



Public Schools of North Carolina
State Board of Education
Department of Public Instruction

Report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee

Interim Requirements for Continuing Licensure (Performance-Based Licensure)

Senate Bill 1115 Section 7.18(a)

Date Due Fall 2002
Report #1 in October 2002-December 2003
DPI Chronological Schedule

Interim Requirements for Continuing Certification

Session Law 2002-126 Section 7.18 (a) suspends the portfolio requirement for continuing licensure and directs that prior to the implementation of interim requirements the State Board of Education report proposed requirements to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee. A copy of this section of the law is included as Appendix A.

Input on possible interim requirements was solicited from a variety of stakeholders including teachers, school administrators, Initial Licensure Program Coordinators, central office administrators, and superintendents. Eight regional meetings were held in November. Participants in the meetings and the summaries of those meetings are included as Appendix B. On December 3, 2002 a ninth meeting was held with representative stakeholders to review the input provided through the regional meetings. Participants in the December 3 meeting are included as Appendix C. On December 12, 2002, the State Board of Education approved the following interim requirements for continuing certification:

1. The Beginning Teacher Individualized Growth Plan (IGP) be utilized to document professional growth and development focused on the INTASC Standards. The completed IGPs and the required observations and annual summative TPAI-R evaluations will be submitted with a statement from the LEA indicating whether or not the beginning teacher has adequately demonstrated competency with all INTASC Standards. (Note: Beginning teachers are currently required to complete an IGP annually and are observed four times and evaluated annually using the TPAI-R.)
2. Beginning teachers be required to participate in professional development activities which are focused on the INTASC Standards and reflect IGP formative assessments. The activities are to be documented.
3. Beginning teachers, along with their mentors, be required to participate in regular meetings within their school/LEA communities for focused discussion of and reflection on the INTASC Standards. They are also to have individual conferences focused on the needs of the beginning teacher. These group meetings and individual conferences are to be documented.
4. While there was not consensus on the use of videos, the majority of participants in the December 3rd meeting favored the use of videos for self-reflection at the local level.
5. The IGPs, the TPAI-R observations and evaluations submitted with the statement from the LEA, documentation of the professional development activities completed by the beginning teacher, and documentation of the beginning teacher/mentor meetings will be reviewed by trained assessors. The results of the reviews will be reported to the State Board.

A copy of the INTASC Standards, the Beginning Teacher Individualized Growth Plan, and the TPAI-R are included as Appendix D.

APPENDIX A

Session Law 2002-126

PERFORMANCE-BASED LICENSURE PROGRAM/SUSPENSION OF PORTFOLIO REQUIREMENT AND STUDY

SECTION 7.18.(a) The State Board of Education, in consultation with the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina and the Education Cabinet, shall review teacher preparation programs and the continuing certification process to determine how these programs can be modified to enhance the continuing teacher certification process and to reduce the burden the continuing certification process places on newly certified teachers. This evaluation shall consider strategies for streamlining the current continuing certification process and reducing the amount of documentation required in the applicant's portfolio.

The State Board of Education shall suspend the portfolio requirement for all teachers who are required, under the current law, to submit portfolios from August 1, 2002, through June 30, 2004. Teachers who are not required to submit portfolios during the period the portfolio requirement is suspended shall be subject to interim requirements adopted by the State Board and shall complete the interim requirements. The State Board of Education shall make every effort to insure that any interim requirements do not require significant and unnecessary paperwork, effort, and administrative burden. Prior to implementation of the interim requirements, the State Board of Education shall report to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee on the proposed requirements.

APPENDIX B

Summaries of Regional Meetings

Central Region Group 1	Central Group 2
<p>Group preferences that showed up in each group discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Provide options for teachers to select from. Once option is selected the teachers remains in that track. Use a combination of IGP, TPAI and reflection from teacher, mentor and principal. All testing or options should be at no cost to teacher. Collaboration with IHE to develop the quality of teachers and provide credit for staff development for all years of ILT program. Bank CEUs—both coursework toward Masters and local CEUs. More mentor training and release time for mentors and ILTs to conference. <p>Feedback</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Use IGP, show evidences, signatures of 3 individuals and reflection on what ILT needs to focus on as well as a growth reflection paired with TPAI-R. Peer teacher review process (as in SERVE model)—3 mentor teachers Reflection practice process is important Options package that is fair—monitor how options work Provide incentives to complete in 2003—since only 5 months left—2 bonus leave days or banked CEUs Test (TTK?)—teacher should not have to pay Performance documentation—video, TPAI and Summative Staff development hours banked (3 CEUs to carry over to continuing license) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Implement a statewide timeline for ILTs and Mentors to document work that focuses on INTASC—may require mentor re-training and at least three district wide meetings to support timelines ILT's with Masters degrees should get a professional continuing license. Video to show INTASC standards being met Concern about any tests that might be offered—are they an authentic assessment? Evaluation instrument based on INTASC to be preformed by administrators (in addition to those currently being given) Video assessment with lesson plans, reflection and self-assessment TTK—test—state should pay Offer PBLP as an option with modifications because of short time frame Staff Development credits re-instated focus on INTASC IGP and Evaluations to be tied Evidence(proof) of each INTASC standard in evaluation process Local assessments—teachers assessing teachers with state approved assessors Unannounced observations with outside assessors Interviews to express knowledge of INTASC Teach a lesson with another component (?) Video (1 hour long) with INTASC demonstrated. Documentation of monthly meetings with mentors and ILTs <p>Additional Concerns/Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The state should pay the cost for any requirement (as they did with product). Move the product requirement to year 3. Don't forget that teachers will begin EOC/EOG testing in March—whatever takes place of product should not interrupt this class time needed for preparing for testing with students. Compensation such as extra annual leave days should be awarded for completion of process. Place more responsibility on universities not ILTs. It is important that the "practice of teaching" is OJT and should be demonstrated there. Any requirement should reflect INTASC as that is what previous focus has been.

Northeast Group 1	Northeast Group 2	Northeast Group 3	Northeast Group 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Observations and IGP INTASC with checklist of behaviors/evidences (they are not collected) Video "Interactive Assessment" -video, panel review (reflection piece-interview, discussion) observations/IGP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Video - 20-minute lesson (can be edited)/lesson plan included Guided Question Interview Video -standard questions based upon INTASC standards (Post-conference formal interview) -Reflective thinking Required IGP Observations (2nd year) / Summative (1st year) <p>*All four elements would be required. Rubrics must be developed for each segment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 15-minute unedited video tape sessions Beginning Middle End of Year <p>Reflective Questions on classroom management and planning/instruction would show mastery of INTASC standards</p>	<p>PROS: Questions already developed Assessors already trained (state) Video gives visual to support reflective questions No unnecessary paperwork or administrative burden</p>
			<p>"ILT Package" Options</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> IGP - submit with evidence of completed goals State assessors review (Year 1 and 2) LEA - sign off on evidence Principal/central office Video - Reflective of IGP Reflection - Video/IGP/ (self analysis) (3 typed pages maximum) <p>This is where I've been This is where I am This is where I'm going +/- + tied to what ILT is doing + INTASC connection + Performance Based Clear - convincing- consistent</p>
			<p>*Videotaping a lesson/unit *Oral interview concerning lesson/unit based on the INTASC standards *Summative Evaluation</p>
			<p>1. Outside observers 2. Videotaping and interviewing by assessors 3. Regional oral interviews on INTASC standards 4. NO ADDITIONAL TESTING 5. More Training for Legislators</p>
			<p>Growth Plan (IGP) Video/Oral Narrative Evaluations (Satisfactory or Above) Possible Oral Exam (Locally)</p>

