

Interscholastic Athletics

NYSPHSAA Update

- **Classification**
 - 2018-2019 BEDS Number - 274
 - For 2018-2019 Year (Potential to Change)
 - "B" Baseball, Basketball, Soccer, Softball
 - "C" Cross Country, Field Hockey, Football*, Volleyball
 - "D" Boys Lacrosse*
 - Changes to Calculation Formula
 - Old – Enrollment of 9, 10, & 11 from previous year on BEDS Day
 - New – Enrollment of 9, 10, & Average of 9/10 on Final Enrollment Number
 - June 2018 number for 2019-2020 (263)
- **Hazing Prevention Course**
- **No Increase in Dues**

Interscholastic Athletics

Section IX/MHAL Update

- **Officials Contract (≈\$2/year until 2021-2022)**
- **R.O.I.A. Increase in Dues (\$500 = 3.13%)**
- **Section IX No Increase in Dues**

Interscholastic Athletics

Championships

- **Mid-Hudson Athletic League (MHAL)**
 - Division Championship
 - Boys Cross Country
 - Boys Soccer
 - Girls Soccer
 - Conference Championship
 - Boys Soccer
 - Girls Soccer
- **Section IX**
 - Boys Soccer Class B Champions
 - Girls Soccer Class B Champions

Interscholastic Athletics
Championships
•States
•Girls Swimming
•Miya Vitale

Interscholastic Athletics
Academic Recognition
•Individual Awards - Fall
•42 All MHAL Academic & NYS Scholar Athlete
•NYS Scholar Athlete Team
•Girls Cross Country
•Field Hockey
•Boys Golf
•Girls Soccer
•Girls Swimming
•Volleyball

Interscholastic Athletics
2018-2019
•Maintain Current Combined Teams (Football & Lacrosse)
•Switch to Eight-Man Football
•Potential Field Hockey Merger

Interscholastic Athletics
Fall Participation (2017)

Sport Level	Female	Male	Total
Varsity	64	45	109
JV	35	19	54
Modified	35	36	71
Totals	134	100	234

Interscholastic Athletics
Winter Participation (2017-2018)

Sport Level	Female	Male	Total
Varsity	9	25	34
JV	7	12	19
Modified	12	14	26
Totals	28	51	79

Interscholastic Athletics
Spring Participation (2017)

Sport Level	Female	Male	Total
Varsity	49	82	131
JV	16	39	55
Modified	32	33	65
Totals	97	154	251

**Fall
Varsity**

	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18
Male	49	54	51	44	36	39	50	45	45
Female	57	47	43	57	62	62	57	51	64
Total	106	101	94	101	98	101	107	96	109

JV

	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18
Male	24	22	19	17	21	19	18	20	19
Female	39	41	38	29	27	43	41	34	35
Total	63	63	57	46	48	62	59	54	54

Modified

	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18
Male	43	34	36	34	38	33	42	39	36
Female	48	54	49	51	51	31	45	36	35
Total	91	88	85	85	89	64	87	75	71

**Winter
Varsity**

	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18
Male	15	14	13	23	12	24	18	27	25
Female	20	21	20	13	11	12	9	7	9
Total	35	35	33	36	23	36	27	34	34

JV

	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18
Male	14	14	12	14	13	14	16	15	12
Female	9	9	16	13	8	6	8	8	7
Total	23	23	28	27	21	20	24	23	19

Modified

	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18
Male	19	20	20	18	17	17	14	14	14
Female	19	13	16	17	21	16	19	14	12
Total	38	33	36	35	38	33	33	28	26

**Spring
Varsity**

	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18
Male	77	76	63	95	90	81	73	82	
Female	50	40	32	40	37	45	56	49	
Total	127	116	95	135	127	126	129	131	0

JV

	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18
Male	15	15	11	12	13	24	24	39	
Female	14	12	13	10	11	20	11	16	
Total	29	27	24	22	24	44	35	55	0

Modified

	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18
Male	35	37	52	45	33	22	28	33	
Female	20	37	32	34	27	26	29	32	
Total	55	74	84	79	60	48	57	65	0

Curriculum Committee Minutes

January 10, 2018

Attendees: Deirdre D'Albertis, Edwin Davenport, Jennifer Hammoud, Steve Jensen, Marvin Kreps, Joe Phelan, Jaclyn Savolainen, Laura Schulkind

College Connection Concurrent Enrollment

Dr. Davenport informed the committee that RHS is looking to expand its pilot College Connection Concurrent Enrollment program with Dutchess Community College (DCC). This program allows high school students to take college level courses during the regular school day, on the high school campus, taught by high school teachers who are also approved as adjunct faculty at DCC. Earned credits may be used towards a DCC degree and are frequently transferrable to other colleges, as well. The only cost to the district is for textbooks (which are selected by DCC). Our students would have full access to DCC resources, including academic support services, the writing center, and the library. We are looking to offer ENG 101 & 102 (each is a one semester course) to seniors, replacing one of our 40 week sections of English 12. They would be taught by Sarah Wheeler, who has been approved by DCC as an adjunct. We already have a concurrent class in Statistics.

