

Instructional Leadership Team Meeting Minutes

“The purpose of this team is to develop a five year plan that addresses the gaps between vision and reality in the areas of curriculum, instruction, and assessment with corresponding action items, person(s) responsible, expected outcomes and products, and projected dates of completion.”

MONDAY November 7, 2016

3:30 – 5:00

MEMBERS:

Committee	
Administrators	Teachers
✓ Linda Christofori	✓ Ali Anderson (SRS)
✓ Amy Fouracre	✓ Lauri Aliengena (PMS)
✓ Kim Saso	✓ Julie Dolan (WS)
✓ Noell Somers	✓ Robin Gunn (Special Education)
✓ Jenny Sullivan	✓ Emma Hynes (PMS)
Joe Turmel	✓ Maryanne Margiotta (SRS)
✓ Jen Willard	✓ Michelle Meczywor (ELL)
	✓ Terry Portenstein (PMS)
	✓ Kasondra Sporbort (GVS)
	✓ Emily Tampone (WS)
	✓ Melissa Trzasko (SRS)
School Committee	Instructional Coaches
Kelly Clendenin - SC	✓ Rachel Barr, District Literacy Coach
Pam Petschke – SC	✓ Beth Grady, District STEM Coach
Parent Representative	
✓ Dianne Houle	

Agenda:

- Review of our vision of our graduates, and meeting norms
- Conditions of School Effectiveness Self-Assessment- tabled until next meeting
- Student Engagement (Power Elements I.A.2, and I.A.4)
 - The team watched a video (Ramsey Mussallam: 3 Rules to Spark Learning) and read an article (“Is Your Lesson a Grecian Urn?”) related to student engagement, then processed their thinking using the Golden Line Protocol. The group then shared their thoughts on what engagement “is” and “is not”. Below are some guidelines proposed by the group:

Student Engagement is...	Student Engagement is not...
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Students talking with each other ○ Cultivating curiosity ○ Understanding what they are learning and explain importance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Attentive /Well behaved ○ Low depth of knowledge/ memorization ○ Dissemination of information

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Teacher as facilitator of inquiry and discovery ◦ Messy ◦ Teacher not the most obvious person in the room ◦ Students not having a sense of time ◦ Feel the thinking and processing of students/ internal dialogue ◦ Purposeful learning ◦ Differentiation- small groups doing different things/collaboration/ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Teacher inflexibility ◦ Regurgitation ◦ Call- respond
---	---

The discussion was productive, but our goal of creating a “look for” list for proficient practice was not completed. The group agreed to continue this discussion at our next meeting.

- HOMEWORK: Identify one research-based best practice/strategy that improves student engagement to share at our next meeting

Next Meeting: Monday, December 5

Topic: Continued discourse around student engagement and student-centered instruction, share student engagement strategies