

Fairfield Curriculum Leadership Structure 2012-2013

Fairfield currently has 3 different levels of curriculum leadership serving 14 program areas. A chart detailing the curriculum hierarchy in the district has been developed and outlines the various positions currently held in the district, the grade levels that each position is responsible for, and the percentage of time devoted to coordinating. Major role responsibilities are detailed below.

Category 1 – Curriculum Leaders report directly to the Director of Elementary Education (PK – 5) and the Director of Secondary Education (6 - 12). These are full-time administrative positions and, in collaboration with the building administrators; they supervise and evaluate 1st and 2nd year teachers in their departments. They are also primarily responsible to work in collaboration with building leaders and teachers to meet the varied needs of these core curriculum departments. Other major responsibilities include developing and managing program budgets, developing and revising curriculum and assessments, providing professional development, recruiting and interviewing new teachers, assisting teachers with pedagogy, providing information to parents and responding to their questions and concerns regarding the curriculum and supporting high achievement for all students with a focus on best practices and curriculum based assessments along with CMT, CAPT, SAT and AP assessments. The Curriculum Leaders meet regularly with their respective teachers departments to conduct departmental business.

Category 2 – Curriculum Coordinators are part-time teachers with release time to perform their coordinator duties. The chart indicates the percentage of each coordinator's FTE that is spent coordinating. These positions are evaluated by their building administrator and they do not supervise or evaluate teachers. Their overall responsibility is to insure smooth operation of each of their departments. They work closely with the Director of Elementary Education (PK – 5) and the Director of Secondary Education (6 - 12) in developing and revising curriculum, developing and managing their program budgets, providing professional development, ordering materials and resources, assisting teachers and coordinating programs for the community, when appropriate, (i.e. concerts, art shows, health fairs etc.). They also provide information to parents and respond to their questions and concerns regarding the curriculum. These coordinators meet monthly with their respective K-12 or level specific departments to conduct departmental business.

Category 3 – Department Liaisons are full-time teachers with no release time. They receive a stipend for the added responsibilities associated with this position. Liaisons are supervised and evaluated by their building administrator, but they work closely with the Central Office administrators in developing and revising curriculum, developing their program implementation budgets each year, purchasing materials, providing opportunities for professional development and meeting with their respective departments to conduct departmental business.

Curriculum Leadership Structure 2011-2012

Central Office

(PK – 5) Anna Cutaia- Leonard, Director of Elementary Education
(6 – 12) Margaret Boice, Director of Secondary Education

Curriculum Leaders (full time administrators)

Mike Rafferty	Language Arts	1.0	Pre K - 5
Walter Wakeman	Math / Science	1.0	Pre K - 5
Paul Rasmussen	Math	1.0	6 - 12
Patrice Faggella	Science	1.0	6 - 12
John Chiappetta	English / Language Arts	1.0	6 - 12
Jeffrey Burt	Social Studies	1.0	6 - 12

Curriculum Coordinators (part time teacher / part time coordinator)

Barbara Pollock	Art	.4	K - 12
Dave Abraham	Physical Education	.6	K - 12
Lori Mediate	Health	.4	K - 12
Donna Schmardel	Music	.6	K - 12
Eileen Frankel	World Language	.4	9 - 12
Laura Williams	World Language	.2	4 - 8
Pat Flynn	Continuing Education	.6	Adult Ed

Department Liaisons (full time teachers with additional stipend)

Michelle Flashman	Family Consumer Science	6 - 8
Nancy Malafatopoulos	Family Consumer Science	9 - 12
Kris Samuelson	Industrial Tech. Ed.	7 - 12
Carl Dioguardi	Business	9 - 12
Dorna Persson	Library Media	K - 5
Nicki Callahan	Library Media	6 – 12
Ileana Scerbo	ELL	K – 12
Sheila Ferrara	Social Studies	K - 5

Operational Audit Of Fairfield Public Schools

December 14, 2010



www.PrismaticServices.com

*Audit Excerpt in Response to Board Questions re: Budget for 2013-2014
Central Office Staff and Curriculum Leaders (3.2 through 3.10)*

3.2 STAFFING

An effective way of viewing the efficiency of a school system is by benchmarking total staffing ratios. The intent of an efficient school system is to provide as much direct classroom instruction to students as possible, while keeping the overall ratios of total staff to students within an acceptable range. The level of effectiveness in reaching this goal can be determined, in a large part, by comparing the percentages of total staff and instructional staff in the system of interest to other peer school systems. A school system compares favorably by exhibiting a higher percentage of instructional staff and a lower percentage of overall staff.

FINDING 3-8

Although it is not universal perception in FPS, the central office administrative team has remained relatively small, even as student numbers have increased.

As shown in Exhibit 3-3, significant percentages of those who responded to the Prismatic staff survey believe that the central office organizational structure is efficient and that district administrators provide quality services to schools.

**Exhibit 3-3
Prismatic Employee Survey Resulted Related to Central Office**

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know/No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The central office organizational structure is efficient.	4%	31%	31%	22%	11%
District administrators provide quality service to schools.	7%	44%	27%	17%	6%

Source: Prismatic Survey, 2010.