Northeast Group 10	Northwest Group 1	Northwest Group 2
Paced Timeline of Professional Growth <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Video of different lessons throughout the year (math, communications, cooperative groups, giving tests, review lessons) IGP Professional Readings with Response (written assessment) Standardized Test at the end of Year 2 (TTK) standardized assessment Reflective Practices Video lessons, student growth, professional development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submission of summative evaluation Monthly Mentor/ILT conferences Log as an expansion to the 3rd page IGP, plus delta sheet All evaluations, conferences and IGP based on INTASC Standards at no additional cost 	A "statement of assurance" checklist <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mentor/Mentee regular meetings System-wide staff development/support meetings with focus on INTASC Standards Regular review of IGP Documentation of scheduled observations Written reflection in two INTASC areas Final verification and signatures Principal Mentor Mentee/ILT ILT Coordinator/Central Office Rep.
		Northwest Group 5 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue Mentor/Mentee meetings – ILT 1,2, and 3s (goal/objectives & coordinated) LEA wide Mentor/Mentee meetings based on needed areas of improvement Professional journal – reflections: weekly, bi-monthly, monthly?? Additional observations of master/superior teachers and reflect Video – reflection with mentor +/^ based on INTASC Standards Graduate work = some interim requirements/ additional certification Staff development
	Northwest Group 3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Required monthly meetings on INTASC Standards Required skill building on INTASC Standards – Coach 2 Coach Modes Required designated time weekly/monthly for Mentor/ILT meetings Expand observation data - add lesson plans and student work for each observation present pre-conference form with data relating directly to INTASC Standards as does the ILT's IGP add a two page reflection for each year of how ILT grew professionally as a teacher 	Northwest Group 4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Menu: choices of test, video, etc. Video and documentation Monthly meetings Mentee/ILT Coordinator Banking of CEUs Graduated annual leave credits (ILT 1-1 day, ILT 2-2 days) Submission of a monthly journal of reflections (based on INTASC Standards) and a video

Sandhills Proposal 1	Sandhills Proposal 2	Sandhills Proposal 3
<p>Year 1—Evaluation with feedback by Mentors and Principal. Meet educational requirements. Spend this year getting to know curriculum, etc.</p> <p>Year 2 – Create a rubric to determine who would need to do “interim” requirements(such as a product) using IGP, TPAI-R, etc. Have the designated individuals do the interim requirements.</p> <p>Year 3—Streamline and customize any revisions on interim product or requirement. Demonstrate through observation ability to overcome weaknesses identified in year 2.</p>	<p>Incorporate true coaching model and build it into the daily schedule.</p> <p>Use the IGP to develop reflections for year 2.</p> <p>Oral assessment with state providing questions prior to assessment.</p>	<p>Want choices/options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEA taught courses (use Coach2Coach modules) on INTASC. Provide evidences each month of attending sessions AND implementing the strategies in classroom. • Test (ITK???) • Masters degree in Education # hours per year(?)
<p>Sandhills Proposal 4</p> <p>Options/Choices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graduate credit/Masters of Education • TPAI-R • Written reflection on chosen part of IGP related to INTASC • Monthly Meetings with ILTs/Mentors 	<p>Sandhills Proposal 5</p> <p>No TEST</p> <p>Reinstate staff development credit and require ILTs and Mentors to meet monthly for focused discussion on the INTASC standards.</p>	

Southeast Group 1	Southeast Group 2	Southeast Group 3
<p>1. The ILT will demonstrate competency of INTASC standards by the development of a video.</p> <p>2. The ILT will use a variety of methods/strategies to show mastery.</p> <p>Options As an incentive for this year's ILT-2's to complete the video, the length and number of INTASC standards would be reduced.</p>	<p>1. <u>NO</u> to the student performance as measurement</p> <p>2. Choice of more in depth IGP (Regional review board) or TTK</p> <p>3. Larger role for mentor (ex. Release time for frequent observations from mentor, time for feedback)</p>	<p>OPTIONS- Differentiated Licensure Process*--</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TTK – Verbal linguistic, analytical • Video and form (NES) * - (Kinesthetic, art/visual, naturalist • EOC/G growth – (Analytical, interpersonal) • Documented Mentor/Mentee observations & meetings based on INTASC (interpersonal, intrapersonal) <p>This process treats teachers in the manner in which we expect teachers to treat students.</p>
<p>Southeast Group 4</p> <p>1. Choice of assessments (test, video, observations, reflective writing)</p> <p>2. Personal Inquiry Project (evidence to support standards picked in IGP) Cape Fear Center for Inquiry</p>	<p>Southeast Group 5</p> <p>1. True implementation of BTIGP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • INTASC Standards • Documented evidence of completion • Targeted Staff Development <p>2. Menu of Options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Video Lesson with reflection on INTASC standards • Test of Teaching Knowledge (TTK) • Documentation of implementation of INTASC standards <p>3. Redirect State Funding to the School Level Focus more on mentor and administrative observations; bring trained assessors to the classroom</p> <p>4. Observations with reflection and meet with Mentor (interdistrict as well as intradistrict observations) (focus on one standard per month)</p> <p>5. Spread amount of work equally over 3 years.</p>	<p>Southeast Group 6</p> <p>1. Video with questions (looking for lesson plan, behavior, unique learners)</p> <p>2. Accept work already done by present ILT-2's</p> <p>3. Assessors to come into the classrooms</p> <p>4. Conversational reflection is important (journal with mentor)</p> <p>5. ALL NC colleges and universities should prepare teachers with INTASC standards (ECU model)</p> <p>6. Video (with no edits) and narrative, with evidence of understanding of INTASC standards.</p> <p>7. Option of test (state paid) or "whatever" is decided upon.</p> <p>8. Give additional incentive for ILTs to complete the requirement this year. (Additional annual leave days.)</p> <p>9. More staff development on curriculum strategies, technology, and classroom management.</p> <p>10. State assessors from neighboring counties with pre-conference.</p> <p>11. *This year, change requirement from year 2 to year 3. (Dec.-May is too short a time frame)</p> <p>12. Begin in year 2004</p> <p>Year 1 – plan with mentor (unit)</p> <p>Year 2 – implement/reflect</p> <p>Year 3 – compile and assess</p> <p>13. Different process for ILTs and Lateral Entry.</p>

Southwest Region

All groups supported the proposal presented by the SW Region Personnel Directors (attached)

Reasons:

Meets both letter and spirit of the legislation, do-able, already in place, acceptability is there, accountability is there (ILT, Mentor, and Principal). Should include an appeal process and review process from local group of teachers, mentors, etc. State teams could go and observe this process if this is a state decision. Fine tune the IGP to show proof of learning INTASC and include reflections on the INTASC standards related to the IGP. Focus the TPAI-R pre-conference on the INTASC standards as well as classroom observations. Merge the INTASC standards and observation questions. If there are inequities across the state with IGP and TPAI-R process—could DPI address these differences as a part of the “interim” requirement? Use forms, Standards, processes already in place.

