

Minutes from the for Computer Science, Library Media and Technology Standards Negotiated Rulemaking Committee meeting February 12, 2020

Contents

Call to Order.....	1
Review Negotiated Rulemaking Process	1
Establish Committee’s Consensus Definition	2
Discussion of the proposed Technology Integration Content Standards.....	2
Proposed Content Standards for Ninth through Twelfth Grade	2
Proposed Technology Program Delivery Standards	4
Discussion of the proposed Information Literacy/Library Media Content Standards	5
Proposed Content Standard 1	6
Proposed Content Standards for Kindergarten.....	6
Proposed Content Standard 1	7
Proposed Content Standards for Kindergarten.....	7
Proposed Content Standards for First Grade	8
Proposed Content Standards for Second Grade	9
Proposed Content Standards for Third Grade	10
Public Comment and Adjournment.....	10

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:06 am by Office of Public Instruction (OPI) Content Standards and Instruction Division Administrator Colet Bartow. Housekeeping items, such as internet connectivity and speakerphones, were discussed. Ms. Bartow reminded everyone that the meeting was a public meeting that was being recorded.

Review Negotiated Rulemaking Process

Ms. Bartow reviewed where the committee was in the negotiated rulemaking process. She reviewed the proposed timeline and noted the dates in the timeline reflect the statutory deadlines. Ms. Bartow also reviewed the Montana Administrative Procedures Act (MAPA) timeline.

Minutes from the for Computer Science, Library Media and Technology Standards Negotiated Rulemaking Committee meeting February 12, 2020

Ms. Bartow reviewed the changes to the Technology Integration content standards. She explained the new format for the standards, and the new program delivery standards. She said the big idea for these standards is the emphasis on technology integration.

Ms. Bartow highlighted some comments from the standards writing teams.

Establish Committee's Consensus Definition

Facilitator Kirsten Madsen lead the discussion on what consensus means to the committee. The committee agreed that a thumb up meant they understood and were in agreement with the proposal; a thumb sideways meant they did not understand the proposal; and a thumb down meant they understood the proposal and did not agree with it.

Discussion of the proposed Technology Integration Content Standards

The committee continued its discussion about the proposed standards, picking where they left off after the January committee meeting. Ms. Madsen led the discussion on the rule recommendations. The rule recommendations were reviewed section by section. The committee started its review at the Proposed Content Standards for Ninth through Twelfth Grade.

Proposed Content Standards for Ninth through Twelfth Grade

The committee reached a consensus to remove the word "their" when the word relates to students from throughout the proposed standards for all grade levels.

The committee reviewed the proposed content standards for Ninth through Twelfth Grade.

The committee revised proposed Content Standard 1.b from:

"build networks and customize their learning environments in ways that support their learning process"

to

"build personal learning networks and customize learning environments in ways that support learning process"

After reviewing the revised content standards, the committee reached a consensus and approved proposed Content Standard 1 as amended.

Minutes from the for Computer Science, Library Media and Technology Standards Negotiated Rulemaking Committee meeting February 12, 2020

The committee revised proposed Content Standard 2.a from:

“cultivate and manage a positive digital identity and reputation:

to

“cultivate and manage a positive digital identity and demonstrate an understanding of how the digital footprint is permanent and can impact reputation”

After reviewing the revised content standards, the committee reached a consensus and approved proposed Content Standard 2 as amended.

The committee revised proposed Content Standard 3 from:

“b. evaluate the accuracy, perspective, cultural sensitivity, credibility, and relevance of information, media, data, or other resources

c. curate information from digital resources using a variety of tools and methods to create collections of artifacts that demonstrate meaningful connections or conclusions”

to

“b. evaluate the accuracy, perspective, cultural sensitivity, credibility, and relevance of information, media, data, or other resources

c. evaluate potential biases in resources

d. curate information from digital resources using a variety of tools and methods to create collections of artifacts that are connected to a theme or support a thesis”

After reviewing the revised content standards, the committee reached a consensus and approved proposed Content Standard 3 as amended.

The committee reviewed proposed Content Standard 4. The committee reached a consensus and approved proposed Content Standard 4 as written.

The committee reviewed proposed Content Standard 5. The committee reached a consensus and approved proposed Content Standard 5 as written.

The committee reviewed proposed Content Standard 6. The committee reached a consensus and approved proposed Content Standard 6 as written.

The committee revised proposed Content Standard 7.b from:

“identify and use collaborative technologies to work with others, including peers, experts or community members, to examine issues and problems from multiple viewpoints”

to

Minutes from the for Computer Science, Library Media and Technology Standards Negotiated Rulemaking Committee meeting February 12, 2020

“identify and use collaborative technologies to work with others to examine global and local issues and problems and solutions from multiple viewpoints”

After reviewing the revised content standards, the committee reached a consensus and approved proposed Content Standard 7 as amended.