Nevertheless, many comments provided by staff in the open-ended section of the survey reflected a perception that the FPS central office is over-staffed with administrators. When asked for ideas to improve efficiency and effectiveness, staff comments regarding administration included a perception that the district could realize significant savings by eliminating most central office staffing.

Nationally, public perceptions of administrative staffing numbers generally mirror the concerns of some FPS staff regarding top-heavy central administrations. However, data regarding changes in enrollment and administrative staff in FPS tell a different story. Exhibit 3-4 compares the number of administrator positions at the central office and schools of FPS between 2005-06 and 2009-10. It shows that, while student enrollment increased by 837, the number of central office administrators increased by 0.5. Considering the initial small number of central office administrators, this is essentially flat. School administrator numbers remained consistent through all those years. The number of positions of Directors, Supervisors, and Managers increased even less, showing a net gain of 0.4 FTE.

**Exhibit 3-4
Comparison of Enrollment to Administrative Staff Positions
2005-06 through 2009-10**

Enrollment and Type of Position	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	Change	Percent
Enrollment	9,195	9,424	9,709	9,880	10,032	837	9.1%
School Administration Staff	38.8	38.8	38.8	38.8	38.8	0.0	0.0%
Central Administration Staff	5.0	5.0	6.0	6.0	5.5	0.5	10.0%
Director/Supervisor/Manager	5.5	5.5	5.4	5.9	5.9	0.4	7.3%
Total Number of Administrators	49.3	49.3	50.2	50.7	50.2	.9	1.8%

Source: Fairfield's final summary statement by object, 2005-06 through 2009-10 and enrollment from budget document.

Exhibit 3-5 compares the number of administrator positions at the central office of FPS and its peers for the 2009-2010 school year. It should be noted that caution must be exercised in examining these positions. Districts often term similar positions by different names. Prismatic has attempted to identify positions that appear to be similar in responsibility. For a complete comparison, job descriptions would need to be examined for positions in each district.

Nevertheless, the data presented show that FPS is similar in central office to that of its peers.

Exhibit 3-5
Comparison of Enrollment to Administrative Staff Positions**
Fairfield Public Schools and Peer Districts

Position Title	Fairfield	Greenwich	Norwalk	Stamford	Trumbull	West Hartford	Peer Average
Deputy Superintendent	0.45	1	0	1	0	0	0.4
Assistant Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer	1	1	2	2	1	2	1.5
Executive Director	0	0	0	1	0	1	0.3
Director	5	6	6	11	1	5	5.7
Assistant Director	0	0	2	3	0	1	1.0
Coordinator, Including Special Education	8	15	6	1	4	5	6.3
Other Curriculum Position/Teachers on Special Assignments	5.9	1.5	0	12	4	5	4.7
Specialist, Program Manager or Administrator	0	5	3	4	3	3	3.0
Communications	0	0	1	2	0	0	0.5
TOTAL FTE	20.4	29.5	20.0	35.0	13.0	22.0	23.3

Source: Created by Prismatic Services, October 2010 from organization charts, emails, and conversations with peer district staff.

* Teacher on Special Assignment

** Titles vary so much from district to district that an attempt was made to identify positions at similar levels on the organizational chart

COMMENDATION

Fairfield Public Schools has only minimally increased its administrative staff, and at rates that compare favorably to the increase in student enrollment over the past five years.

The proposed staffing additions in Finding 3-2 (a net gain of 2.55 FTE central office) would still be within the comparable range of the peer districts.

FINDING 3-9

Current central office curriculum staffing is not sufficient to support curricular development and implementation in FPS schools.

The state of Connecticut does not provide curriculum documents to its school districts, so districts must develop documents and processes themselves. Currently, FPS has two full-time

Curriculum Leaders for grades K-5 at the central office, one in Math/Science, and one in Language Arts. The district has Curriculum Leader positions for grades 6-12, one each for Science, English/Language Arts, and Math. The Math Curriculum Leader position for secondary schools was vacant at the time of the on-site visit.

One additional Curriculum Leader wears two hats, serving 6-12 for Social Studies and K-12 for Library Media/Technology. Many staff noted that adding responsibility for technology to that position has made a tremendous stride toward beginning to integrate technology and instruction. It has also helped bring instruction into decisions about technology in the district.

RECOMMENDATION

Improve the organizational structure for curricular leadership.

Prismatic recommends that the district:

- * divide the Social Studies/Library Media/Technology Curriculum responsibilities;
- * add an additional curriculum leader position for Social Studies;
- * fill the vacancy for 6-12 Mathematics; and
- * assign a Technology/Media Curriculum Leader to the Technology Department.

The need for instruction and technology to be more closely tied together in FPS was a primary concern expressed at multiple levels during the review. Considering how great the needs of FPS are in the area of technology, the Technology/Library Media position needs to be made a full-time curriculum leader position, playing a vastly expanded role in district planning and decision-making regarding instructional technology. All building techs supporting technology in the schools should report to the Curriculum Leader for Library Media/Technology.

FISCAL IMPACT

The budget currently contains funding for the Math Curriculum Leader. The addition of a new Curriculum Leader to take over the Social Studies content area would cost the district the average salary of administrators, including benefits, for a total of \$155,730.

Recommendation	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Add a Curriculum Leader for Social Studies	(\$155,730)	(\$155,730)	(\$155,730)	(\$155,730)	(\$155,730)