1. Staff Development Units should be reinstated; gives the ILT documentation and is an incentive. Monthly meetings with Mentor and ILT documented by sign-in sheets/provide time for Mentor/ILT meetings within the day). Must be related to INTASC. Give schools the opportunity to tie in School Improvement, Technology, SACS, Safe Schools, etc.
2. IHEs should be required to introduce INTASC standards. Make known differences in portfolio at IHE level and at other levels...should be different than any required of teachers. Need to think about a year long internship, thus justifying the increased pay upon graduation.
3. There should be different requirements for Lateral Entry teachers. Pay for teachers who graduated from Teacher Education institutions should be a pay grade higher than lateral entry.
4. Require ILTs to observe designated Master Teachers in the LEA. Provide two half days of release time for this.
5. Unannounced Observations by a Professional Observer—Whole day, Based on INTASC, planning period to review and give feedback.
6. More rigorous accountability for Mentors.
7. No additional tests of any kind.

West Group 1	West Group 2	West Group 3
<p>1) Continue monthly meetings with ILTs and mentors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus on IGP and these INTASC Standards: content pedagogy, motivation and management, and planning. ILT2s will be assessed via TPAL-R (or other model) with all functions rated “at standard” or above. <p>2) Long-term proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ILT3s in their 1st semester produce a 20-minute video and written reflections, assessed by a trained mentor/assessor in concert with principal’s recommendation. 	<p>Menu option</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pilot test National Education Services test on INTASC Standards. Require mentor/mentee meetings with evidence of INTASC to be assessed within the region but outside the LEA. If deemed “below standard,” ILT must go to a 2-day intensive training. The intense 2-day retreat will be for ILTs who need further professional development. High quality teachers who demonstrate INTASC Standards and help ILTs pull together evidence of INTASC Standards will provide this training. ILTs will earn CEUs for participation. <p>Also noted:</p> <p>PBL Product requirement would move to a part of student teaching</p>	<p>Four options as numbered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Licensure decision based on results of interviews and conferences between ILT and site administrator. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rubric on INTASC Standards LEA makes recommendation for licensure. Two full lessons on videotape with supporting evidence. ILT reflects orally, on tape, or written Based on INTASC Evaluated by trained assessors. 3) Menu (No more than three) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PBL Portfolio Videotaped lessons with assessment Test (State pays, not ILT or State reimburses upon successful completion). 4) Continuing Education Credits to document learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Banked during ILT process Formula for how many count toward continuing license. <p>Also noted:</p> <p>Tough calls make it difficult for licensure decisions to be done locally</p>
		<p>West Group 4</p> <p>1) Expand and clearly define the role of mentor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better documentation of meetings Implement reflective practices with mentor Give mentor more authority Better match of certification areas Give mentor more training and more time with mentee <p>2) Shrink Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questions need to be more succinct Lengthen the time frame to complete the product ILT2 process <p>Also noted:</p> <p>No more out of pocket expenses for teachers</p> <p>No video</p>
		<p>West Group 5</p> <p>Show INTASC implementation in classroom with more support for ILT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monthly meetings with ILTs and mentors. Possibly structured activities or action plans. Mentor should provide informal observations for ILT. Support system. Let ILTs see good teachers in action. Focused staff development with timeline. Provide professional development day on a monthly basis. Follow-up is important. Support throughout the entire year. Promotional incentives for ILTs such as renewal credit or annual leave days. <p>Also noted:</p> <p>Products should be implemented during college or student teaching to standardize requirements.</p> <p>No Test</p>

West Group 7	West Group 8
<p>Suggestions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Money that has been set aside for PBL assessment be given to local systems to hire master teachers who provide assistance to first year and second year teachers • Local control • Time provided for comprehensive program • Video/discussion of INTASC Standards 	<p>Menu option of four items; keep the rigor; system chooses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test • Interview • Portfolio – may be modified • Growth standard (not a one time, one test situation) Have a school level discussion with ILT2s as a part of the process • TPAI with monthly reflection • Principal or committee recommendation. • Cover INTASC over three years and give options when standards are covered.

Also noted:

- Reflective process is good
- Beginning teacher pay does not match expectations
- Improve student teaching
- Hire full time mentors

Additional Comments/Notes

1. Individuals who need to resubmit

From the Southeast Regional Meeting: *WE ARE VERY CONCERNED ABOUT RESUBMISSIONS!!!! (Can we let them redo??? Since we want "Interim" requirements to be well-developed and not rushed?)

2. \$500 stipend from the state for teachers completing requirements in lieu of assessment fees (Sandhills)
3. Expand probationary license to 3 years (Sandhills)
4. More uniform standards at IHEs (Sandhills)
5. Want flexible options with balance (Sandhills)
6. Retrain Mentors on current material (Sandhills)
7. **VERY IMPORTANT:** Teachers should not pay for any interim requirement since the product did not have a fee to assess paid by teachers. (Southwest)
8. DO NOT make this in addition to what teachers are already doing. (Southwest)
9. Let the decision making be at the local level. (Southwest)
10. There needs to be stronger accountability for Principals/Administrators. (Southwest)
11. Options (a menu of two of three items to clear ILT) should be allowed with parameters. (Southwest)
12. DO NOT give options(differing view was would this be defensible in court?). (Southwest)
13. Move the product to year 4. (Southwest)
14. Teachers are not returning because of the product.
15. Continue full funding for a Mentor Program.

From Brenda Dail, Perquimans County

I have just recently finished going through the NC Teaching Fellows process with our top-notch students. I was so impressed with them and the entire process. It is a wonderful, challenging and valid process (much research and documentation to support program). I was thinking this process might be a good fill-in until another process could be approved. It is a very structured and rigorous process. Naturally, we could take it to a higher level and incorporate the INTASC standards.

Writing Assessment:

I suggest that we keep the writing assessment like they do for the teaching fellows. All LEAs will receive a sealed envelope including two writing prompts. During a certain time frame all local coordinators (or designees) will be responsible for administering a 60-minute writing assignment to their local ILTs - year 2 (or people needing to meet this licensure requirement). It would be nice to have it done on computers (like we do our comps for our masters degrees). Use a website, disk or paper - I would prefer them to demonstrate technology skills. Each ILT will select one prompt to write about defending their answer or reflecting on an experience. I will fax you a copy of the Teaching Fellows writing assignment and directions for you to review. The writing assignment can be printed out, saved on a disk or sent as an attachment to our Regional ILT Coordinator. Our Regional Coordinator will get our already trained PBL assessors to meet in June to read these papers and evaluate them based on a standard four-scale rubric. This will demonstrate technology skills, reflective writing and thinking skills, etc. I don't think this is too much to ask of our ILTs. The writing assessment can be done during the month of April.

Interview Assessment:

During the months of May and June, all ILTs will schedule a 20-minute interview with three trained PBL assessors (arranged by Regional and Local ILT Coordinators). The assessors will be given a set of 5 - 8 questions designed by DPI State ILT Coordinator and team. Again, received in a sealed envelope and all will be alike and follow their directions. (I will fax you a copy of this, too). Each ILT will be asked the same questions across the state. The interview session can be judged like the Teaching Fellows interview. I will send you a copy of the scoring sheet. Each PBL assessor will give a certain score for five areas. A minimum score will be set for the interview and all writing assignments must meet "At Standard" ranking.

