

Sample Client Services Overview

Lawrence Hall of Science

This overview represents the services for one client of the professional learning partner.

Services Overview

| Curriculum or Content Area (adoption) | n/a | |
|---|---|--|
| Type of Professional Learning (Adoption, Launch, Ongoing for Teachers, <i>or</i> System Design and Leadership Support) | System Design and Leadership Support | |
| Number of educators serviced | ☐ 1 - 50 ☐ 51 - 100 | ☐ 101 - 500 ☐ 501 - 1000 ☐ 1000+ |
| Audience (select all that apply) | ☐ Teachers☐ School Leaders | Instructional CoachesDistrict Leaders |
| District Type | Traditional District Charter Suburban Greater than 20% of English language learners Greater than 20% students with disability | Private Parochial Rural Greater than 60% of economically disadvantaged students Greater than 80% students of |





| | | color |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| District Size | Fewer than 2,500 students 2,500 to 10,000 students 10,001 - 50,000 students | 50,001 - 100,000 studentsMore than 100,001 students |
| Delivery Format | ☐ Virtual☐ In-person☐ Hybrid | |
| Total Cost Range ¹ | Less than \$50,000 \$50,000 - \$100,000 \$100,001 - \$500,000 | \$500,001 - \$1,000,000 \$1,000,000+ |

Services narrative

What were the goals of the professional learning? How did you work with the school or system to determine the goals and progress monitor for them throughout the engagement? (Limit 200 words)

The Lawrence Hall of Science partnered and worked in consultation with a state-level elementary science supervisor to design and implement a project was to elevate the prioritization and resourcing of elementary science education in service of learning experiences where content areas are coherently and authentically integrated in mutually supportive ways (including how HQIM implementation supports content integration).

RE

¹ Includes any travel related expenses, etc.



The goals for each strand were tailored for the target audience, with the common aim of supporting elementary teachers and leaders to build their individual and systems-level capacities to support equity-driven, high-quality content integration anchored in science.

- (1) Two Teacher Cadres, comprised of teachers across the state
- (2) Two Leader Cadres, comprised of instructional and systems-level leaders across the state
- (3) Consulting and Coaching, provided to the state science supervisor for the purpose of statewide strategy coherence and coordination.

Progress monitoring included regular, ongoing meetings with the state science supervisor; convenings with content integration specialist experts; and quarterly meetings with external evaluators. Survey data collected by external evaluators was collected after each professional learning session and used for short- and long-term monitoring of participant learning, engagement, needs, intentionality, and changes in practice, as well as to make adjustments to support services.

How was this professional learning customized to meet the educators' needs? How were facilitators prepared to meet the needs of participants? (Limit 200 words)

The state-level science supervisor initially collected data about participants' district demographics as well as other information such as current status of science implementation and use of various science and other subject instructional materials, including but not limited to HQIM. This data plus the ongoing survey data from the external evaluation partner allowed the Lawrence Hall of Science to customize its offerings by tailoring goals and ongoing learning activities to the individuals in the Teacher Cadres and Leader Cadres. Across both cadres, professional learning was customized to capitalize on the assets of





participants, including but not limited to grade level groupings and planning, grade span conversation and collaboration, collecting and reflecting on data (e.g., student data, empathy interview data), etc. For example in the Leader Cadres, participants were asked to identify an individual problem of practice and to engage in systems conditions mapping around their problems, and engage in empathy interview data collection to better understand their contexts. Participants were also grouped within educational service district regions to engage in regional conversations, job alike groups to encourage job alike/shared identities collaboration, and random groupings to support ongoing connectivity of the cadre cohort.

Describe the delivery structures employed and how often participants were able to participate in professional learning over the length of the engagement. (Limit 200 words)

Participants engaged in remote professional learning in both the teacher cadre sessions and the leader cadre sessions. Structures for inclusive and engaged participation were employed in each meeting to create time for interactive work and meaning-making with facilitation, content delivery and resources interspersed throughout. This included using chat features and having whole-group and small-group conversations supported by digital tools (Eg. google doc, jamboards, discussion boards such as Padlet, etc.) to build relationships, capture participant contributions, and support reflection and application. Breakout group conversations took place with intentionally— assigned groupings such as job-alike, grade-band, regional, and randomized groups to allow for participants to both form connections with one another and to build on one another's ideas about similar problems of practice.

In order to provide an ongoing structure for continuous learning, the cadres were designed so participants met over a series of approximately 13 engagements. A learning management system, Canvas, was used





for all participants to view session recordings, complete asynchronous work, engage in discussion boards, and access resources. In addition, in order to ensure a coherent experience for participants, we established structures such as review cycles with our content-integration specialist / expert partners who facilitated additional sessions in the series.

How did the professional learning build on previous work or set the foundation for additional professional learning? (Limit 200 words)

This project built on previous work by the state-level science supervisor who worked to systematically deepen her knowledge around content integration anchored in science and the national leaders in the field who could support her. In 2020, she had previously engaged in continuous improvement cycle design around barriers to "time for elementary science" and mapped key drivers for support time for elementary science instruction that informed her overall strategy for supporting her content integration strategy.

The aim of this project was to continue to build awareness and capacity at the statewide level and at various levels of the state education system—regionally (education service districts), at the district level, and among teams of teachers as well as individual teachers. During this Lawrence Hall of Science partnership and cadres effort, the state-level entity is coalescing around content integration through cross-disciplinary collaborations and other efforts. The state level entity plans to support the individuals and teams from these cohorts to continue the work at the conclusion of the 18-month project term through ongoing cadre support into future years, and an annual convening for leaders and teachers to share, connect, and learn from each other.

