



BLOOMFIELD BOARD OF EDUCATION - CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MEETING

Curriculum Committee Meeting AT Tuesday, April 28, 2015

Bloomfield Board of Education 1133 Blue Hills Avenue Board Room, 1133 Blue Hills Avenue ,  
Bloomfield, CT 06002

1. Establishment of a Quorum and Call to Order
2. Consent Agenda
  - A. Approval of Minutes - Curriculum Committee - March 31, 2015 2  
M. Walters
3. New Business
  - A. 2015 Annual Climate and Satisfaction Survey Results
  - B. Silver
4. Adjournment



BLOOMFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS – CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MEETING  
Tuesday, March 31, 2015, 6:30 p.m.  
Bloomfield Board of Education  
1133 Blue Hills Avenue  
Board Room

**ATTENDANCE:** M. Walters, Chair Present  
H. Frydman Present  
R. Ike Present

**ALSO PRESENT:** J. Thompson Q. Johnson L. Mara  
D. Harris W. Guzman S. McCann  
M. Williams S. Braun S. Simpson  
W. Joslyn E. Stoltz B. Silver

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

M.R. Walters called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. The roll was called and a quorum was present.

### 2. CONSENT AGENDA

#### 2. A. Approval of Minutes – Curriculum Committee Meeting – October 28, 2014

A motion was made by R. Ike and seconded by H. Frydman for the Curriculum Committee to approve the meeting minutes for October 28, 2014 as presented.

The motion was passed unanimously.

### 3. NEW BUSINESS

#### 3. A. Instructional Rounds

Dr. Ellen Stoltz, Chief Academic Officer distributed a copy of the Power Point presentation on Instructional Rounds. Dr. Stoltz stated that instructional rounds are a key lever of practice that will change our district.

The purpose, process and payoff are noted on page 2 of the presentation document. The purpose is to inform the curriculum committee. The process will be review the instructional core and to describe the team learning approach. The payoff of the presentation will be to link instructional and organizational improvements to changes in adult practices.

Instructional Rounds are not used to evaluate teachers and is not used to implement a classroom checklist. Instructional Rounds are focused on teaching, not the teacher, and are focused on patterns of practice.

The current challenge is the variability across the classrooms, the expectation to increase rigor and inconsistent definition of terms. The next level of work is to build a network of educators focusing practices for improvement.



Dr. Ellen Stoltz shared a comparative table on page 5 of the presentation. She compared medical rounds of attending doctors to instructional rounds. Specifically she noted an emerging standard of practice, encouraging dialogue among colleagues, understanding of terminology and creating structures used to describe and analyze observations.

The tool is used to observe the problem of instructional practice. Even when defining terms such as curriculum, you will likely receive 30 different answers from 30 different people. This model helps us to understand terms and practices.

The definition of instructional core was outlined on page 6 of the presentation. The Instructional Core describes what the teacher is doing and saying, what a student is doing and what is the task. The first premise illustrates, “if you don’t see it, it is not there”. The task predicts performance and rigor is defined by the Cognitive Rigor Matrix.

A sample of the Cognitive Rigor Matrix was distributed.

A Problem of Practice is identified by data, examining the strengths and weaknesses at the school level and determining what is the result. The best practice is evidence based. At Carmen Arace they have continued this practice by creating in-house instructional rounds, professional development, vertical teaming and engaging students.

D. Harris inquired how teachers are reacting to this new practice. Dr. Stoltz commented that this is an innovative practice and new to the district. The training to prepare the teams has been outstanding. In addition, the responses from the certified staff have been very receptive and positive.

It was inquired how Instructional Rounds relates to Common Core. Dr. Stoltz replied that Instructional Rounds provide meaningful and purposeful information about what common core looks like in classroom. It demonstrates what practices are being used to implement the standards and how students are engaging. These Instructional Rounds method and Common Core Standards are aligned.

L. Mara inquired if principals are focusing on individual schools. Dr. Stoltz stated that the Schools Accountability Plans are directly aligned to Instructional Rounds because the problem of practice feeds into performance data. The Instructional Rounds helps us to look at the school accountability plans and comprehend our goals. She further stated, that if we increase rigor, students will be engaged and student performance will increase.

M. Williams stated this method is a similar process to the one he uses in his profession. How do you ensure that these rounds are kept separate from the evaluation process? Dr. Stoltz replied that Instructional Rounds does not look at individual teachers but district teacher practices. Further, the team does not have an evaluative role. The descriptive data focuses on problem of practice and has four distinct domains. Further, how the findings are reported varies from the evaluation process. This is not about “getting” teachers, but about improving the problem of practice, system-wide.



**4. ADJOURNMENT**

At 7:03 p.m., a motion was made by R. Ike and seconded by H. Frydman to adjourn.

The motion passed unanimously.

---

M. Walters, Chair