East Lyme Public Schools
Long-Range Planning Committee Meeting

Tuesday, January 17, 2017
9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.

East Lyme Public Schools will inspire, engage and educate each student to become a
contributing citizen and a responsible, independent, and critical thinker.

Members Present: Jeffrey Newton (Supt), Amy Drowne (Asst Supt/Curriculum), Jason Bitgood (Asst. Principal), Tracy Burns (DW Math Teacher), Amanda Cappon (Elementary Library/Media Specialist), Amy D'Anna (ELMS Teacher), Kimberly Davis (Interim Spec. Serv. Dir.), Melissa DeLoreto (LBH Principal), Patricia Lannon (Director of Technology), Dawn LeMay (Spec. Ed. Teacher), Debra Marshall (Paraprofessional), Stacey Muscarella (Administrative Assistant), Joe Onofrio (Salem Superintendent), Mike Susi (HS Principal), Diane Swan (NCS Teacher), Heather Treptow (Elementary Parent Rep.), Suzanne White (MS & HS Parent Rep)

Members Absent: Eric Bauman (BOE Member), George Jackson (Salem BOE Member), Joan Phillips (Salem Principal), Kimberly Reith (HS Teacher), Barbara Senges (BOE Member), Robin Soule (Flanders Teacher)

Presenter: Jonathan Costa, Executive Director of EdAdvance

Mr. Costa distributed and presented the Strategic Coherence Planning Phases III & IV PowerPoint and opened the meeting with an overview of the meeting agenda:

- Review Big Picture
- Team Check-in
- Team Report – Questions and Reflections
- Data Analysis & Synthesis
    - Identify, Prioritize and Order
- Start the planning process
    - Gap-Evidence and Action

Mr. Costa reviewed the committee's charge to reengage and refocus on the outcomes for appropriate student learning goals that will ensure student success in life, learning and work beyond school and to determine the gap between where our district currently is verses our long-range goals. During the meeting, each group will present their research findings to the entire committee who will then rate the evidences and determine the outcome gaps between the information provided and how the district currently functions.

Group 1: Goals for Learning (Members: Jeffrey Newton, Eric Bauman, Mike Susi, Suzanne White)

Task: To gather evidence on goal setting processes and evidence on materials and resources.

Outcome: The building, teacher, and district goals are currently loosely connected. The evidenced outcomes are to align all goals to improve coherent practices, to establish a clearly articulated process to intentionally link all goals throughout the district, to improve communication for sharing district and building goals, to develop and make accessible a complete compliment of curriculum and instructional materials.

- Goal Setting Context and Philosophy: Rated 1 of 4
- Goal Setting Processes: Rated 2 of 4
- Goal Setting Support and Engagement: Rated 1 of 4
- Materials and Resources: Rated 2 of 4

Group 2: Teaching and Learning (Members: Jason Bitgood, Amy D'Anna, Dawn Lemay, Joan Phillips)

Task: To gather evidence on student engagement, digital learning practices and professional learning practices.

Outcome: Alignment with common language used, terms, and definitions are needed. Staff supervision and evaluation relates back to student engagement. Reports should be aligned with appropriate language to show engagement. There is a high degree of faculty knowledge of understanding of how to design and facilitate digitally supported instructional experiences that support rigorous, higher-power thinking and sustained engagement. There are inconsistencies among building technology policies.

- Student Engagement: Rated 3 of 4
- Digital Learning Practices: Rated 1 of 4
- Professional Learning Practices: Rated 2 of 4

Group 3: Assessment/Accountability Practices (Members: Amy Drowne, Melissa DeLoreto, Kim Reith, Kim Davis, Tracy Burns)

Task: To gather evidence on assessment/accountability practices as it relates to assessment philosophy, assessment capacity, performance data, professional measures of learning, and school/district measures of learning.

Outcome: The district uses and reports on appropriate and balanced measures of student and adult success that are aligned with its student learning goals. There are some individual efforts or minimal group attempts, but there is no systemic evidence or process in place to support assessment philosophy. There is some systemic efforts to create the desired coherence outcome related to performance data, but its implementation is uneven and has yet to deliver meaningful change. There is no systemic evidence or process in place to support the existence of the desired outcome for the professional measures of learning. There is no systemic evidence or process in place to support the existence of the desired coherence outcome for school/district measures of learning.

- Assessment Philosophy: Rated 1 of 4
- Assessment Capacity: Rated 1 of 4
- Performance Data: Rated 2 of 4
- Professional Measures of Learning: Rated 1 of 4
- School/District Measures of Learning: Rated 1 of 4

Group 4: Systems Alignment, Coherence and External Factors (Members: Patricia Lannon, Stacey Muscarella, Barbara Senges, Heather Treptow)

Task: How the leadership and supporting systems are structured in the district to work together in support of the priority student learning goals. Do these elements consistently work together to enable a sustained focus on things that matter or are they consistently reactionary and disconnected? To determine this, judgments will be made on the state of (1) leadership and mission focus coherence, (2) policy and regulations, (3) community engagement, and (4) resource deployment.

Outcome: Even though there is a well-articulated district mission, and individual school missions align with the district mission, the district mission is not well known. Communication should be thoughtful, organized and consistent.

- Leadership/Mission Focus: Rated 2 of 4
- Aligned and Coherent Leadership Connections re: Alignment of Individual, Building and District Goals: Rated 1 of 4
- Policy and Regulation: Rated 3 of 4
- Community Engagement: Rated 3 of 4
- Resource Development: Rated 1 of 4

Group 5: Knowledge of How Local Context Might Impact our Planning Process and Outcomes (Members: Joe Onofrio, Amanda Cappon, Deb Marshall)

> Task: To identify any external contingencies that the planning group should be aware as it determines the best ways to close the identified coherence gaps.
>
> Outcome: Challenges and Opportunities Prioritized List
>
> A. Economic and Demographics
> B. Mandates/Legislation
> C. Historical Achievement Data Trends
> D. Impact of Digital Tools for Learning
> E. Local Context
> F. Other – PL189 Data Privacy

Following the five group presentations, the Long-Range Planning Committee discussed and ranked the information presented which resulted in the following.

Areas defined in which more information in needed:

A. How will East Lyme Public Schools define and measure engagement across the district?
B. What is our current digital infrastructure and where do we need to go/do next?
C. How do we develop, establish and monitor district coherence for goals regarding student achievement?
D. Do the administrator and teacher evaluation/support plans align with our district core values?
E. What is Infinite Campus capable of? Do we still need Atlas?
F. How do we go about incorporating digital citizenship and using digital devices?
G. What efforts have we made to develop and retain qualified employees?
H. Are our assessment practices communicated district-wide, alignted PK-12, reviewed for consistency, and used to demonstrate growth?

Concerns: Areas of systemic challenges:

A. Not losing our successes as we (re)define reality. (Count: 3)
B. Supporting district-wide coherence – challenges of moving from building based to district based alignment. (Count: 53)
C. Need to develop assessment and data literacy (Count 40)
D. Need for meaningful and relevant professional learning (Count 30)
E. Need for meaningful goals and feedback through the teacher evaluation and support plan (Count 4)
F. Challenges of digital communication (Count 0)
G. Resources to support relevant digital literacy (Count 6)
H. How to continue improving communication (Count 13)
I. Improving trust (Count 1)

During the next meeting, at a date to be determined, the Long-Range Planning Committee will prioritize the gap areas and identify the strategic priorities based on the final count/ranking of the Concerns: Areas of Systemic Challenges.

Respectfully submitted,

Leigh Reinhart
Recording Secretary