

CDEP MEETING MINUTES

OCTOBER 6, 2005

11:30am – 2:30pm

Room 127 RHS

MEMBERS PRESENT

Thomas Blass

Jane Ebaugh

Edwin Davenport

Sal Guido

Jennifer Hammond-King

John Kemnitzer

Marvin Kreps

Dan O'Leary

Joseph Phelan

Regina Recchia

Patricia Sexton

Edward Sullivan

Julie Turpin

Marla Ulrich

Dean Vallas

Ernie Welch

Mary Winkler

Katherine Younger

MEMBERS ABSENT

Edward Ostapczuk

The meeting was convened at 11:40am with opening statements by Marvin Kreps. He acknowledged the existing members of the 2004-2005 CDEP Committee, and introduced the new members for 2005-2006. Mr. Kreps then made reference to the documents included in folders given to each member at the start of the meeting; provided a brief description of each document, and then reviewed the meeting's agenda. Each committee member introduced themselves by name and identified the stakeholder group that they represent.

The committee had a general discussion of the purposes and role of the Comprehensive District Planning Team. The conversation included points related to both the process and the product of Comprehensive District Education Planning.

Dan O'Leary - Science Department - asked for clarification on the references made in the CDEP documents to "Data Analysis". Dr. Ed Sullivan responded by explaining that Data Analysis referred to the breakdown of all data to assess the need and strengths of the District's academic program.

Joseph Phelan added that with increased work and a decrease of time and resources, the District needed to better distinguish between hunches and root causes when developing the Action Plans. The

CDEP team and Vertical Teams are responsible to generate hunches, conduct research and draw conclusions based on the research to either validate or invalidate hunches. The goal is to identify the root cause of particular student achievement gaps and to generate research based best practice strategies to improve student achievement.

Dean Vallas, Board of Education member, added that before the forming of the CDEP Committee, the Board of Education determined a need for communication with staff and faculty. The establishing of a District Mission, Vision, and Core Value statement did move the District forward and offered focused and identifiable goals to direct the District.

Joseph Phelan commented that the Board of Education felt their goals mirrored the CDEP objectives, and that an improvement in student results would equal an increase in change.

Marvin Kreps, Director of Curriculum and Instruction, asked for teacher input on the role and function of the CDEP Committee.

Katherine Younger indicated that she refers to the CDEP document for all of her Professional Development. All of the activities in and out of the classroom align with the goals of the Board of Education, and with the CDEP goals. It helped improve her goals when she had a “stakeholder” relationship with the District goals.

Marvin Kreps provided a brief description of the purpose of the CDEP process from the point of view of the NY State Education Department. The primary focus of the CDEP process was to allow school districts the flexibility to integrate the various plans that are required. This is why the current Comprehensive District Education Plan includes the Professional Development Plan, Annual Professional Performance Review Plan, Mentoring Plan, Technology Plan, District Demographics, and Student Achievement Data. Although the CDEP team last year during the development process generated 5-7 strategic goals it was determined that the major focus of the district should be in two areas: Student Academic achievement and School Climate. The over arching goals of Comprehensive District Education Planning then are integration of separate plans by the relevant stakeholders into one continuous school district improvement plan.

12:10pm - The Committee reviewed the existing ground rules and determined them to be acceptable.

It was suggested that any rule that is no longer applicable be changed to fit existing circumstances.

Marvin welcomed Jennifer Hammond – King as the Title I program representative from Chancellor Livingston Elementary School. Based on State Education requirements, we are required to have a Consultation Collaboration Process in place. Jennifer will represent the Title I program at future CDEP meetings and a Title I parent will be determined at a future date.

Julie Turpin offered to assist in recommending a parent to represent the Title I program but Mr. Kreps indicated that a process was in place to identify this parent.

Dan O’Leary asked the CDEP Team to clarify what is meant by the language in the CDEP guidance document that reads: “These plans must address the needs of all students rather than depending upon separate plans that result in fragmented services and increased paperwork”.

Marvin Kreps explained the “No Child Left Behind Act” requires that special education students must be included in any plan to improve student achievement in the district. This process leads to increased plan integration and a decrease in fragmentation and disintegration of services. Jane Ebaugh, Director of Special Services, added that there is no longer a need for developing separate Special Education plans because they are included in the CDEP.