The committee revised proposed Content Standard 8 from:

- a. evaluate historical, cultural, and social impacts of technology innovations on individuals and groups, including American Indians
- b. explain how technology innovations influence their individual technology tool and resource preferences”

to

- a. evaluate historical, cultural, and social impacts of technology innovations on individuals and groups, including urban, rural, and reservation communities
- b. reflect on and explain how technological innovations influence selection of tools and resources appropriate to a task”

After reviewing the content standards, the committee reached a consensus and approved proposed Content Standard 8 as amended.

Proposed Technology Program Delivery Standards

The committee reviewed the proposed Technology Program Delivery Standards as the proposed program delivery standards are brand new to the Technology content area.

The committee revised proposed Program Delivery Standard 1.b from:

- i. full progression of skills and knowledge from basic to advanced
- ii. full integration of technology competencies with academic knowledge in a contextual setting
- iii. include whole group, teacher-led, or personalized instruction”

to

- i. progression of skills and knowledge from basic to advanced
- ii. integration of technology competencies with academic knowledge in a contextual setting
- iii. incorporate a range of instructional strategies, including personalized learning”

After reviewing the revisions, the committee reached a consensus and approved the proposed program delivery standards as amended.

Minutes from the for Computer Science, Library Media and Technology Standards Negotiated Rulemaking Committee meeting February 12, 2020

Discussion of the proposed Information Literacy/Library Media Content Standards

Ms. Madsen led the discussion on the rule recommendations. OPI first presented the history of its proposed changes. Ms. Bartow explained the title change of the standards, how the proposed agency standards were developed, and the comments received on Computer Science, Technology, and Library Media content standards. It was explained that 38 comments were received for the Library Media content standards, primarily from AA schools, while no comments were received for Computer Science and Technology standards. Ms. Bartow explained the Superintendent will make one recommendation to the Board of Public Education based on the committee's work.

Next, committee member Ann Ewbank presented an alternative proposal for revisions to the Library Media content standards. She explained how the alternative proposed standards were developed and gave a synopsis of the feedback she received on the alternative proposed standards. She said she encouraged those who gave her feedback to add their comments to the public record by contacting Ms. Bartow. An example lesson plan based on the alternative proposed standards was presented.

The committee had a lengthy and robust discussion about the two sets of proposed content standards. Topics discussed included:

- The differences between the agency's current proposed content standards and the proposed content standards from the Revision Team
- The wish from some in the profession for more challenging and rigorous standards, including by reference to national standards adopted by the American Association of School Librarians (AASL)
- How the alternative proposed content standards got to the committee
- The Negotiated Rulemaking process and possible next steps in light of competing proposals
- The issue of implementing the proposed content standards across all school sizes
- Opportunities for additional public comment in the Negotiated Rulemaking process, as well as to the Board of Public Education as part of the formal rulemaking process
- What happens if the committee does not come to a consensus on either set of proposed content standards
- Concerns that the proposed agency content standards are too similar to the current content standards

Minutes from the for Computer Science, Library Media and Technology Standards Negotiated Rulemaking Committee meeting February 12, 2020

- Concerns about giving the Library Media standards the same amount of time given to the other two content areas being reviewed by the Committee
- The timeline for completing the Committee's work

The Committee did not reach consensus as to which proposal to review. However, because the committee voted 9 to 4 to move forward with the proposed agency standards, Ms. Madsen recommended the committee begin its work there. The Committee thus began reviewing the proposed agency standards. She reminded the committee members that even if a member had withheld consensus on moving forward with the agency proposal, that member was still permitted to comment and participate, including to withhold or give consensus, on discrete provisions under review.

Proposed Content Standard 1

The committee read and discussed the proposed Content Standard 1. The committee revised the standard to add:

- “e. Students will exercise their freedom to read and demonstrate their ability to pursue personal interests
- f. Students will engage in authentic inquiry experiences about the distinct and unique cultural heritage of American Indians”

After reviewing the revisions, the committee reached a consensus and approved the proposed Content Standard 1 as revised.

Proposed Content Standards for Kindergarten

The committee read and began its discussion of the Kindergarten standards. As revisions were proposed it became apparent that additional debate was needed regarding which proposal (the agency's or the alternative) should be evaluated.

The committee engaged in further discussion of their concerns with the competing proposals, including those summarized above; the committee also addressed the process of developing each proposal and how best to proceed.

During this, some committee members expressed a willingness to change position(s) and to instead vote to consider the alternative proposed content standards instead given the timeline for their work and with the understanding it would be easier to remove items from the alternative proposed content standards than to continually add items to proposed agency content standards. The committee then reached a consensus to move forward with reviewing the alternative proposal. Ms. Rasmussen noted her consensus was given with extreme reluctance and only to avoid stymieing the committee's work on reviewing any standards for Library Media; Ms. Rasmussen expressed her disagreement with the alternative standards themselves and her specific

Minutes from the for Computer Science, Library Media and Technology Standards Negotiated Rulemaking Committee meeting February 12, 2020

objection to the manner in which the alternative proposal was brought forward for the committee's consideration.

Note: All proposed content standards here forward are in regard to the alternative proposed content standards.

The committee started its review with Content Standard 1.