I realized a lot of people suggested a video taping yesterday, but a writing assessment and interview may be more valid and practical while wait for the study to be completed. Many schools do not have proper video equipment and could cause a real hardship here at the last minute. I know our school system is poor and we don't have a lot of cameras. Also, teachers sometime record the same lesson over and over again until they get it perfect and this takes away from true instructional time and true learning. Plus, getting some one to record a quality video is often difficult. You get motion sickness watching some of these amateur videos. I don't think a 15-minute video allows enough time for a person to evaluate another person's teaching abilities. Based on the TPAI training, a true evaluation should last a least 45 to 50 minutes. Snapshots alone are not very valid documentation. Plus, getting people together to view videos could cost the state more money and more trouble. Is there validity in video watching?

Hopefully, IGPs, INTASC standards and evaluations could be a part of the interview questions and/or writing assessments. (They are all very important components for an ILT to be successful).

November 22, 2002

Ms. Gayenell Campbell Gull

Mr. V. Brock Murray

Dr. Kathy Sullivan

Dr. Zoe Locklear

Greetings:

At a meeting on November 14, 2002, the personnel administrators of the Southwest Educational Alliance agreed on a recommendation to make to you regarding the interim Performance-Based Licensure requirements. We appreciate very much the opportunity to provide this input.

We want to emphasize that we are fully supportive of high standards for continuing licensure. Furthermore, we feel strongly that continuing licenses should be issued based on quality performance. In addition, one of the goals of the State Board of Education and all of our local school systems involves the recruitment and retention of quality teachers. These are some of the guiding principles behind our proposal.

As you know, the Initial Licensure Process that is in place now is already more rigorous than it was when the Excellent Schools Act was passed. This additional rigor is due to the alignment of the Beginning Teachers' Individual Growth Plan with the Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument—Revised, the Pre-Conference Questions, and the rubrics that have been developed. In addition, these documents have also been correlated to the INTASC Standards, the State Board's standards, and the NBPTS Core Propositions. With these alignments, we feel strongly that the continuing licensure program for Initially Licensed Teachers must be based on the INTASC standards and the teacher's growth within these ten standards. Therefore, we strongly recommend that the Beginning Teacher Individualized Growth Plan be the **primary** document used for determining continuing licensure, along with the other TPAI-R documents. On the following page is the analysis behind this recommendation.

A further recommendation is that the General Assembly provide a fully-funded mentor program. If the new teacher is classified as an ILT, then a state-paid mentor should be provided until the new teacher qualifies for a continuing license.

Again, we appreciate this opportunity for input. Please let us know if you would like additional information.

Sincerely,

Personnel Administrators
Southwest Educational Alliance

Analysis of the Recommendation to use

THE BEGINNING TEACHER'S INDIVIDUAL GROWTH PLAN FOR CONTINUING LICENSURE

+	▲
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Since 2000, administrators, mentors, and ILTs have been trained and/or re-trained in the use of this instrument. + The BT-IGP focuses on the ten INTASC Standards, which address the main things that a teacher needs to know and be able to do. + The legislation requires "that any interim requirements do not require significant and unnecessary paperwork, effort, and administrative burden." Since these documents and processes are already in place, this recommendation meets that requirement of the legislation. + With the additional focus on the BT-IGP, it becomes a more rigorous process. + It focuses on the GROWTH of the ILT. Certainly that should be the focus of any effective and productive recruitment, induction, retention, and licensing program. + The IGP is reviewed three times per year. The school-based administrators and the mentor and/or other peers are involved in that review. As part of the review, the ILT provides documentation / evidence related to or addressing each of the INTASC standards. Over a three-year period, a minimum of nine reviews occur. A form is already provided to document these reviews. + Part of the BT-IGP documentation would be verification of completion of professional development sessions related to each of the INTASC standards (for example, a minimum of 60 hours = 20 hours per year for each of the three years in the ILT program). These would not be renewal credits, but would be professional growth directly related to the Beginning Teacher Process and the INTASC Standards. + One of the INTASC Standards addresses Motivation and Management of Students, one of the most common growth areas for ILTs. + The Key Indicators for the INTASC Standards provide a ready-made rubric for the IGP (copy attached). + This recommendation is aligned with what beginning teachers already are doing, with the addition of specified professional growth and documentation related to the INTASC standards. Perhaps one additional page would have to be added: a sign-off sheet for the school-based administrator, the mentor, and the central office regarding the ILTs readiness for a continuing license. + This proposal does not require additional DPI staffing or major effort at DPI. In a year, when the state agency has already lost 30-40 positions and most departments are stressed, this is an important consideration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ The State Board and/or Legislative Oversight Committee may not be aware of the BT-IGP and the revised TPAI, including the excellent Pre-Observation Questions and Rubric, as they were not in place when the Excellent Schools Act was passed. The monitoring process and evaluation system for beginning teachers are now more rigorous than when the PBL process began. ▲ With the added focus on the BT-IGP, school systems may need to concentrate a little additional in-service time on this instrument, as well as on how to analyze one's strengths and weaknesses as they relate to the BT-IGP. ▲ Many school systems have used the Pre-Observation Conference questions with our Initially Licensed Teachers on a trial basis (these questions were originally developed for experienced teachers). Those trials have been very successful, and we recommend that the Pre-Conference Questions and Rubric be used at least one time per year with the ILTs (not more than once because their use requires an announced observation). These questions need to be incorporated into the local performance appraisal training for ILTs. ▲ Someone (preferably DPI) should further develop the INTASC Key Indicators Rubric, listing suggested activities / strategies for each of the Key Indicators as well as the resources (people, funds, materials, or time) needed to accomplish each activity/strategy. This sample prescriptive growth document should be shared with all NC school systems.

Participants in the Regional Meetings

Individual	Position	LEA
Linda Loy	Coordinator for Personnel Development	Alamance-Burlington
Sheryl Steele	Mentor Teacher	Alamance-Burlington
Rachel Walker	ILT 2	Alamance-Burlington
Liz Cronan	ILT2	Alexander County
Elizabeth Curry	Principal	Alexander County
Lynn Grogan	EC Lead Teacher	Alexander County
Barry Redmond	Associate Superintendent	Alexander County
Tanya Carmichael	ILT2	Alleghany County
Phil Howell	Principal	Alleghany County
Leann Joines	ILT1	Alleghany County
Carol Porter	Mentor Teacher	Alleghany County
Gary West	Principal	Alleghany County
Maxter Allen		Anson County
Betsy Ammons		Anson County
Melissa Edwards		Anson County
Eileen Churchill	ILT Coordinator	Arapahoe Charter
Ina Cox	Personnel Director	Ashe County
Elizabeth Cuildus		Asheboro City
Jennifer Lake		Asheboro City
Barbara Skelly		Asheboro City
Jennifer Smith		Asheboro City
Cindy Byron	Teacher	Asheville City
Vicki Dineen	Principal	Asheville City
Nancy Reid	ILT Coordinator	Asheville City/McDowell County
Greg Townsend	Mentor Teacher	Asheville City
Rachel Hollman	Director of Personnel	Avery County
Diane Jaynes	Principal	Avery County