12:15pm: The Committee moved to the next Agenda Item : Vertical Team Action Plans

Marvin Kreps explained the process of developing the document.

The Board of Education is expecting the Vertical Teams to prioritize any of the Action Plan Goals that have budgetary implications. This is especially true of the goals that require additional budget support through the budget process for the 2006-2007 school year.

Marvin Kreps asked the Committee for their input regarding the acceptance of the plans as goals for the Vertical Teams in the upcoming year.

Ernie Welch, President of the Rhinebeck Teachers Association, inquired about the software mentioned in AIS Goal #1.

Jennifer Hammond – King explained the AIS-M Direct program has been contracted through the Centris Group, and the Mid-Hudson Regional Information Center (MHRIC). Inputting of student information data has posed the district a challenge but progress is being made.

Ernie Welch then inquired about the process of inputting student data into the program.

Jennifer Hammond–King explained that implementation consisted of various interventions to develop a history of services for each student. This would include progress reports, test data, and a variety of parent notifications.

Ernie Welch inquired as to when the data should be implemented, and cited instances of teachers lacking the necessary information regarding their AIS students.

Jennifer Hammond – King explained that since the Elementary School teachers are individual providers, they are entering their own student information.

At the Middle School level, Carmela Fountain, Guidance counselor, is currently responsible for the BMS students. At the High School level, this is a clerical duty performed by Sheryl Mulkins, guidance secretary.

Marvin Kreps suggested that there needs to be greater clarification regarding the exact responsibilities of an AIS provider in the middle and high schools. Initially, the inputting of the basic information into the

program was seen as the duty of the persons who were currently keeping the records on the green cards. There is concern that in its current form the AIS program might not be in compliance with State mandated reporting. Ideally, the AIS providers should do data input and the feasibility of this should be examined by the District.

Jennifer Hammond – King stated that the process should be de-centralized so that the providers of the service are doing the inputting. Right now, implementation of the program is a priority because the district will be using these data for state reporting.

Dean Vallas, Board of Education, inquired as to who controls the input, and output of information.

Marvin Kreps indicated that the task would possibly be assigned to one individual, with other individuals holding limited rights to the program. For now this duty has been shared between Jennifer Hammond-King and Marvin Kreps.

Mr. Vallas clarified that “limited rights” is what Mrs. Hammond – King referred to as a “de-centralized” process.

Dan O’Leary referred to the criteria for AIS (Academic Intervention Services) as failure of a final exam. Below proficiency and teacher recommendation are also criteria for referral. He asked for confirmation to his understanding of the expectations of the AIS-M program as being:

- * increase of diagnosing and prescribing of strategies
- * better placement and tracking of student performance
- * examination of exit criteria of AIS services

Jennifer Hammond – King posed the question of “what is the definition of AIS in the high school/ middle school?” There seems to be no solid understanding of this. Is this typically interpreted by the individual providers? Can this be more clearly defined?

Julie Turpin asked Jennifer Hammond – King if the information being put into the program includes both current and past students. Jennifer responded by indicating that only students currently receiving AIS will be entered into the program. Julie also expressed concern over privacy. Users of the program need to be accountable for protecting the rights of the student. Mrs. Turpin also inquired about the individuals in the Middle school and High school who have access. Who governs the program at those levels?

Mrs. King explained the program is password protected. Access will be limited and individualized based on the role of each user. There is no policy in effect at this point as to whom would be responsible for oversight of the program in the MS/HS. So for now this duty belongs to the administrative team.

Julie Turpin expressed concern that, as a parent, that there is a lack of consistency in the AIS programs in the middle and high schools. She feels the timeline needs to be improved in regard to identifying students and getting eligible students the services they need. And that there needs to be more attention paid to the kids who typically “fall between the cracks”.

Dr. Davenport, High School Principal, asked Mrs. Turpin to clarify whether she was referring to AIS, or the 504 process. He explained the current process for both programs, and indicated the need for refinement.

Katherine Younger stated the communication between buildings is vital to the success of the program and needs significant improvements.

