
From: dmoore@nstu.ca
Sent: Sunday, March 04, 2018 7:10 PM
To: Office of the Legislative Counsel
Subject: Bill 72 Law Amendments submission

I have been a teacher for the past 14 years. For the past two years I have been studying culturally responsive pedagogy as part of a cohort of teachers and instructional leaders from Chignecto-Central Regional School Board, who has made culturally responsive pedagogy its number one priority. This is something that has made me very proud to be a teacher in CCRSB. Our cohort is made up of classroom teachers from elementary, middle, and secondary levels, principals, student services workers, and family of school supervisors. Many of us are now on the CCRSB Culturally Responsive Lead Team.

I tell you this to give you an example of what educational leadership should look like in the 21st century. It is not a conventional model that is "characterized by dependency, hierarchy, and professional isolation" as Glickman et al say in their 2010 book, *SuperVision for Successful Schools*. Rather, it is a collegial model that is, as Glickman et al say, "characterized by purposeful adult interactions about improving schoolwide teaching and learning."

You have likely already heard about concerns from teachers that removing principals from teachers will damage the collegial model. You may have misunderstood this to mean a congenial, friendly relationship. That is not what is meant by a collegial model. In a collegial model of education, educational personnel are organized so that instructional leadership can be distributed among formally designated instructional leaders such as principals, vice-principals, department heads, mentors, and coaches, as well as less formal leaders. This can include, for example, teachers who are conducting action research in their schools, or creating authentic professional learning communities. As Joyce and Calhoun say in their 2010 book, *Models of Professional Development: A Celebration of Educators*, "in the higher-achieving schools, governance was broader and more integrative-decision making was shared" and "teachers and principals were organized to work together" collaboratively, rather than in a hierarchical system.

I should note that what I am sharing with you is information I have been learning as part of my graduate studies. I am currently enrolled in a course on professional development and supervision. It has been challenging to be learning about how a collegial model of education where principals act as instructional leaders-sharing school leadership with teachers on their teams-has contrasted with what the government is proposing to do by further enshrining a managerial mindset of principals in our education system. It flies in the face of what we are learning is best for our students.

One of the changes proposed to the Teachers' Collective Bargaining Agreement is listed as:

"5 (f) adding immediately after clause (i) the following clause:

"(ia) "manager" means a teacher as defined in the Education Act who

"(i) is employed by an education entity or the Minister of Education and Early Childhood Development, and

"(ii) holds, including in an acting capacity, a position with greater supervisory responsibility than a department head, including a position as regional executive director of education, superintendent of schools, director, subsystem supervisor, co-ordinator, principal or vice-principal,"

This change exemplifies the concern many people who have studied educational supervision have. The word "manager" is a relic of Industrial Age modes of production that has no place in a 21st century education system. It carries with it a conventional form of supervision. That is to say, "Throughout most of its history supervision has operated from within a conventional paradigm attempting to control teachers' instructional behaviors" (Nolan & Hoover, 2010; Sullivan & Glanz, 2009). This is of particular and acute concern because of the teacher shortage crisis we are now experiencing in Nova Scotia, as "The flight from education of both new and experienced educators is due, in part, to the external control of teachers' work lives" (Lavié, 2006).

We are now 18 years into the 21st century, and here we are moving backwards, when our students need us to progress. Supervision in a 21st century education system is distributed and shared among all members of an instructional team. As Glickman et al say, it is "the province of teachers as well as formally designated supervisors" and there is a "focus on teacher growth rather than teacher compliance" (2010).

For those of you who are not as familiar with how a modern education system works, you are probably wondering why, in clear terms, a conventional model with principals as managers is inadequate to address modern needs. Again I turn to Glickman, who says (2010):

"Why should teachers participate in instructional leadership? Why not just let supervisors supervise and teachers teach?" The collegial model:

1. "1. Promotes democratic schools and democratic education
2. "2. Allows the school to take advantage of teacher experience and expertise
3. "3. Helps the school to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers
4. "4. Increases the likelihood that teachers will accept curriculum and instructional innovations, since teachers are involved in designing the innovations
5. "5. Promotes a more professional work environment"

Your government has said that it wishes to empower school communities by giving money to School Advisory Councils, yet at the same time Bill 72 will prevent the democratization of those same school communities.

We should be doing everything we can to recruit and maintain teachers here, rather than losing them to other jurisdictions and other careers, but instead this legislation will further aggravate the situation.

Your government has embarked on a comprehensive curriculum renewal that includes embedding Treaty Education and culturally responsive pedagogy throughout every grade level and every subject area. I know, because I am currently working on two of the teams involved. This has been good, important work, with teachers engaged throughout the

process as educational leaders. This legislation creates the kind of conditions that make it more difficult to implement curriculum change.

I should note that I have spent five weekends so far this year working at the Department of Education on the new curriculum because there are no substitute teachers to release us during the work week, to further illustrate the teacher shortage crisis we are experiencing.

In an ideal world, Bill 72 would not do anything that would create any sort of divide between teachers and principal teachers. That means not removing them from the union to which they have belonged for over 120 years. At a bare minimum, I ask you to mitigate the damage that Bill 72 will do to achieving a 21st century education system by removing any managerial language from it, including, but not exclusive to Section 5 of the Teachers' Collective Bargaining Agreement, and Sections 5, 9, 11, 20, 30, 42, 44, 47, and 50 of the Education Act.

Drew Moore

Teacher
VP, Communications and Public Relations
Colchester East Hants Local, NSTU
(902) 814-2692
@CEHLocal