

**RHINEBECK CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT  
COMPREHENSIVE DISTRICT EDUCATION PLAN (CDEP)  
COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES  
Wednesday, February 6, 2013  
11:30 a.m. - 2:30 p.m.**

**Members Present**

Victor Britton  
Jackie Dedrick  
Marvin Kreps  
Joe Phelan

Deirdre Burns  
John Kemnitzer  
Diane Linenbroker  
Susan Van Vlack

Ed Davenport  
Brett King  
Erin O'Brien  
Richard Zipp

**Members Absent**

Bobbie Bie  
Cynthia Ping

Chantal Collins  
Shaun Ramsey

Bonnie Murphy  
Pat Sexton

---

The meeting began with review of the proposed agenda. The proposed agenda is as follows:

- Welcome and discussion of agenda
- Comprehensive District Education Plan
  - Vertical Teams/School Based Inquiry Teams
  - Goal Setting/Monitoring
  - Revising the Comprehensive Plan
  - State Education Department Accountability Plan and New Planning Process
- NWEA Measures of Academic Progress
- Teachscape
- Student Learning Objectives Training and Writing
- APPR Next Steps
- Common Core Learning Standards Curriculum Projects
- Professional Development Planning
- CELT Technology Capacity Review
- Other????

---

Mr. Kreps went over the agenda items and asked for additional input from members of the committee.

**CDEP**

Mr. Kreps started the discussion by speaking to the amount of accountability for schools. School districts will be held accountable to the new college and career aspirational goals (proficiency in HS Math 75% and HS English 80%). Similarly to the regulations of NCLB in 2001 looking for full proficiency by the 2013-14 school year, the state will be looking for the new aspirational goals to be met by school districts. The question is whether our current structure will meet our needs. We need to make some decisions:

- Do we re-create the plan and update it?
- Do we keep the Vertical Teams (VT) or should we go to School Based Inquiry Teams (SBIT)?
- If we go with SBIT, should the teachers involved be directly responsible for curriculum governance?
- If we decide to keep the VT, we would need to task them with real tasks like aligning curriculum to the common core, deal with issues with core outcomes, baseline metrics against outcomes. We will need to be crystal clear on what the expectations are for courses.

Mr. Kreps explained that the Vertical Teams were borne as a way to get a K-12 vertical approach to curriculum governance. At the time, there was a sense that we were disconnected; a lot of judgment was to be made to see what was going to be in what grade level; and there was not much direction from the state. The Vertical Teams served the district well at the time but now things are different with the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS). Mr. Zipp added that it seems that the CCLS has done the work of the Vertical Teams for us, they have laid out the

**RHINEBECK CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT**  
**COMPREHENSIVE DISTRICT EDUCATION PLAN (CDEP)**  
**COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**  
**Wednesday, February 6, 2013**  
**11:30 a.m. - 2:30 p.m.**

curriculum. Now, a building level approach seems to be a better way to make informed decisions for that building. Mr. King added that it's about taking the information/data we have and have the teachers who it affects be part of the process. We need each teacher to be part of the process because they all have a stake in the game. The committee discussed the possibility of work groups where every teacher is in a workgroup. We need everyone to look at the data and work together to see how curriculum is being taught at each grade level (or grade band).

The committee discussed the possibility of having one SBIT for each building and one VT for the district. We would have curriculum governance about student achievement, professional development, curriculum writing, conducting data analysis at each site and then a K-12 governance team that would meet to overview all three buildings. This configuration seems to meet the need to meet by building and vertically.

Mr. Phelan voiced concern as to whether the system can support that many teachers working on that many committees? Last year, people felt that it would be difficult to do both; is that still the feeling? In a perfect world, it would make sense to operate both but do we have the capacity to do that? There is purpose served by both functions, and not everybody wants to give one up over the other but it was a concern from people on the Vertical Teams last year.

Mr. Kreps stated that the Vertical Team process has been difficult to manage in the past particularly for teachers because they are being pulled out of classrooms for meetings. Their attendance has been challenging, especially at the high school level. Now, it will be even more challenging for elementary and middle school teachers.