Marvin Kreps indicated the Vertical Teams will be informed of the CDEP expectations, and redirects the group’s attention back to the CDEP Goal Activities

Patricia Sexton refers to AIS Goal 1, and asks about possible options for K-12 coordination of the AIS program. Who would do this? Someone internal? Clerical support hired from the outside? What kind of money is available for this position? What would the cost be?

Marvin Kreps responded with a number of options, such as it being a stipend position, an Administrative role, or appointing one individual to “manage” the AIS-M program acting as liaison between all parties involved in the implementing of the District’s AIS program. This is what needs to be identified. Clearly, one root cause for student achievement gaps that has been identified is the breakdown of communication from grade level to grade level; building to building.

Tom Blass agreed that communication and lack of clarity with regard to AIS service delivery roles needs further definition.

Mr. Vallas stated the Board of Education would analyze the experience and qualification of the individual given the responsibility. This action was supported by Mr. Phelan.

Dr. Sullivan added that other root cause elements to be studied through AIS-M are organization and structure of programs, and student attendance patterns, to name a few. Jennifer Hammond-King reminded the group that the Student Support Services Vertical Team is also in the process of studying these issues and will work together with the AIS Vertical Team.

Jane Ebaugh stated that while working together on some issues is beneficial, each team must remain focused on their specific goals.

Ernie Welch stated that while the Elementary School is in the process of evolving and developing their AIS services, the Middle and High School programs are in need of improvement. One issue that remains to be resolved is the clarification of the responsibility of an AIS provider in the Middle School and High School. It was agreed that this issue does need to be resolved but that the Vertical Team process should continue.

Joseph Phelan responded by stating that it is not the CDEP Committee's responsibility to prioritize the goals in the Vertical Team Action Plans, rather the CDEP Team should return them to the Vertical Teams for further study and prioritization in time for the budget development process.

Marvin Kreps asked the Committee again if they accept the Action Plans and agree to return them to the Vertical Teams for prioritization.

Ernie Welch restates his concern over what he sees as contractual related issues.

Dean Vallas stated that if the Vertical Team has not asked for full implementation; why should the Committee jump the process? The Committee should find out where the Vertical Teams are at in their work.

Ernie Welch agreed with what Mr. Vallas said. Joseph Phelan added that what needs to be made very clear to the Vertical Team is the significance of the prioritization process. He added the CDEP would be wise to trust the Vertical Team decisions.

Patricia Sexton asked if there were a way to separate the recommendations in to categories such as Administrative Needs and Creative Changes. The Vertical Teams need to be apprised of any budgetary restrictions or requirement that may affect their work.

Mr. Phelan stated that practical consideration to the financial side needs to be a given. Unless grant monies are utilized, all items must follow the budgetary process. The Board of Education would need any budget items by January. This process must be explained to the Vertical Teams before any prioritizing is done. Mr. Phelan recommends Marvin Kreps address this with the Teams at the beginning of their first meeting. He offered his support in the explanation of the budget timeline to the Teams as well.

Returning to the discussion, Julie Turpin suggested a representative of each Vertical Team be represented at the CDEP meetings.

Dr Davenport asked whether or not the CDEP Committee can make known their own areas of priority to the Vertical Teams. It was stated to the group by Mr. Phelan that Dr. Davenport was welcome to sit in on meetings and offer input if he wanted as these are "open" meetings.

Marvin Kreps asked the CDEP Team if it is acceptable to let the Vertical Teams take the Action Plans as they are written and continue their work of prioritizing, conducting root cause analysis and developing rationales.

Tom Blass asked what happens once the Vertical Teams make their prioritized lists. Will it be sent back to the CDEP Committee for approval? Marvin Kreps indicated that Vertical Team Action Plan work should be presented to the CDEP Team at their January meeting. The CDEP Team should focus on the "Big Picture" while Vertical Teams become the "micro-managers" with the task of deciding objectives and reporting back to the CDEP Team.

Joseph Phelan articulated an example for purposes of clarification. If each Vertical Team chose one goal, the January 6 proposals should then be prioritized due to the time limits. CDEP needs to take the Teams priorities and determine which ones are feasible. Ernie Welch agreed with Mr. Phelan, and is willing to allow for the process to work; he felt everyone may have issues with one point or another, but as a group they should respect the process. Joseph Phelan supported Ernie's comments.