The rationale is that about a third of our students attend DCC, with the balance attending a four year college. We offer two AP English classes but the overlap between DCC-bound students and AP students is almost nil. Adding these proposed classes would expand college level offerings to a wider segment of students. Also, some colleges won't accept credits from two high school AP classes in the same discipline but might accept these.

The plan is to add these classes to the course request list to see how many students would be interested. Interested juniors would sit for the Accuplacer test and would have to meet the minimum standards for the courses.

Questions asked in committee:

- Could community members take this class? No, these courses are intended for current high school students.
- Does DCC pay part of the instructor salary? No.
- Will AP courses still be on our course list? Yes.
- Is this separate from the bridge program? Yes, bridge students attend classes full time on the DCC campus and get both high school and college credit. Those students pay tuition to DCC and do not attend classes at RHS.

Jaclyn noted that many concurrent programs send their students on field trips to DCC for a library instruction session and tour of the campus.

After this discussion, Dr. Davenport left the meeting.

iMacs, PCs, Chromebooks and iPads

Steve Jensen conducted a review of prior research regarding the question of whether there is a significant favoring of Windows vs. Mac laptops in K-12 settings, and found nothing meaningfully different. The bottom line is that the two operating systems are neck-in-neck. Macs have a higher resale value, but that doesn't apply in our situation because we never sell our machines. (We have two laptop carts that are 8 years old and still usable and circulating.) In general, we feel that it is healthy to diversify platforms and teach the students to use both. Students should have as broad an experience as possible. However, there are definitely situations where an individual department would benefit more from one system than the other, and we can work with that.

Steve also reviewed the question of iPads vs. Chromebooks. He shared an article with 5 Pros and Cons of Chromebooks.

Pros:

1. Low price
2. Seamless Google ecosystem
3. Android apps available on your laptop
4. High speed performance
5. Long battery life

Cons

1. Plastic build is less durable than metal
2. Complete reliance on internet connectivity (they can't do much without it)
3. Some apps aren't available (only Google developed apps, not Adobe Creative Suite)
4. Printing problems (printers must be compatible with Google Cloud Printing or else you need to keep a desktop available as a workaround) - we have about 45 printers that were donated that are not compatible
5. There is almost no storage on the Chromebook (storage is Cloud based)

Also, Google doesn't support individual Chromebook models after 5 years. Chromebooks likely don't have the longevity that other laptops have, so we have to think about funding new machines relatively soon down the road. We don't want to buy throwaway machines but also don't want to buy "Cadillacs" and underutilize them. Joe noted that feedback from other schools indicates that Chromebooks aren't durable. Jaclyn said that there are 10 Chromebooks in the DCC library which haven't had to be replaced in at least 4 or 5 years, but they are locked down to a laptop counter so they don't have occasion to be moved, dropped, or abused.

Security issues are the same for Chromebooks, Macs and PCs; there isn't a product with a perfect filter.

In summary, most school Tech Directors feel Chromebooks work for some purposes but not others. The high school tech committee is cautious because of concern about applicability for the whole faculty and also questions whether we want to give HS students computers that do less than their phones.

Laura pointed out that two years ago, we had a 1-to-1 model proposal but we didn't have the money for it, and Steve agrees that this isn't a likelihood in the next 5 years, so we don't need to be thinking about a standardized platform for this purpose.

There seemed to be consensus in the room that we don't need to choose a single platform or machine type for the whole district or even a whole school. We need an understanding of what each department needs and wants, and how they would use it. Instead of meeting with just department chairs, it would help if Steve could meet with full departments to get a better idea of how they use technology on a daily basis. Steve agreed to make this a priority in the next few weeks. Joe noted that we want to make sure each department completely understands what each system will and won't do. Chromebooks may be fine for most English classes, but Journalism classes may need layout apps which are not available on Chromebooks. PCs or Chromebooks are probably fine for Math and Science, but Photography Art and Music may have special needs requiring Macs.

There was also interest in the room in looking at the needs of each school again, as we look at the needs of the high school. If, for example, the HS needs mostly word processing, perhaps some of their iMacs could be repurposed in CLS or BMS and replaced by Chromebooks. There is usually a waiting list for the laptop carts at both RHS and BMS, which means there is high demand. Maybe with declining enrollment at CLS, some of those machines could be moved to the other schools.

Each CLS and BMS teacher has been issued a laptop -- that is a situation which probably doesn't make sense for Chromebooks. Steve also shared a summary of how many and what types of computers are in each of the schools. CLS has slightly more total units, and BMS and RHS have about the same numbers, which means BMS has the greatest number, proportionally. We may need to consider a replacement plan longer than the optimal 5 year scenario.

Steve recently asked faculty what technology topics are of interest to them (for discussing at Superintendent's Conference). He was pleased to see the topics are now wide ranging and more detailed and informed than in the past.

