

Focus Group with 5 accomplished early-career teachers

4/27/07

Online Community on the BRIDGE

Clarifying Question: In what instances will the Framework for Educators be used instead of the Framework for Teaching?

1. Answer from Sally: We'll work on WARM and COOL feedback about the Framework related to the goals...and that can include the purposes too I think. It would be used as an umbrella by our college of ed. The TEACHING Framework would be for all the teacher ed programs.... others might develop parallel specific frameworks, e.g. for administrators. I think other universities may also adopt this as they feel a need to be more inclusive. As you all have to meet SACS, the university ed. programs have to meet NCATE standards and a common assessment is one of those...

First question: In what ways does the Framework for Accomplished Educators meet the stated goals? And to remind you, the goals are: (a) to create a framework to reflect the work of all educators, and (b) to ensure that a Framework for Accomplished Educators represents teachers as well.

2. I think the framework for educators is worded in a way that it could be used by many different groups.
3. It includes educators on all levels.
4. I agree.
5. The language of the framework for educators is more inclusive. For example, "knowledge of students" is changed to "knowledge of learners". I could see this applying to literacy coaches, curriculum directors, etc.
6. Yes, I like that it applies to all educators, not just classroom teachers.
7. I like under assessment where student outcomes and program priorities was added under 4.2. This helps to focus on a bigger picture.
8. I like the emphasis on community as opposed to just classroom/school.
9. I also see the word community under assessment 4.6 because it encourages feedback to all stakeholders in education.
10. As I read the revised statements, I definitely feel like I am included as a teacher but I also like the feel of how this seems to apply to the whole education community.
11. The second goal...does it represent teachers as well...I think it does, but the language might be intimidating.
12. I agree, the language might be intimidating to some, but it does meet the purpose.
13. I was just thinking that. It's not exactly jargony, but some teachers may not think in these terms. How are these terms defined?
14. I don't know if intimidating is the right word...it just seems the one for teaching sounds so much more like something I could use myself and esp. with a new teacher, Things like "culturally responsive classroom." I think people may define that in different ways.

(b) In what ways does the Framework for Accomplished Educators not meet the goals?

15. Depending on where people work, teachers may or may not have control over whether they can do all these things.
16. I agree with X now. I keep looking at the framework for educators and applying that to myself. It is much more readable and applicable, less threatening than the language in the framework for teaching. I'm wondering why there need's to be two?
17. I think that some of the language is inconsistent at times. For example, under the knowledge of learners column, I see the word "students" used and the word "learners" used. I think the word learners is more inclusive.
18. It does meet the goals when just looking at the specifically.
19. I think it does meet the goals...I just think the language is harder to relate to as a classroom teacher.
20. In professionalism, there are places where a teacher-esp. a new teacher may not be presented with opportunities to meet these goals
21. Specifically...the difference between content/subject and "which ground their practice" as an example.
22. I think it reflects the work of most educators, but I think that teaching has become awfully scripted in some places. So while this is ideal, it's not practical in some situations (unfortunately).
23. I'm wondering if in sections like 5.2 that it is still specific to teachers (with assessment data, student learning environments). I'm wondering what other things that educators would base instruction and programs on that might be different than what a...
24. I like the fact that both frameworks are being used.

Okay, our final question is very open: What else do you see?

25. This may be picky, but the language in 6.4 "in order to improve what they do" seems much simpler than the rest of the document. I'm not sure how else to word it though.
26. I think that overall it accomplishes it's goal and is something to aspire to
27. I agree with X. In a perfect world, educators would do all of these things.
28. I really do think that these documents are representative of the goals stated.
29. I felt the same way X did about 6.4 with 5.1 It has to be general...but "decisions" seems vague. Overall, I feel it meets both goals...I just hope teachers still use the one for Teaching...much easier to connect with.
30. Once teachers become familiar with the Framework for Teaching maybe the Framework for Educators will not seem so intimidating.

Sally's report on what she heard.

31. I'll use the quick term EF to stand for the Educator Framework.... I've written notes on the side so I'll copy paste them in as my reflections.
32. All agree that EF (Educator Framework) seems to be inclusive of all levels and types of educators.
33. Readers like the focus on the bigger picture of SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES beyond classrooms.
34. Some language in the EF might intimidate teachers. (I wonder what exactly might be intimidating? OK, "not jargon-y but not terms some use—like Culturally Responsive Classroom.")

35. PS: I'm very aware that YOU are an incredible group of teachers who SEE and THINK about the larger picture of schools and communities, and not everyone does.)
36. The EF may NOT be the one you'd use with teachers; but instead, you'd use the Framework for Teaching still. You're right; teachers wouldn't meet all these goals on the EF! That's the reason for the Teaching Framework to continue.
37. Does the EF suffice? Is it enough for teachers so that we could DROP the original?
38. Glad you noted the students versus learners...in a footer we define learners as including ADULTS since some school personnel work with kids AND adults. Students we meant as just k-12 kids.
39. Scripted teaching, yes. Remember the GSTEP Principles? One is that "TEACHERS SHOULD OWN THEIR OWN CAREERS." We've always worked in a world of "act as if..." to push the envelope of possibilities.
40. If you have any further insights...even little edits, please send to me at saross@uga.edu! We sincerely appreciate your perspectives! I can't thank you enough!

Direct quotes from typed chat room. Organized and names removed by Sally Ross.