Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment Leadership
Reorganization Proposal

Medway Public Schools, April 5, 2018
Tonight's Goal

Provide the School Committee and the Medway Community with a proposed reorganization plan connected with the leadership of our content, instructional, and assessment programs, K-12.
Agenda

- Background of curriculum, instruction and assessment leadership in the Medway Public Schools
- Process for assessing need for reorganization
- Rationale for proposal
- Proposal
Background
Prior to 2009

- Various combinations of departments heads at high school and K-12 curriculum leaders with part-time teaching responsibilities within the district
- Primary responsibilities around ordering, inventory, professional development, data analysis, management tasks
Proposal by Superintendent Evans to implement Instructional Coaching model at elementary and middle schools

Theory of action: If there is a structure for adult learning at every school; and if teachers see the effect on their students, then they will engage in a different, more effective way of teaching

- Building positive, helpful relationships with teachers
- Sharing best practices among schools
- Promoting peer observations between and within schools
- Shifting professional development to help teachers improve instruction through immediate and specific feedback
- Improved instruction and student achievement
- Fully released from formal teaching assignment

~ from SC Presentation 12/4/08
2011-2014

- Transition to Educational Leaders: Science, Technology, Engineering (STEM) and Humanities (2013)
  - grades 9-12
  - up to 40% teaching
  - provides ‘non evaluative’ feedback

- Addition of 2 K-12 Technology Integration Specialists (2012 and 2013)
  - K-4, 5-12
  - fully released from teaching
Rationale and Process for Leadership Study
Current Leadership Model

- PK-12 Director of Wellness (full time director)
- K-12 Fine and Performing Arts Coordinator (full time teacher with additional stipend)

- K-1, 2-4, 5-8 STEM, 5-8 Humanities Instructional Coaches (full time coaches)
- 9-12 STEM, 9-12 Humanities Education Leaders (teach up to 40%)
- K-12 Technology Integration Specialists (2 positions, full time specialist/coaches)
Current Leadership Model

Benefits

- Significant progress with Curriculum Review Self Study processes (World Language, Digital Learning, Health and Physical Education, History/Social Sciences, Mathematics)
- Meaningful support of curriculum mapping efforts
- Consistent student centered focus
- Support of new program implementation efforts depending on role and building assignment: Everyday Math, Reader’s and Writer’s Workshop, Project Lead the Way, etc.
- Building based / relationship building

Challenges

- Multiple content area oversight - original plan for math and reading focus (at K-8) has been diluted
- Clarity of responsibilities questioned frequently (curriculum mapping, PLC participation, access to student performance information, feedback to teachers)
- Presence in classrooms of Professional Status Educators
- Challenges with vertical oversight
- Lack of clarity around providing instructional support to educators through verbal and/or written feedback
Rationale for Study

To what extent have we fulfilled our vision for these teacher leader roles (goals presented as part the 12/2008 proposal)?:

- Building positive, helpful relationships with teachers - varied, likely due to the many personnel shifts in these roles
- Sharing best practices among schools - curriculum review processes, partnership with Teacher’s College
- Promoting peer observations between and within schools - usually only with our very newest educators and mentors
- Shifting professional development to help teachers improve instruction through immediate and specific feedback - only Education Leaders at the high school have been able to provide feedback for improvement
- Improved instruction and student achievement - 2016 Accountability = 2 level 2 schools; 2017 accountability = high school moved to level 2, no accountability determination for other levels

What is NEXT for in our state of professional growth and learning as a district?
Process and Timeline for Study

- **February 2017:** Initiated collaborative conversations around coaches, technology integration specialists and education leaders roles responsibilities with MFT; shared research articles to explore
- **May 2017:** Shared that a “teacher leadership model exploration” would be taking place Summer - Fall 2017
- **Summer, 2017-December 2017:** Explored research and compilation of cross district practices - reported back to leadership team with updates
- **December 2017:** Identified themes and opportunities from the research and practices in other districts
- **December 2017:** Finalized proposal with administrative team
What Other Models Exist?

- No one model seems to be “the best” as each is values based and reflective of district and school culture and climate
  - Models that are less “administrative” are in place due to the recognition and appreciation for educators/peers supporting other educators in areas of instructional improvement
- Medway was at the forefront when initiated coaching model in 2009
- Our proposal based loosely off of examples found in Duxbury, Dedham, Gloucester, Groton-Dunstable, Medfield, Norwell, Norwood, and Sharon
Recommendation
So What Does Medway Need Now?

- Majority of time with teachers in classrooms to introduce, model and support student learning
- Content and content pedagogy expertise
- K-5; 6-12 structure: vertical alignment at appropriate developmental levels
- Leadership around student data analysis as part of PLC facilitation
- Support with effectively evolving instructional practice
- Enhancement of culture and climate - more frequent feedback and interactions with educators
- Provision of enhanced time for classroom educators to focus on their students and the learning of their students
- Response to recommendations from technology, history/social sciences and world and classical languages curriculum review processes to identify content specific leadership and oversight
What Proposed Structure Will Support These Aspirations?

Supervisors in the Areas of...

- K-5 Mathematics
- K-5 Literacy and Social Sciences
- K-5 Science, Technology/Engineering and Digital Learning
- 6-12 Mathematics
- 6-12 English Language Arts
- 6-12 Science, Technology/Engineering and Computer Science
- 6-12 History/Social Sciences
Measurement of Impact

- Student learning and performance enhancements/improvements
- Enhancement of innovative practices and learning experiences
- Faculty and staff satisfaction
- Student and family perceptions (baseline data has been collected through curriculum review processes)
- # of opportunities to provide feedback to educators
- Updates in curriculum maps to reflect stage II and III enhancements (assessment and learning plans)
Questions?