

Appendix B

Methodology

The writing team that developed these Competencies began by defining the student competencies necessary for graduate success in today's economy. Over the past decade, much has been written and researched to expand the definitions of secondary and postsecondary success to include greater weight across knowledge, skills, and dispositions (e.g., recent pieces such as Conley 2014, Pellegrino & Hilton 2012, Farrington et. al. 2013, Nagaoka et. al 2015). In addition to these research frameworks, we reviewed graduation requirements and standards for students in schools with explicit student-centered approaches and/or deeper learning goals (e.g., sampling from schools in networks such as Big Picture Learning, Expeditionary Learning, and High Tech High).

With these compiled lists in mind, we began back-mapping to what educators would need to know and do to enable their students to reach those identified outcomes. Simply put, if we expect learners to achieve these cognitive, metacognitive, and employability skills to be successful, then we need to define, support, and train the kinds of educators capable of teaching such things. We developed the initial criteria for the educator framework by crosswalking ten educator competency lists. We selected frameworks to represent a range, from highly tested, multi-state and school site-adopted lists developed for our current mode of education (e.g., the Danielson Framework), to newer and sometimes more theoretical lists designed for personalized, innovative settings (e.g., iNACOL's Blended Learning Educator Competencies). For a complete list of original educator source material, see Appendix C.

We then grouped, revised text to avoid duplications, and eliminated skills that clearly did not point toward achieving a personalized, learner-centered approach. We presented the frameworks in two feedback rounds with approximately 20 state and district practitioners in each, asking them to read for: 1. what was missing; 2. where the list needed to distinguish better between the personalized, learner-centered approaches and basic good teaching. The third revision went to additional CCSSO staff experts to craft a side-by-side comparison with the InTASC standards. We also turned that version into an HTML document for a comment period during which we solicited feedback from a broad spectrum of education practitioners, policy makers, researchers, and thought leaders (please see the breakdown of respondents). Through the digital document, we collected over 250 comments from close to 35 additional people. This final piece reflects the incredible wealth of information and thoughtful input we gathered from these multiple rounds of vetting.

Total Respondents	77
State policymakers (e.g., commissioners, deputies)	12
State implementers (e.g., TA Providers, Consultants)	15
Researchers	9
Thought leaders and nonprofits	17
District leaders	11
School leaders	6
Teachers	7