The committee discussed the current structure for teachers to meet during common prep times. At the elementary level, grade level teachers have a common lunch time and prep time. Many times, it is a challenge for grade levels to complete tasks during their prep time because the time is short due to the time it takes for teachers to drop off and pick up students. Usually, a task will take several weeks in order to complete. On their own time, many grade levels meet once a week during their lunch or after school. Once a month, grade levels meet with the principal. At the middle school, the teams are already there and working great but there is no time for departments to meet as well as special area teachers. At the high school, it is easier because it is a department structure.

There is so much to be done that we are always behind. The committee discussed the possibility of using Superintendent Conference Days (SCD) and half days more thoughtfully across all buildings. Some members felt that there is a lot of room to restructure the SCDs feeling that many of those days lack density and planning. Much of the time is spent on information download scheduled for 2-3 hours when a short 15-20 minutes will do.

Mr. Phelan explained that state regulations give the district the ability to use 4 SCD (full days) and take 4 half days per semester for staff development activities or conferences (like parent-teacher conferences). The district is looking to calendar more of those half days. There were some questions as to whether the state would permit breaking down the full day SCD into half-days. Mr. Phelan will look into the regulation to see if it can be done. Some discussion on the issues that could arise from splitting the full SCD into halves would be increasing the amount of days students attend school, and how will the parents feel.

The committee discussed the work that the teams would be doing. Mr. Kreps stated that although our students do well on average, the new accountability standards may change that. We need to be sure our students are making the progress they need to be college and career ready. The committee discussed the timing of the work to be done by the teams. Some ideas were before or after SLO writing; or around the 5- or 10-week marks of the school year; or after MAPs testing which may be natural places to examine data.

**RHINEBECK CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT  
COMPREHENSIVE DISTRICT EDUCATION PLAN (CDEP)  
COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES  
Wednesday, February 6, 2013  
11:30 a.m. - 2:30 p.m.**

The consensus seems to be the idea of a school based team at each building meeting with some frequency with one vertical team which is district based. The vertical team would not meet as often. Some members of the committee expressed the need to have guidelines with what the expectations will be for the teams. Mr. Kreps will discuss this item with the administrators and give them the expectations to bring to their individual buildings.

**NWEA UPDATE**

Mr. Kreps shared that the district has created the Class Roster file which is currently being validated by NWEA. Our timeline is to administer the first round of assessments the last two weeks in February. In preparation for the testing, the NWEA met with approximately 20 teachers and did an overview on how to administer the MAPs and went over the reports. Teachers will be able to log in to the website to get the scores on their students. We expect to get training on how to use the data soon. In the elementary school, testing will be two half-hour blocks for ELA and Math each. In the upper grades, it will be three 1-hour blocks. In the High School, it will spread over two periods and is replacing the Terra Nova tests. The NWEA has pre-canned letters to communicate to parents the process.

**TEACHSCAPE**

Teachscape is the agreed upon platform to handle the performance reviews for district. We have created the teacher roster file and tied teachers and principals to buildings. Eventually, teachers will get log in information and will be able to see the workflow progress for themselves. The principals have 26 hours of training to do and the teachers will need some training as well in how to upload and access professional development resources. It is a totally different way of performance review but the rubric is similar.

**APPR NEXT STEPS**

At a meeting yesterday, the APPR Steering Committee brainstormed all the things that have to be done before we can start the APPR. It is an extensive list of work to do in a short time frame. Due to the late start, we are going to do the best we can and will need flexibility from everyone.

**COMMON CORE LEARNING STANDARDS CURRICULUM PROJECTS**

The state has issued a common core curriculum that we can either adopt, adapt, or reject but we need to have a plan in place by September 2013 that aligns all grade levels against the common core. We are partially there for Kindergarten through grade 8 for Math and ELA. Once complete, we will need to get a curriculum document approved by the Board of Education.

The committee discussed using other models besides summer to do the work i.e. after school or weekends. The reason for doing the work over the summer has been because we have to work within the budget for the school year which starts July 1<sup>st</sup>.

The committee agreed that we should create digital curriculum document to save money.

**CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND TECHNOLOGY (CELT)**

CELT produced reports to the Board of Education. The Board asked the administrators to create a plan on how we are going to respond to this audit. The Technology Vertical Team went over the document and prioritized the recommendations for the Board.