Individual	Position	LEA
Wendi Reed	ILT 1	Baker Charter
Marti Wilson	Principal	Baker Charter
Susan Legg	Teacher	Beauford County
Nicole Howard	Principal	Beaufort County
Carolyn Satchell	Human Resources	Beaufort County
Sandra Hardy	Assistant Principal	Bertie County
Brenda Pollard	Teacher	Bertie County
Connie Richardson	Director	Bertie County
John Bettarto	Principal	Bethel Hill Charter
Gail Collie	Teacher	Bethel Hill Charter
Sandra Snead	Teacher	Bethel Hill Charter
Sandy Jones		Bladen County
Pat Holden	Director-ILT Coordinator	Brunswick County
Susan Piland	Mentor Teacher	Buncombe County
Margaret Hyatt	Principal	Buncombe County
Don Icenhour	Principal	Buncombe County
Donna James	ILT Coordinator	Buncombe County
Cassie Ostertag	ILT	Buncombe County
Steve Demiter	Director of Personnel/ILT Coordinator	Burke County
Penny Jenkins	Mentor	Burke County
Julia Knight-Pittman	Assistant Principal	Burke County
Shanda McFarlin	Principal	Burke County
Erin Wall	ILT2	Burke County
Teresa Abernathy		Cabarrus County
Marion Bish		Cabarrus County
Vickie Honeycutt		Cabarrus County
Jonathan Newton		Cabarrus County
Colleen Sain		Cabarrus County
Paula Mickey	Personnel Director/ILT Coordinator	Camden County

Individual	Position	LEA
Mary Beth Poole	Teacher	Camp Lejeune
Tom King	Personnel Administrator	Camp Lejeune
Janet Kinney	Principal	Camp Lejeune
Lisa Griffin	Director	Cape Fear Center for Inquiry
Sarah McCircle	Teacher	Cape Fear Center for Inquiry
Valarie Simmons	Teacher	Cape Fear Center for Inquiry
Lisa Sullivan	Teacher	Cape Fear Center for Inquiry
Barbara Brown	Licensure Specialist	Carteret County
Donna Kimbro	ILT Coordinator	Caswell
Shelba Barrett	ILT Coordinator	Catawba County
Ashley Dozier	Teacher	Chapel Hill-Carrboro City
Mary Gundeson	ILT Coordinator	Chapel Hill-Carrboro City
Helen Maxwell	Teacher	Chapel Hill-Carrboro City
Mollie Henderson		Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
Elaine Miller		Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
Teresa Shipman	Human Resources	Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
Valerie Williams		Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
Dale Bunch	Teacher	Chatham Charter School
John Cazzinni	Principal	Chatham Charter School
Judy Morris	Teacher	Chatham County
Crystal Perry	Teacher	Chatham Charter School
Rhonda Underwood	ILT Coordinator/Licensure Specialist	Chatham County
John Arnold	ILT Coordinator	Cherokee Central Schools
Wanda Arrowood	Principal	Cherokee County Schools
Tim Coffey	Director of Instruction	Cherokee County Schools
Linda Crowe	Principal	Cherokee Central Schools
Clara Gustason	Mentor Teacher	Cherokee County Schools
Arlene Huskey	Teacher	Cherokee Central Schools
Teresa Mosteller	Teacher	Cherokee County Schools

Individual	Position	LEA
David Newsome	Principal	Cherokee County Schools
Laura Hastings	Association President	CLDS
Christine Moye	ILT	CLDS
Joe Bowen		Cleveland County
Cathy Mason	Assistant Principal	Clinton City
Mary Nell Darden	Assistant Principal	Clinton City
Faye McManus	Principal	Clover Garden Charter
Charity Saunders	Teacher	Clover Garden Charter
Camille Thomas	Teacher	Clover Garden Charter
Kathryn Faulk		Columbus County
Roy Mayo		Columbus County
Amy Powell		Columbus County
Georgia Spaulding		Columbus County
Barbara Yates		Columbus County
Marnie Halvorson		Covenant Day School
Betty Blythe	Personnel Director	Craven County
Shirley Dawson	Assistant Superintendent	Craven County
Cindy Johnston	Teacher/Mentor	Craven County
Jennie Oakley	Principal	Craven County
Jewel Smith	Teacher/Mentor	Craven County
Cindy McCormic		Cumberland County
Theresa Rovry		Cumberland County
Dale Williams		Cumberland County
Anne Mackin	Personnel Director	Currituck County
Margie Parker		Dare County
Jules Crowell	Principal	Davidson County
Annette Kruse		Davidson County
Melissa MacDermid		Davidson County
Evan Myers		Davidson County

Individual	Position	LEA
Faye Patterson	ILT Coordinator	Davidson County
Amy Durso	Resource Coordinator	DHHS
Michael Viar	Licensure/Support Services Coordinator	DHHS
Carole Breerwood		Diocese of Charlotte
Rosalie Innacelli	ILT Coordinator	Diocese of Raleigh
Jennifer Haygood	Teacher Support Coordinator	DJJDP
Vicki Alabaster	ILT Coordinator	Duplin County
Minnie Bryant	Human Resource Director	Duplin County
Marian Chavious	Lateral Entry Coordinator	Duplin County
Alice Hagaman	PBL Coordinator	Durham Public
Sheila Washington-Callis	Mentor Coordinator	Durham Public
Jennifer Bellizza	Teacher	East Wake Academy
Kelly Maxson	ILT Coordinator	East Wake Academy
Michelle Alexander	HR Director	Edenton-Chowan
Debbie Burrough	ILT 2 Coach	Edenton-Chowan
Debora Lightfoot	ILT Coordinator	Edgecombe County
Joyce Harris	ILT Coordinator	Elizabeth City/Pasquotank
Victor Vance		Fort Bragg Schools
Quincy Etheridge		Gaston County
Jennifer Fannin		Gaston County
Marcia Hunter		Gaston County
Penny Powell		Gaston County
Linda Rader		Gaston County
Nina Yeargin	Director of Human Resources	Graham County Schools
Dave Bennett	HR Director	Granville County
Mekeisha Williams	Professional Development Coordinator	Granville County
Mary Beth Riddick	Teacher	Greene County
Gwen Smith	ILT Coordinator	Greene County
Raymond Smith	Director, Human Resources	Greene County

Individual	Position	LEA
Erica Summerlin	Teacher	Greene County
Sonja Fischer		Guilford County
Doris Henderson	ILT Coordinator	Guilford County
Martha Snavely		Guilford County
Audrey Young	Teacher	Guilford County
Selma Allen	Personnel Director	Halifax County
Vivian Branch	Principal	Halifax County
Chastity Kinsey	Teacher	Halifax County
Jeffrey McCain	Principal	Halifax County
Claudia Sikes	Literacy Specialist	Halifax County
Betty Ann Bowen		Harnett County
Carla Crenshaw		Harnett County
Cecilia Gregory		Harnett County
Linda Turlington Herring		Harnett County
Rebecca Caldwell	Mentor Teacher	Haywood County Schools
Kadie Franklin	ILT	Haywood County Schools
Regina Lambert	Principal	Haywood County Schools
Terry McCracken	Director of Human Resources	Haywood County Schools
Bill Nolte	Principal	Haywood County Schools
David Jones	Sr. Director of Personnel Services	Henderson County
Gailoe Johnson	Teacher	Hertford County
Betty Pyl	ILT Coordinator	Hertford County
Ric Vandett	Assistant Superintendent	Hickory City
Linda McLaughlin		Hoke County
Diantha Coley	Administrative Assistant	Hyde County
Charles Delforge	Principal	Hyde County
Bertha Valentine-Thorpe	Principal	Hyde County
Susan Norman	Lead Teacher	Jackson County
Carol Burchette	Mentor Teacher	Johnston County

