

**MINUTES**  
**SOCIAL STUDIES STANDARDS RECOMMENDATION COMMITTEE**  
**SEPTEMBER 23, 2016**

The Standards Recommendation Committee met for its second scheduled meeting at the Tennessee Higher Education Commission’s board room at 9:00 CDT.

**Present.....10**

**Absent.....0**

- Mr. David Barrett**
- Ms. Pamela Bobo**
- Mr. Bill Carey**
- Mr. William Freddy Curtis – Vice Chair**
- Dr. Shannon Duncan**
- Mr. Louis Gallo**
- Ms. Katherine Petko**
- Ms. Marsha Rains**
- Mr. Jason Roach – Chair**
- Mr. Todd Wigginton**

**9:20 AM**

**Mr. Jason Roach** called the meeting to order. **Ms. Laura Encalade** called the roll. Then, **Ms. Encalade** explained the materials that were in their binders and what the committee would use for today’s meeting.

**Mr. Roach** asked the members to read over the minutes.

**Mr. Roach** asked for a motion to approve the minutes.

**ACTION:** **Ms. Rains** moved acceptance. **Ms. Bobo** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**Mr. Roach** asked for a motion to adopt the agenda.

**ACTION:** **Mr. Wigginton** moved acceptance. **Ms. Rains** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**9:25 AM**

**Ms. Encalade** presented on the review process. She started with a brief overview of the entirety of the process. **Ms. Encalade** also gave updated numbers from the second public review website that has only been open for a week.

**Mr. Bill Carey** asked about the higher education review part of the process. **Ms. Encalade** explained that the higher education review included the three higher education systems across the state who gave recommendations for faculty members to review the revised standards. Their feedback will be combined into a feedback report, but State Board staff can also send the individual feedback forms to the members.

**9:35 AM**

**Ms. Encalade** updated the committee on the communications process as part of the review thus far.

**9:45 AM**

**Mr. Roach** introduced the educator advisory teams' leads. **Ms. Kenecia Sullivan** presented on the entire review approach that her elementary team took. **Mr. Scott Ezell** added that there is a handout in the binder that gives specific trends from the public feedback. He explained that the next step they took after defining the feedback trends was to develop specific goals.

**Ms. Karen Stanish** explained the next step in the process which was to create guiding questions. **Mr. Ezell** said that the presentation will follow the guiding questions as the leads detail their revision process with examples of standards.

**Ms. Sullivan** discussed the number of standards being reduced in K-5. **Mr. Dave Barrett** noted that some elementary schools do not offer social studies every day, meaning the number of standards in the elementary section is now appropriate. **Mr. Freddy Curtis** seconded this, discussing how third grade teachers will thank them greatly. **Ms. Marsha Rains** agreed, saying that there is a lot of content to be taught that isn't written on the paper. She also said that even if you do teach every day, there are only so many days in the year for them to be teaching.

**Ms. Bobo** asked if there were some standards that were removed and if the committee knew which ones were removed. **Ms. Sullivan** said that yes there were some, and they are on the tracker. She explained to **Ms. Bobo** the rationale for moving the standards to different grades to make it more coherent.

**Ms. Rains** said now the standards go from the child, to community, to state, to the United States, and the world. **Ms. Stanish** said that there are Tennessee standards embedded in eighth grade and a Tennessee history class was created as a high school elective.

**Mr. Carey** asked if there has been any conversation at the State Board about making a Tennessee history elective course a requirement. **Ms. Encalade** said that there had not been any discussions on that but she did explain the process of how electives get approved by the state. **Mr. Barrett** expounded on her example.

**Mr. Barrett** also explained that there are history standards in K-2 to prepare the students for the third grade course.

**Mr. Ezell** continued his presentation by showing the progression of the number of standards per grade level from K-12. He explained to the committee that the main trend in the public feedback was there were too many standards and concepts at each grade level.

**Dr. Duncan** said that some of the adjustments she has seen have been rewording to make the standard more of a standard, such as taking out 'conducting a research project' which is an instruction, not a standard.

**Mr. Roach** said that as you start making the standards less specific, it is a double-edged sword. However, by broadening the standards out it may be too large for teachers to know what they need to prepare the

students for on the state assessment. **Dr. Duncan** asked if the committee was going to work on a supplementary document to help advise the teachers.

**Dr. Duncan** added that the assessment will follow the revision standard. So the committee has to drill down on the standards and the updates to the assessment will follow the process.

**Mr. Louis Gallo** asked the presenters if there have been any discussions so far about the makeup of the assessment, if it will be just multiple choice, etc.

**Dr. Tammy Shelton** from the Tennessee Department of Education explained what the department has explored for the assessment moving forward but specified that the standards are the most important. Coming up with the assessment will only follow once the standards are finalized.

### **10:30 AM**

**Ms. Sullivan** explained how the elementary committee worked to maintain the rigor in the K-5 standards, to make sure it is still challenging but age appropriate. For example, they changed the word 'trace' in some standards to the word 'analyze' to keep the rigor but be more specific about the skill.

**Mr. Carey** asked about the data on a specific standard in eighth grade (8.2). He asked the educator advisory team why they changed that specific standard but the feedback had been to mainly keep it.

**Mr. Barrett** explained that the standard has only been condensed and revised, not completely taken out.

**Mr. Carey** explained that he is concerned that there is not enough detail in the standards because the current standards had too much detail and they may have reversed course.

**Mr. Roach** said that they need to remember that this is the first draft and that these concerns will be addressed through this process.