Laura also asked if we could find out the status of Smartboards in each building. Steve said people are moving away from using projectors but that large screens (which can connect wirelessly to computers) like the one in this conference room are about \$1,000. Interactive screens are about \$4,000 but last 10 years. As more upper level students are collaborating and annotating with Google apps, there is likely less call for interactive screens like Smartboards. The Smart brand products we have are no longer being supported.

Steve will present to the full board the results of his talks with departments at the first meeting in February. Main questions to be answered: what are the department needs and what will the board need to assess as related to the budget?

Jennifer Hammoud came to the meeting to observe because a faculty member reached out to the Rhinebeck Science Foundation for a possible grant for Chromebooks and Jen wanted to find out the district plan. She left after this discussion.

Smart Schools Bond Act Funds

We had to replace our server out of the general fund before the Smart Bond money was available, so that frees up some funds for another use. The fiber optic connection project is about \$80,000 and that leaves about \$100,000. We are looking for long-term one-time purchases, not things that will need more money down the road.

Middle School Curriculum Update

Marvin sent requests to each of the BMS computer teachers and principal for an update on the implementation of the new computer science curriculum. The three courses meet every other day for 40 weeks. All classes seem on track to move through the full curriculum by year's end. Marvin will visit each class for their culminating unit and will schedule meetings with the teachers to see how they're doing. For next year, he may revisit the matter of curriculum sequencing and discuss best practices with the teachers.

Communications Committee Meeting Minutes

4.4.2

January 11, 2018

Attendees: Elizabeth Raum, Jaclyn Savolainen, Laura Schulkind, Joe Phelan, Steve Jensen

Facebook

Steve has started looking into what other school districts are doing regarding social media policy and disclaimers. NYSBA recommends not relying upon policy but using a disclaimer (placed on a side bar for easy viewing). The reasoning being that school districts have policies regarding bullying, code of conduct, etc. and that those policies pertain to the use of social media formats. Also, NYSBA's point about policy is that if it doesn't require Board action, you don't need it. Steve and Joe will go ahead with writing a disclaimer for our page and we can decide at a later date if a policy is indeed needed.

Steve has contacted various Tech Directors in our county regarding constructing a Facebook page and they recommend using a business page that allows for designated administrators (those who can monitor comments and create postings) and this allows for online/offline construction. Steve will create a sidebar for our disclaimer and guidelines of use, which will also link to the specific policies. Our FB page will not allow guests to make initial postings, a guest can comment on a post but only administrators can make posts. We also reserve the right to delete comments in our disclaimer.

Steve Dickens has been extremely helpful and generous with his time for the Dannon/CLS playground campaign in demonstrating how to use Hootsuite, which is a social media management platform that integrates your Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, etc. and prebuilds marketing campaigns.

Follow-up questions for FB:

Do we have anything that covers libel?

Does the Code of Conduct cover outsiders commenting on posts?

Can we call out particular people for good stuff (we cannot do that at Board Meetings)?

Budget Newsletter

Joe checked with Ed Davenport regarding the journalism class helping with design and that's not going to work, so Steve has started building the basic format. Both Whitney and Steve will attend an InDesign Training. FYI, printers no longer accept PDF files. Joe will start working on the letter from the Board.

Outreach for Long Range Planning

Joe will reach out to Claudia Cooley, Rhinebeck Chamber of Commerce, to discuss maximizing our relationship with businesses in our village and marketing our school district. Jaclyn is meeting with Mary Beth Cale. Laura did meet with new family, the recruiter they used has been laid off but still has some leads, will pursue.

Next meeting: February 8, 2018

Respectfully submitted: Elizabeth Raum

4.4.3

Audit Committee Minutes

January 16, 2018

Attendees: Diane Lyons, Deirdre d'Albertis, Steve Jenkins, Christine Natoli, Tom Burnell
Absent Lisa Rosenthal

The committee received the 5 proposals submitted from audit companies for performing our annual external audits. We reviewed the 5 proposals, discussed the differences, and reviewed the pricing.

We decided to bring back 4 of the 5 vendors for interviews. The interviews will try and be scheduled for Jan 29 or Feb 12.

We reviewed the Corrective Action Plan based on last year's External Audit findings. There were 3 recommendations to address.

1. The accounting software, INFOMATIC, will not be supported past Jan 2020. The district has been reviewing alternatives and a fix has been in progress and on schedule for replacement, and costs budgeted.
2. The special revenue fund balance deficit of \$129,352 needs to be addressed. The recommendation will be do pay this down over the next 10 years.
3. GASB 75 - This unfunded mandate is to estimate the future expense of healthcare for all employees through retirement. The current GASB 45 only estimated the cost of employees close to retirement. This unfunded mandate is required and it will cost the district an additional \$8,000 every other year. As a consequence, the voluntary internal audit that the district performs could be impacted due to this additional mandate's cost if the district's audit costs are kept the same

Next meeting will be set to interview the 4 audit vendors

Respectfully submitted by Steve Jenkins