - David Coleman’s ELA instructional shifts recommendations
  - Aspen Institute white paper on Teacher Effectiveness and CCCSS
- City Schools Instructional Models
- Denver Public Schools Effectiveness Rubric

### The Integration Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Shift</th>
<th>What it means</th>
<th>Key Actions</th>
<th>How do we incorporate this shift into the cadre?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ELA Shift 1         | Core-Based Assessments: Students focus rich and rigorous conversations which are dependent on a common text. Teachers should guide students to connect the text to their lives. | TE, T3, T4, T5, T6, T7, T8 | Completes texts. Same things mentioned for Shift 1.  
|                     | ELA Shift 2    | TE, T3, T4, T5, T6, T7, T8 | Teachers read and strategize with the text.  
|                     | Writing Revisions: Writing needs to emphasize use of evidence to reframe or take an argument rather than the personal narration and other forms of the communication prompt. While the revision still has an important role, students develop skills through written arguments that respond to the ideas, facts, and arguments presented in the texts they read. | TE, T4, T5, T6, T7 | Incorporating text dependent questions.  
|                     |               | TE, T4, T5, T6, T7 | Additional Notes: AM/TL – constant feedback from teacher and peers. |

### The Integration Product

**Topic 1**

**Public 1.0**

- **Context of Revisions**
  - **Modules/Unpackings:** Multiple learning opportunities designed to develop students’ skills, knowledge, and understanding of the content and skills.  
  - **Engagement:** Students engage in activities that support or extend the content.  
  - **Standards:** Content is aligned to current state standards.  
  - **Coherence:** Learning experiences are connected and build on prior knowledge.  

**Public 1.1**

- **Context of Revisions**
  - **Modules/Unpackings:** Multiple learning opportunities designed to develop students’ skills, knowledge, and understanding of the content and skills.  
  - **Engagement:** Students engage in activities that support or extend the content.  
  - **Standards:** Content is aligned to current state standards.  
  - **Coherence:** Learning experiences are connected and build on prior knowledge.  

**Revised Public 1.2**

- **Context of Revisions**
  - **Modules/Unpackings:** Multiple learning opportunities designed to develop students’ skills, knowledge, and understanding of the content and skills.  
  - **Engagement:** Students engage in activities that support or extend the content.  
  - **Standards:** Content is aligned to current state standards.  
  - **Coherence:** Learning experiences are connected and build on prior knowledge.
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APPENDIX

- POTENTIAL CHALLENGES
- KEY DECISIONS
- MAJOR RUBRIC REVISIONS
- RUBRIC REVIEW PROTOCOL

Potential Challenges

- Highly aggressive timeline to meet June 19-22 rollout
- Unknowns for teacher evaluation in SY12-13
- Honoring teachers’ concerns for how the Instructional Framework and Rubric was rolled out in their school during SY11-12
- Implementing CCSS instructional shifts effectively
- Coordinating multiple feedback opportunities simultaneously
Key Decisions

- For what purposes will the Instructional Framework being used in SY 12-13?
- What is the District’s bar for quality evidence collection?
- What are the Focus Key Actions for SY12-13?
- What distinguishes Highly Effective teachers?
- What supporting documents should accompany 2.0 rollout?

Major Rubric Versions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric 1.v1</th>
<th>Rubric 1.v2</th>
<th>Rubric 1.v3</th>
<th>Rubric 2.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revisions made: March 22 – 28</td>
<td>Revisions made: April 20</td>
<td>Revisions made: April 23-May 1</td>
<td>Revisions made: May 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY1-11 feedback from principals and teachers</td>
<td>Workgroup revisions using “close reads” for content (CCSS infusion), student-centered focus, examples/strategies, and level 3-4 distinctions</td>
<td>“Close reads” for content (CCSS infusion), student-centered focus, examples/strategies, and level 3-4 distinctions</td>
<td>CAO feedback, classroom and video observation “field testing”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rubric Review Protocol

- Overview of revisions from 1.0 to 2.0
- Independent read of revised Rubric levels 3 and 4
- Discussion of revisions
  - Did we clearly capture all of the components of the Key Actions?
  - Do the Key Actions incorporate teacher practices that support the instructional shifts required by the Common Core?
  - Do the revisions capture the feedback you received throughout the year as a practitioner?