Individual	Position	LEA
Kirk Denning	Principal	Johnston County
Robin Little	ILT Coordinator	Johnston County
Holly Price	ILT 2	Johnston County
Valeria Barrow	Personnel Officer	Jones County
Jerry Meaney	Teacher	Jones County
Donna Morton	Teacher	Jones County
Jo Stone	Principal	Jones County
Sherry Winn	ILT 2	Jones County
Chip Buckwell		Kannapolis City
Judy Dayroutt		Kannapolis City
Judy Goodnight		Kannapolis City
Annie Pickett	Personnel Director	Kannapolis City
Kristi Stubbs		Kannapolis City
Ronnie Wilson		Kings Mountain
Lou Coggins		Lee County
Amy Thomas		Lee County
Robert Melton	ILT Coordinator	Lenoir County
Ashley Hinson		Lexington City
Melissa Pfeffer		Lexington City
Susan Vivacoua		Lexington City
Vicky Ratchford		Lincoln County
Phyllis Talbert		Lincoln County
Richard Baldwin	Director of Personnel	Macon County
Terry Bell	Principal	Macon County
Tammy Tisdale	Principal	Macon County
Theresa Banks	Associate Superintendent	Madison County
Susanne DuVall	Teacher	Madison County
Shannon Ramsey	Teacher	Madison County
Lisa Snelson	Teacher	Madison County

Individual	Position	LEA
Candi McPherson	Principal	McDowell County
Sarah Pratt	Personnel Services	McDowell County
Sandra Queen	Mentor	McDowell County
Robyn Wall	Teacher	McDowell County
Jim Washburn	Principal	McDowell County
Aimee Auman		Montgomery County
Bob Gilman		Montgomery County
Ralph Johnson		Montgomery County
Sue Long		Montgomery County
Stella Farrow		Moore County
Donna Thomas		Moore County
Carmen Vaughan		Moore County
Elizabeth Sadler		Mooresville City
Denny Barr	Assistant Principal	Mt. Airy
Gloria Best	Mentor	Mt. Airy
Whitney Blackwell	ILT2	Mt. Airy
Roberta Ackley		New Century Charter
Amy Conklin	Teacher	New Hanover County
Cary Sink	Teacher	New Hanover County
Olga Wheatley	ILT Coordinator	New Hanover County
Michael Zentwerger	Principal	New Hanover County
Larry Harris		Newton-Conover
Beckie Collins	Personnel Director	Onslow County
Cindy Paredes	ILT 3	Onslow County
Deborah Rose	Site Coordinator	Onslow County
Sue Florence	ILT Coordinator	Orange County
Judy Pounds	Teacher	Orange County
Patricia Temple	Principal	Orange County
Margaret Vaughn	Teacher	Orange County

Individual	Position	LEA
Wanda Dawson	Assistant Superintendent	Pamlico County
Deloris Rhodes	Director of Personnel	Pender County
Brenda Dail	Personnel Director	Perquimans County
Jennifer Kiesicki	Teacher	Perquimans County
Judith Hunley	Teacher	Person County
Donna Jerry	Assistant Director/Personnel	Person County
Kim Kauffman	Mentor Teacher	Person County
Chera Cayton	Teacher	Pitt County
Walter Claybrook	Assistant Principal	Pitt County
Sheridan Holstein	ILT Coordinator	Pitt County
Virginia Simmons	Assistant Principal	Pitt County
Margaret Wirth	Teacher	Pitt County
Cathy Childress	Principal	Polk County
Rick Howell	Principal	Polk County
Mary Margaret Ingle	Associate Superintendent	Polk County
Stephanie Bridges	Assistant Principal	Randolph County
Nancy Cross	Instructional Lead Teacher	Randolph County
Judi Moffitt	Coordinator for Personnel Support	Randolph County
Kelli Vann	Teacher	Randolph County
K. Luann Greene		Richmond County
Lane Street		Richmond County
Martha Webb		Richmond County
Linda Humble	ILT Coordinator/Principal	River Mill Academy
Mildred Hurteau	Teacher	River Mill Academy
Joan Love	Teacher	River Mill Academy
Joyce Kennedy	Personnel Director	Roanoke Rapids
Gene Freeman		Robeson County
Vicki Gibson		Robeson County
Melinda Powers		Robeson County

Individual	Position	LEA
Jay Jones	ILT Coordinator	Rockingham County
Delores Morris		Rowan Salisbury
Jean Kennedy		Rowan-Salisbury
Sandra Rogers		Rowan-Salisbury
Mandi Sweet		Rowan-Salisbury
Donna Wiseman		Rowan-Salisbury
Steven Helton	Assistant Principal	Rutherford County
Marty Hopper	Principal	Rutherford County
Diann Johnson	Assistant Principal	Sampson County
Rhonda Spell	Assistant Principal	Sampson County
Elizabeth Wheeler	Teacher	Sampson County
Ellen Jones		Scotland County
Leslie Knauss		Scotland County
Patricia McLean		Scotland County
Any Sloop		Scotland County
Donna Suttle		Shelby City
Peggy Furr		Stanly County
Terry Griffin		Stanly County
Debby Johnston		Stanly County
Angela Mills		Stanly County
Susan Shields		Stanly County
Melisa Jessup	Human Resources	Stokes County
Jennifer Scott	Director of Professional Development	Surry County
Bill Hester	ILT	Swain County
Bobby Marr	Associate Superintendent	Swain County
Jody Marr	Mentor Teacher	Swain County
Sam Pattillo	Principal	Swain County
Os Waters	Principal	Swain County
Barbara Armstrong		Thomasville City

Individual	Position	LEA
Elizabeth Ballard	ILT	Transylvania County
Amy Schoenacher	Mentor	Transylvania County
Betty Scruggs	Assistant Principal	Transylvania County
James Cahoon	Assistant Superintendent/ILT Coord.	Tyrrell County
Pearl Ogletree	Director, C&I	Tyrrell County
Joanne Smith	Teacher	Tyrrell County
Patty Spencer	Support Teacher	Tyrrell County
Terri Cooper		Union County
Sarah Bristow	Teacher	Vance Charter School
Vivian Bullock	ILT Coordinator	Vance County
Carolyn Powell	Principal	Vance Charter School
S. Wall		Vance Charter School
Gail Washington	Teacher	Vance Charter School
Anne Hudson	Elementary ILP Coordinator	Wake County
Luana McCamy	Teacher/ILP Coordinator	Wake County
Mary Page	Principal	Wake County
Judy Stines	Secondary ILP Coordinator	Wake County
Wendy Thomas	Administrator	Wake County
Lisa Woodside	ILT 3	Wake County
Princine Jefferies	Assistant Superintendent	Warren County
Chelsa Jennings	Teacher	Warren County
Joyce Long	Principal	Warren County
Willistine Williams	Teacher	Warren County
Gail Ford	K-8 ILT Coordinator	Watauga County
Phyllis Garr	Mentor Teacher	Watauga County
Clarissa Schanal	HS ILT Coordinator	Watauga County
Angela Watson	Teacher/Mentee	Watauga County
Carla Anderson	Teacher	Wayne County
Debbie Durham	ILT Coordinator	Wayne County