Marvin Kreps explains to the group that many of the goals have been included in this year's budget, such as AIS-M. There are a large number of items that require funding. CDEP members are tasked with determining whether or not these objectives are effective, feasible, and functional. He requested again from the Committee a decision to accept or refuse the Action Plans.

Patricia Sexton asked to revisit the issue of whether or not Vertical Team members are aware of the budgetary processes. They should not waste time on items that have no chance of being approved during the budget development process.

Joseph Phelan expressed his commitment to build the budget process capacity with each Vertical Team. Dean Vallas commented that he did not want to restrict the Teams' goals and dreams at the first meeting.

Sal Guido, High School Math Chair, asked: Is this process really a time saver? Vertical Teams decide on their priorities, and then CDEP prioritizes their priorities...etc. Would it be more effective for the CDEP Committee to do the prioritization first? Do all Committee members need to deliberate on and be in agreement to each goal?

Katherine Younger agreed with Sal, and felt Marvin Kreps and Joseph Phelan could represent the group and highlight the committee's priorities to the Vertical Teams. Dan O'Leary referred the group to the Science goals, indicating that they are very "do-able", and does not present much concern.

Julie Turpin stressed her desire to see all content areas represented. Ernie Welch would like to see Unit representation as well. Dean Vallas stated these items need to be kicked back to the Vertical Teams.

The group requested Joseph Phelan and Marvin Kreps clarify with the Vertical Teams what has been implemented to date, and work out cost and feasibility with them as well. Mr. Phelan suggested Marvin be the resource to work with the teams stating concern the teams may not appreciate receiving priority influence from him.

Dean Vallas suggested creating categories, and allowances to assist the Vertical Teams.

Marvin Kreps asked if the group was prepared to accept the Plans as written. Before the group responded, Jane Ebaugh commented that not all people are aware of grant funds that may be available. If successful items are in place and found to be successful, can we continue with them? Dr. Sullivan asked if we should continue with successes, or look to reallocate personnel, and funds rather than adding on. Jane felt the Vertical Teams must revisit current budget items to determine continuation or initiation of new items.

Tom Blass commended Marvin Kreps on his work with the CDEP Committee and Vertical Teams, and stated his confidence in Mr. Kreps to convey to both groups what goals are realistic. The Committee asserted their trust in his judgment.

Given that vote of confidence, Mr. Kreps addresses the Committee to determine whether or not the CDEP Committee can give the Vertical Teams their “marching orders” with regard to the Action Plans. Does the group accept them?

Representing the RTA, Mr. Welch stated his desire to respect the process and let the Vertical Teams do their job. He trusts them and their abilities. The rest of the Committee agrees!

November 1, 2005 – Superintendent Conference Day

This date was to be dedicated to CDEP related activities, AED/CPR certification and Curriculum Vendors. Ernie Welch felt there would not be enough traffic to justify the enlisting of Vendors, the group agreed and felt the item should be dropped from the agenda for the day.

Jennifer Hammond-King indicated that the Vertical Teams have been very productive; however, staff not currently serving on a Vertical Team should to be involved in the CDEP process. Mr. Kreps suggested assigning projects to the individuals who do not have Vertical Team affiliation. Dr. Davenport stated unengaged High School staff could work on building level activities. Dr. Sullivan felt not many Chancellor Faculty would be left out; could they be integrated with the Middle and High school faculty? Jennifer King expressed concern that November 1 should not be the first meeting of the Vertical Teams. Joseph Phelan agreed with Jennifer and suggested a meeting prior to that date to help plan their day. Marvin Kreps commented on the scheduling problems encountered in the past and does not want to disrupt the classrooms. The Committee suggested the possibility of engaging staff that are not on a Vertical Team, acting as Ad Hoc members. This would allow all Faculty members to be involved in the work being done on the Vertical Teams without having to commit to being on a full committee. This would offer an opportunity for people to gain a better understanding of what is being done and to participate in the development process.