Proposed Content Standard 1

The committee read and discussed the proposed Content Standard. The committee reached a consensus to remove the phrase "Students will" from the proposed Content Standard. The committee reached a consensus to remove the word "their" when the word relates to students, and remove periods at the end of the sentences from throughout the proposed standards for all grade levels.

The committee revised Content Standard 1.d from:

"make meaning for oneself by collecting, organizing, and sharing resources of personal relevance"

to

"make meaning by collecting, organizing, and sharing resources of personal relevance"

The committee removed Content Standards 1.e and 1.h, as the topics in those standards are also covered by other standards. In the grade-specific standards, the overarching content areas are referred to numerically (1-8) rather than alphabetically (a-h). For example, content area 1.d, appears as standard 4 in each grade-level. Although the removal of standards 1.e and 1.h would cause the other areas to be re-numbered (*i.e.*, 1.f would become 1.e, and 1.g would become 1.f), the following minutes use the existing numerical references. For example, "exercise freedom to read ..." is 1.f in the overarching standard and standard 6 in each grade level; in these minutes it has not been re-numbered to standard 5.

After reviewing the revisions, the committee reached a consensus and approved the proposed Content Standard 1 as amended.

Proposed Content Standards for Kindergarten

The committee reviewed the proposed content standards for Kindergarten. The committee discussed the wording of the standards.

After reviewing and discussing the grade level progression of difficulty of the proposed content standards for First Grade, the committee returned to the proposed content standards for Kindergarten. The committee discussed revising the standards to include

Minutes from the for Computer Science, Library Media and Technology Standards Negotiated Rulemaking Committee meeting February 12, 2020

grade level progression of difficulty, and including the measurability of standards for the teachers.

The committee revised Content Standard 4.a from:

“With guidance and support, generate questions about a topic and select a focal question to explore”

to

“Express feelings and ideas about a story in different formats”

The committee revised Content Standard 6 from:

“a. Request, choose, and share a variety of materials from various genres related to personal interests”

to

“a. Routinely select picture, fiction, and information books

b. Explore new genres

c. Select books at the appropriate reading level, to be read aloud, or challenging books for browsing and enjoyment”

The committee revised Content Standard 7 to remove substandard 7.a.

After reviewing the revisions, the committee reached a consensus and approved the content standards for Kindergarten as amended.

Proposed Content Standards for First Grade

The committee reviewed the proposed content standards for First Grade. The committee discussed the grade level progression of difficulty of the proposed standards, and how the standards reflect the progression. They agreed to revisit the proposed content standards for Kindergarten.

After revisiting the proposed content standards for Kindergarten, the committee returned to their review of the proposed content standards for First Grade.

The committee revised Content Standard 4.a from:

“With guidance and support, generate questions about a topic and select a focal question to explore”

to

“Express feelings and ideas about a story in different formats”

Minutes from the for Computer Science, Library Media and Technology Standards Negotiated Rulemaking Committee meeting February 12, 2020

The committee revised Content Standard 6 from:

“a. Request, choose, and share a variety of materials from various genres related to personal interests”

to

“a. Request, choose, and share a variety of materials from various genres related to personal interests

b. Select books at the appropriate reading level, to be read aloud, or challenging books for browsing and enjoyment”

The committee removed the phrase “by citing sources” from Content Standard 7.a.

After reviewing the revisions, the committee reached a consensus and approved the content standards for First Grade as amended.

Proposed Content Standards for Second Grade

The committee reviewed the proposed content standards for Second Grade. The committee discussed the grade level progression of difficulty of the proposed standards, and how the standards reflect the progression.

The committee revised Content Standard 1 from:

“a. Form simple, factual level questions and begin to explore ways to answer them

b. Ask “I wonder” question about a topic, question, or problem”

to

“a. With guidance and support, generate questions about a topic and select a focal question to explore”

The committee revised Content Standard 4.a from:

“With guidance and support, generate questions about a topic and select a focal question to explore”

to

“Make connections between literature and personal experiences”

The committee revised Content Standard 6 from:

“a. Request, choose, and share a variety of materials from various genres related to personal interests”

to

Minutes from the for Computer Science, Library Media and Technology Standards Negotiated Rulemaking Committee meeting February 12, 2020

- a. Select books at the appropriate reading level, to be read aloud, or challenging books for browsing and enjoyment
- b. Begin to recognize that different genres require different reading, listening, or viewing strategies”

The committee removed the phrase “by citing sources” from Content Standard 7.a.

After reviewing the revisions, the committee reached a consensus and approved the content standards for Second Grade as amended.

Proposed Content Standards for Third Grade

The committee discussed reviewing the proposed content standards for Third Grade. The committee agreed to continue its review of the proposed content standards at their next meeting.

Public Comment and Adjournment

The next meeting date was announced as Monday, February 24, 2020. The committee agreed to start the meeting at 9 a.m. Ms. Madsen thanked the committee for its work.

Ms. Madsen asked for public comment about the committee’s work and the day’s proceedings. Finding none, the meeting was adjourned at 4:08 pm.