Individual	Position	LEA
Teresa Simmons	Mentor Teacher	Wayne County
Diane Watts	Assistant Principal	Wayne County
Jenny Whitfield	Principal	Wayne County
Donna Draper	Teacher/Support Coach	Weldon City
Betty Hanks	Counselor/Support Coach	Weldon City
Roger Metcalf	Director	Western-RESA
Milton Frink		Whiteville City
Chinaki Jal		Whiteville City
Katie McLam		Whiteville City
Deanna Sherman		Whiteville City
Jerry Barlett	Principal	Wilkes County
Deborah Elleridge	ILT Coordinator	Wilkes County
Bob Hobert	Principal	Wilkes County
Charles Davis	Principal	Winston-Salem Forsyth
James Lucas	ILT Coordinator	Winston-Salem Forsyth
Fran Oates	Dir. of Staff Development/ILT Coor.	Winston-Salem Forsyth
Suzanne Sarfert	ILT2	Winston-Salem Forsyth
Jane Thomas	Mentor Teacher	Winston-Salem Forsyth
Ann Marie Wasson	ILT3	Yadkin County
Karen Matthew	ILT Coordinator	Yadkin County
Brenda Perdue	Mentor	Yadkin County
James Sheek	Principal	Yadkin County

APPENDIX C

Participants

December 3, 2002 Meeting

Individual	LEA Affiliation
Barbara Armstrong	Thomasville City
Cecil Banks	NCPTSC
Velma Barnes	Wilson County
Valeria Barrow	Jones County
Becky Blomgren	Greensboro College
Betty Blythe	Craven County
Chip Buckwell	Kannapolis City
Vivian Bullock	Vance County
Angela Farthing	NCAE
Alice Hagaman	Durham County
Larry Harris	Newton-Conover
Dorsey Harris	NCAE
Susan Harrison	Wake County
Parmalee Hawk	East Carolina University
Doris Henderson	Guilford County
Ashley Hinson	Lexington City
Vickie Honeycutt	Cabarrus County
Anne Hudson	Wake County
Gary Jarrett	DPI
Melisa Jessup	Stokes County
Jay Jones	Rockingham County
Jean Kennedy	Rowan-Salisbury
Debora Lightfoot	Edgecombe County
Robin Little	Johnston County
Zoe Locklear	DPI

Individual	LEA Affiliation
Penny Maguire	DPI
Karen Matthews	Yadkin County
Robert Melton	Lenoir County
Delores Morris	Rowan-Salisbury
Brock Murray	DPI
Bennett Myers	Craven County
Jane Norwood	SBE
Faye Patterson	Davidson County
Philip Price	DPI
Vicki Rivenbark	Onslow County
Sandra Rogers	Rowan-Salisbury
Tony Romano	Charlotte-Mecklenburg
Susan Simpson	PENC
Judy Stines	Wake County
Linda Suggs	DPI
Joyce Wade	Johnston County
Olga Wheatley	New Hanover County
Claire White	NCPTA
Devon White	PENC
Margaret Wirth	Pitt County

APPENDIX D

INTASC STANDARDS

INDIVIDUALIZED GROWTH PLAN

TPAI-R

The INTASC Standards

Standard 1: Content Pedagogy

The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.

Standard 2: Student Development

The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support a child's intellectual, social, and personal development.

Standard 3: Diverse Learners

The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

Standard 4: Multiple Instructional Strategies

The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

Standard 5: Motivation and Management

The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

Standard 6: Communication and Technology

The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

Standard 7: Planning

The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

Standard 8: Assessment

The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.

Standard 9: Reflective Practice: Professional Growth

The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

Standard 10: School and Community Involvement

The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.

DIRECTIONS FOR THE USE OF THE BEGINNING TEACHER'S INDIVIDUALIZED GROWTH PLAN (IGP)

1. Fill in identifying data on the beginning teacher and the mentor teacher. Specify the school year and indicate (by circling 1, 2, or 3) if the beginning teacher is in the first, second, or third year of the Initial Licensure Program.
2. Review the 10 INTASC Standards for Beginning Teachers. Using the attached form, assess the beginning teacher's standing relative to each of the standards.
3. Based on the review of the INTASC standards, identify the standard(s) on which the beginning teacher will focus for the IGP year.
4. Identify the Key Indicators on which the beginning teacher will focus during the IGP year.
5. Identify the Activities/Strategies the beginning teacher will use to focus on the targeted Key Indicators during the IGP year.
6. Identify the Resources (people, funds, materials, or time) need to accomplish each activity/strategy.
7. Identify a target date for each activity/strategy.
8. Record the completion date for each activity/strategy.
9. Identify evidence of completion of each activity/strategy.
10. Near the end of the school year, the beginning teacher, the mentor teacher, and the supervisor should each assess the progress of the beginning teacher in realizing the targeted Key Indicators. Each should sign and date the comments.
11. Throughout the year, periodic conferences should be conducted to assess the beginning teacher's progress in realizing the targeted Key Indicators. Summaries of these conferences should be recorded on the Assessment Conferences sheet. Additional copies of this sheet should be made as needed.

BEGINNING TEACHER INDIVIDUALIZED GROWTH PLAN

Name: _____	School Year: _____	ILP Year: 1 2 3 (Circle)																																			
Mentor: _____	Position/Subject Area: _____	School: _____																																			
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">INTASC Standards for Beginning Teachers</th> <th colspan="3">Focus Standards:</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Key Indicators</th> <th>Activities (Strategies)</th> <th>Resources</th> <th>Target Date</th> <th>Completion Date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Content Pedagogy</td> <td>6. Communication and Technology</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Evidence of Completion</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Student Development</td> <td>7. Planning</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Diverse Learners</td> <td>8. Assessment</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. Multiple Instructional Strategies</td> <td>9. Reflective Practice: Professional Growth</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>5. Motivation and Management</td> <td>10. School and Community Involvement</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			INTASC Standards for Beginning Teachers		Focus Standards:			Key Indicators	Activities (Strategies)	Resources	Target Date	Completion Date	1. Content Pedagogy	6. Communication and Technology			Evidence of Completion	2. Student Development	7. Planning				3. Diverse Learners	8. Assessment				4. Multiple Instructional Strategies	9. Reflective Practice: Professional Growth				5. Motivation and Management	10. School and Community Involvement			
INTASC Standards for Beginning Teachers		Focus Standards:																																			
Key Indicators	Activities (Strategies)	Resources	Target Date	Completion Date																																	
1. Content Pedagogy	6. Communication and Technology			Evidence of Completion																																	
2. Student Development	7. Planning																																				
3. Diverse Learners	8. Assessment																																				
4. Multiple Instructional Strategies	9. Reflective Practice: Professional Growth																																				
5. Motivation and Management	10. School and Community Involvement																																				
<p>Beginning Teacher's Summative Assessment</p> <p>Signature: _____ Date: _____</p> <p>Mentor's Summative Assessment</p> <p>Signature: _____ Date: _____</p> <p>Supervisor's Summative Assessment</p> <p>Signature: _____ Date: _____</p>																																					