Dan O’Leary asked what the criteria were for being on a Vertical Team. The group explained it was voluntary, with an equitable distribution of staff from all buildings. The CDEP Committee requested a list of all Vertical Teams and the members. Jennifer Hammond – King commented that some areas have an over commitment of members. Joseph Phelan asked who would decide the assignment of Ad Hoc members. At that time, Marvin Kreps advocated for Art, Music, and LOTE Teachers to be excluded from these activities to continue the work on curriculum development initiated over the summer. It was determined that none of the individuals involved in curriculum writing are on any Vertical Teams. Dr. Davenport questioned what the role of Vertical Team Ad Hoc participants would perform. Jennifer Hammond-King suggested the Vertical teams define this role as it may vary from one team to the next. Ernie Welch reminds the group that Superintendent conference days are an obligation for the Faculty, and in the interest of equity, all individuals must be working. Katherine Younger indicated the Elementary Grade Level Chairs can decide where to place their team.

Joseph Phelan suggested that a brief session before the start of the day to address the accomplishments of the Vertical Teams might be helpful. Ernie Welch agreed with Mr. Phelan adding it would be a great motivator. Mr. Phelan confirmed that a continental breakfast and lunch would be provided by our in-house food service department.

The next topic for November 1 was AED/CPR. The training requires ½ day, and would involve members of Vertical Teams who have expiring certifications. There is an issue of time to consider. Tom Blass expressed concern over having to choose between the two. Joseph Phelan requested a list of individuals needing re-certification. If the group is small there are options; even if it needs to be done after hours, he would support paying staff to attend.

Dr. Davenport and John Kemnitzer offered to take responsibility for obtaining the list of staff needing re-certification.

Marvin Kreps recaps the decisions surrounding November 1 Superintendent Conference day.:

- * Official CDEP day
- * Vertical Teams will meet
- * Art, music, and LOTE teachers will continue work on Curriculum
- * Any Faculty not involved in the above mentioned areas would act as Ad Hoc members on the Vertical Teams
- * No curriculum vendors
- * AED/CPR would pose a conflict and will be held at another time
- * Lunch will be provided by the District

The April 27, 2006 CDEP Team meeting date was changed to Tuesday, April 25, 2006.

Data Section Update

The Data section of the CDEP Document needs to be updated. The Committee needs to determine what data points should be included in this section. Marvin Kreps explained how the State is requiring Districts to appoint a Data Administrator, and Data Team. Mr. Kreps is fulfilling the role as Data Administrator. Mr. Kreps explained that the Leap Report (information on students grades K-8) and the Step Report (grades 9-12) are going to be combined and managed with SASI, the District's current student management system. This integration of programs will be facilitated by the Mid-Hudson RIC.

Jennifer Hammond-King asked Mr. Kreps how this is different, and how does this affect the District. The Mid-Hudson Regional Information Center (MHRIC) provides technical support for the SASI program and our student management system needs to be brought into compliance with SED data reporting

standards. One of the responsibilities of the Data Team will be to determine protocols for governing such things as input of information, reports, confidentiality, and what staff members should have rights to use the system, and what would those rights entail. Dean Vallas asked if the increase of data and improved accuracy of data dovetail with the AIS-M system. Mr. Kreps indicated that the Program Information Report (PIR) currently required by the State Education Department can be generated from the AISM program. Mr. Vallas noted that the State's mandate on this information points to a clear Vertical Team priority that the district entire all AIS data into the AISM program.

In keeping with State mandates, Marvin Kreps spoke briefly on the new State Education Department requirement for Grades 3-8 testing in English and Mathematics. The tests have to be administered and scored by the district. This poses a Profession Development component. It also will prove to be demanding on the district from an operations standpoint. Teachers will need to be pulled out of the classroom to be trained in the administration and scoring components. Ernie Welch wondered if retired teachers could be used as a possible resource. Mr. Kreps responded that the State will allow that if the teacher has certification in the appropriate field. Mr. Kreps indicated that he will check into the feasibility of using retired teachers to score the tests.

Due to the significance of the topic, and the amount of time needed to clearly explain it, Mr. Kreps suggested the discussion be tabled until the next meeting. The group was in agreement.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.