Joint Instructional and Negotiations Committee

School Board Committee: Joint Instructional and Negotiations
Date: April 8, 2013

Committee members present: Jennifer Patterson, Tom Croteau, Clint Cogswell, Barbara Higgins
Committee members absent: Bill Glahn, Oliver Spencer, Tara Reardon
Other Board member present: Kass Ardinger

Administrators and other staff: Chris Rath, Superintendent, Donna Palley, Jack Dunn; Technology Integrators Melisa Scott, Alison Casko, Chris Demers; Steve Rothenberg; Susan Lauze; Charles Swift, Mike Macri, Tom Sica, Paul Bourassa

Media Technology Program
Assistant Superintendent Donna Palley presented a brief history of the library media technology program in the elementary schools. With the elementary school consolidation and the need for professional staff in the library media/technology area, the program has changed. The focus of the program this year has been on integration of technology and media resources into the classroom programs. Donna described this year’s goals: coordinating the use of new technologies, facilitating the integration of media and technology into the life of the school (and use of the learning commons); developing a student portfolio to collect and share evidence of competency on standards. Clint Cogswell asked about students’ learning keyboarding skills; the plan is for students to practice Type to Learn on stations in the classroom.

Ms. Palley shared the goals for the Library Media Program curriculum including goals for students to be able to locate and evaluate information; use software and applications to create multimedia products/presentations; make stop-motion movies in art. The curriculum also includes lessons on proper citations, using digital images, internet safety, cyber-bullying, posting and sharing book reviews, posting to forums, planning and conducting research; understanding concepts and systems such as keyboarding; using Office applications; and image editing.

Ms. Palley demonstrated an example of a student’s digital portfolio using Google Sites. Each student in the pilot classes has access to Google Drive and Google Sites; currently students do not have email accounts. She showed several examples of work students have been entering into their portfolios.

Ms. Palley described ways in which the learning commons are being used, as well as other events in the school (e.g. book talks, monthly book displays, book fairs, specialty book carts). The library media/technology teachers talked about how they are beginning to help students make connections between the work they are doing and the Information and Communication Technology standards. Teachers are providing guidance with respect to students’ writing reflections.
Barbara Higgins voiced a concern about the loss of 90 minutes of literacy (literacy arts, library technology) with the shift to more physical education, art and music. At Beaver Meadow School, the art, music and physical education teachers teach literacy arts during their additional block. She asked if this could be made more consistent from school to school. Kass Ardinger was pleased with the involvement of students in writing reflections about their work, showing increased ownership for their own learning.

**Educator Effectiveness Committee report**

Superintendent Rath and members of the Educator Effectiveness Committee provided a summary of the committee’s work to address the task in the sidebar to the most recent CEA Collective Bargaining Agreement to review Appendix K. The committee has compared the new New Hampshire Model for Educator Support and Effectiveness to Appendix K, the current teacher supervision and evaluation procedures described in the Agreement. There were many areas of agreement between the two documents, including an emphasis on the purpose of supervision and evaluation procedures being on improving the quality of teaching and education in Concord. Both systems have a set of standards: Appendix K has Guidelines for Classroom Teachers and the NH Model uses national standards (InTASC standards). Both systems have annual goal-setting and annual reflection on progress made toward goals. Both systems have a “summative” or final evaluation every three years for experienced teachers. Both systems use formal classroom observations and one source of evidence, and both systems have procedures spelled out for teachers in need of improvement.

There are differences between the two systems. The NH system requires educators to develop portfolios with samples of their work (e.g. unit plans), samples of student work and personal reflections. At the end of three years, administrators currently recommend a teacher for renewal, recommend a teacher with reservations or do not recommend a teacher for renewal. In the NH System, administrators must review evidence in five domains (including measures of student achievement) and determine the teacher to be in one of four categories: highly effective, effective, needs improvement, or ineffective.

The Committee reported on the first year of using the supervision and evaluation procedures developed by consultant Kim Marshall. This system replaces the one formal classroom observation with 10 mini-observations. The summative process at the end of three years consists of teacher and administrator both completing the extensive Teacher Evaluation Rubric, on which the teacher is assessed on 60 indicators. The committee also shared the results of a survey of teachers and administrators who participated this year, which were overwhelmingly positive. The CEA will vote whether to continue the pilot this coming year at its meeting on April 9, 2013. The Negotiations Committee will provide the Superintendent feedback on the plan at its meeting on April 17, 2013.

The committee will continue to work on specific revisions to Appendix K, which could be presented to both negotiating teams when the next round of negotiations begins.

Christine Rath, Recorder