ASSESSMENT CONFERENCES

Date	Beginning Teacher's Assessment/Comments	Mentor's/Principal's Assessment/Comments
		Signature: _____

INTASC STANDARDS ASSESSMENT

1: Content Pedagogy	2: Student Development	3: Diverse Learners	4: Multiple Instructional Strategies	5: Motivation and Management
+	+	+	+	+
▲	▲	▲	▲	▲
6: Communication/Technology	7: Planning	8: Assessment	9: Reflective Practice	10: School/Community Involvement
+	+	+	+	+
▲	▲	▲	▲	▲

Teacher Performance Appraisal System – Revised

Teacher's Name

School/Location

INSTRUCTIONS

- Based on the evidence from observation, artifacts, and discussion, the evaluator is to rate the teacher's performance with respect to the 8 major functions of teaching listed below.
- The evaluator must add pertinent comments at the end of each major function for which a rating of Above Standard, Below Standard, or Unsatisfactory is given.
- The teacher is provided an opportunity to react to the evaluator's ratings and comments.
- The evaluator and the teacher must discuss the results of the appraisal and any recommended actions pertinent to it.
- The teacher and the evaluator must sign the instrument in the assigned spaces.
- The instrument must be filed in the teacher's personnel folder.
- The rating scale will include the four Levels of Performance described below.

4. Above Standard

Performance within this function area is consistently high. Teaching practices are demonstrated at a high level. Teacher seeks to expand scope of competencies and undertakes additional, appropriate responsibilities.

3. At Standard

Performance within this function area is consistently adequate or acceptable. Teaching practices fully meet all performance expectations at an acceptable level. Teacher maintains an adequate scope of competencies and performs additional responsibilities as assigned.

2. Below Standard

Performance within this function area is sometimes inadequate or unacceptable and needs improvement. Teacher requires supervision and assistance to maintain an adequate scope of competencies and sometimes fails to perform additional responsibilities as assigned.

1. Unsatisfactory

Performance within this function area is consistently inadequate or unacceptable and most practices require considerable improvement to meet minimum performance expectations. Teacher requires close and frequent supervision in the performance of all responsibilities.

Above Standard	At Standard	Below Standard	Unsatisfactory

1. Major Function: Management of Instructional Time

- 1.1 Teacher has materials, supplies, and equipment ready at the start of the lesson or instructional activity.
- 1.2 Teacher gets the class started quickly.
- 1.3 Teacher uses available time for learning and keeps students on task.

Comments:

Above Standard	At Standard	Below Standard	Unsatisfactory

2. Major Function: Management of Student Behavior

- 2.1 Teacher has established a set of rules and procedures that govern the handling of routine administrative matters.
- 2.2 Teacher has established a set of rules and procedures that govern student verbal participation and talk during different types of activities—whole class instruction, small group instruction, etc.
- 2.3 Teacher has established a set of rules and procedures that govern student movement in the classroom during different types of instructional activities.
- 2.4 Teacher frequently monitors the behavior of all students during whole-class, small group, and seat work activities and during transitions between instructional activities.
- 2.5 Teacher stops inappropriate behavior promptly and consistently, yet maintains the dignity of the student.
- 2.6 Teacher analyzes the classroom environment and makes adjustment to support learning and enhance social relationships.

Comments:

Above Standard	At Standard	Below Standard	Unsatisfactory

3. Major Function: Instructional Presentation

- 3.1 Teacher links instructional activities to prior learning.
- 3.2 Teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning activities that make these aspects of subject matter understandable and meaningful for students.
- 3.3 Teacher speaks fluently and precisely.
- 3.4 Teacher provides relevant examples and demonstrations to illustrate concepts and skills.
- 3.5 Teacher assigns tasks and asks appropriate levels of questions that students handle with a high rate of success.
- 3.6 Teacher conducts the lesson or instructional activity at a brisk pace, slowing presentations when necessary for student understanding but avoiding unnecessary slowdowns.
- 3.7 Teacher makes transitions between lessons and between instructional activities within lessons effectively and smoothly.
- 3.8 Teacher makes sure that assignment is clear.
- 3.9 The teacher creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.
- 3.10 The teacher uses instructional strategies that encourage the development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.
- 3.11 The teacher uses technology to support instruction.
- 3.12 The teacher encourages students to be engaged in and responsible for their own learning.

Comments:

Above Standard	At Standard	Below Standard	Unsatisfactory

4. Major Function: Instructional Monitoring

- 4.1 Teacher maintains clear, firm, and reasonable work standards and due dates.
- 4.2 Teacher circulates to check all students' performance.
- 4.3 Teacher routinely uses oral, written, and other work products to evaluate the effects of instructional activities and to check student progress.
- 4.4 Teacher poses questions clearly and one at a time.
- 4.5 Teacher uses student responses to adjust teaching as necessary.

Comments:

Above Standard	At Standard	Below Standard	Unsatisfactory

5. Major Function: Instructional Feedback

- 5.1 Teacher provides feedback on the correctness or incorrectness of in-class work to encourage student growth.
- 5.2 Teacher regularly provides prompt feedback on out-of-class work.
- 5.3 Teacher affirms a correct oral response appropriately and moves on.
- 5.4 Teacher provides sustaining feedback after an incorrect response by probing, repeating the question, giving a clue, or allowing more time.
- 5.5 The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal and non-verbal communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

Comments:

Above Standard	At Standard	Below Standard	Unsatisfactory

6. Major Function: Facilitating Instruction

- 6.1 Teacher has long- and short-term instructional plans that are compatible with school and district curricular goals, the school improvement plan, the NC Standard Course of Study, and the diverse needs of students and the community.
- 6.2 Teacher uses diagnostic information obtained from tests and other formal and informal assessment procedures to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.
- 6.3 Teacher maintains accurate records to document student performance.
- 6.4 Teacher understands how students learn and develop and plans appropriate instructional activities for diverse student needs and different levels of difficulty.
- 6.5 Teacher uses available human and material resources to support the instructional program.

Comments:

Above Standard	At Standard	Below Standard	Unsatisfactory

7. Major Function: Communicating within the Educational Environment

- 7.1 Teacher treats all students in a fair and equitable manner.
- 7.2 Teacher participates in the development of a broad vision of the school.
- 7.3 Teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and community agencies to support students' learning and well-being.

Comments:

Above Standard	At Standard	Below Standard	Unsatisfactory

8. Major Function: Performing Non-Instructional Duties

- 8.1 Teacher carries out non-instructional duties as assigned and/or as need is perceived to ensure student safety outside the classroom.
- 8.2 Teacher adheres to established laws, policies, rules, and regulations.
- 8.3 Teacher follows a plan for professional development and actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.
- 8.4 Teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her decisions and actions on students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community.

Comments:

Evaluator's Summary Comments

Teacher's Reactions to Evaluation

Evaluator's Signature and Date

Teacher's Signature and Date

Signature indicates that the written evaluation has been seen and discussed.