**Mr. Carey** asked if he is missing any of the public feedback because there are standards that were revised that got mainly keep votes. **Mr. Ezell** said that the standards were not revised with the feedback as the only tool, that the committee also used their professional expertise and the trends.

**Dr. Duncan** explained that this is true for how the process has gone for the other three major subject standards. She also added that feedback over time on the current standards indicated that they were just prescriptive, and it lead to remote memorization rather than a deep dive.

**Mr. Wigginton** explained what happened five years ago with the current standards process. He added that what has been 'removed' in the standards is still there embedded in other standards.

**Mr. Roach** also said that there is an expectation to trust the social studies teachers and their content knowledge when teaching the specific standards.

**Mr. Gallo** said that he is concerned about the Golden Age in the U.S. History course, so could they create a document that has some suggested examples for the teachers. **Ms. Sullivan** explained that they have put a lot of that in their supplemental document. **Mr. Carey** said he liked that idea.

**Ms. Bobo** said she wanted to be clear that these revisions are not etched in stone.

**Ms. Rains** agreed but said that the supplemental document will be the curriculum piece rather than all of the information being in the standards.

**Mr. Barrett** said that the committee has to also keep in mind whose toes they will be stepping on because the local school districts create the curriculum.

**Ms. Petko** asked what the term “recognize” means and looks like in the standards.

The educator leads continued their presentation of standards examples they changed to make sure the standards are more grade-level appropriate.

**Ms. Petko** asked how the educatory advisory teams determined what was grade-level appropriate. **Ms. Stanis** said that it was determined in their discussions and teams.

#### **11:00 AM**

The last question the educator advisory leads went over in their presentation was to make sure all of courses were vertically aligned.

**Mr. Barrett** caught that the title for 5<sup>th</sup> grade unit needed to be changed to reflect a certain date.

**Mr. Carey** asked about the title and what is the actual content that is covered in sixth grade.

**Dr. Duncan** said that some specific third grade standards were a little too hard for third grade. She asked to spend some time discussing those specific standards.

**Mr. Roach** said that later in the agenda there is time for debate and discussion but wanted the educator advisory team to finish their presentation first.

The educator advisory team leads explained some format changes to the standards.

**Mr. Ezell** also gave details for how the educator advisory teams created consistency in covering major religions in the standards.

#### **11:15 AM**

**Mr. Roach** thanked the educator advisory team leads for their presentation and the work that they did. He also said that the next fifteen minutes can be used for discussion until the lunch break at 11:30 AM. He summarized a few key topics he heard throughout the presentation. He asked **Dr. Duncan** to start the third grade standards discussion.

**Dr. Duncan** read aloud the standards that she thinks are grade-level appropriate as a few examples. She asked **Ms. Sullivan** to explain the rationale with a few standards that she felt were just too difficult. **Mr. Barrett** asked to move a few standards to later in the progression once there is more of a foundation.

**Ms. Rains** asked to clarify if the issue with the standards is the flow and order or the actual content. **Dr. Duncan** responded that it is partially the flow.

**Mr. Carey** asked about adding more world geography standards back into third grade but keeping it simple. The committee discussed the countries that were listed for the third graders to identify and locate on a map.

**Ms. Sullivan** and **Dr. Duncan** discussed a possible change in the flow for specific standards in grade three.

The committee continued their discussion about grade-level appropriateness and where to put certain subjects.

**Mr. Roach** summarized the committee's discussion about the third grade standards. He complemented the educator advisory team leads for the great working document in front of the committee.

#### **12:00 PM**

The committee broke for lunch.

#### **12:45 PM**

**Mr. Roach** called the committee back to order. He asked if anyone would object to doing 15 more minutes of discussion then moving forward with the agenda as is. He said at 1:05 PM the committee will move forward after opening it up for discussion.

**Dr. Duncan** said that she found, during lunch, a more succinct way to phrase what she would like the educator advisory team to look at with the third grade standards.

**Mr. Roach** explained to the committee that this meeting today is to just discuss with the leads the takeaways from the draft standards. Beginning at the next meeting, the committee will start to create a list of things they want the educator teams to revise in the standards. **Ms. Encalade** said that she was taking notes to create a document to present to the committee during future meetings that will encapsulate their feedback for the educator teams.

**Mr. Carey** asked about taking out the primary sources that were listed in the standards. **Mr. Wigginton** explained that he would discuss it later this afternoon. **Mr. Barrett** said that he thought it would come down to the district curriculum coordinators as part of the curriculum associated with the standards. **Mr. Ezell** said that the draft is an attempt to allow autonomy for the teachers to use the best primary and secondary sources. The supplemental document will provide examples of texts the teachers can use rather than putting it in the standards, which basically says which source needs to be used with each specific standard.

**Mr. Barrett** said that he wanted to compliment the educator leads on the immense work that they did all summer long.

**1:10 PM**

**Mr. Wigginton** began his presentation on the social studies practices at the state level. He also gave some background knowledge for what occurred during the last social studies standards revision process four years ago.

He discussed what the committee members would find in the draft standards and the rationale for how the educator advisory team vertically put the standards together. He said that there are skills that are integrated throughout the grade bands but the teachers get to decide which devices they will use to teach the standards.

**1:25 PM**

**Ms. Encalade** spoke about upcoming feedback opportunities on the standards. The committee members are welcome to attend the roundtables to get feedback on the draft standards. She gave the logistics for the next meeting on October 28<sup>th</sup> as well as what she will send the committee following today's meeting.

**Mr. Roach** asked if there was any closing statements or questions.

**Mr. Roach** said without objection the committee will be adjourned until October 28, 2016.