

CENTRAL BUCKS SCHOOL DISTRICT

Policy Committee Meeting
October 25, 2017

Committee Members Present

Mr. Dennis Weldon, Chairperson
Mrs. Meg Evans, Member

Mr. John Kopicki, Superintendent

Committee Members Not Present

Mr. Paul Faulkner

Others in Attendance

Mrs. Sharon Collopy, Board Member
Mr. John Gamble, Board Member
Dr. David Bolton, Assistant Superintendent

Mrs. Mary Kay Speese, Director of Student Services
Dr. Susan Salvesen, Principal Doyle Elementary
Mr. David Heineman, Principal Groveland Elementary

	voting action will take place. Mrs. Evans asked if it would be	<u>Under review – pending further discussion with Mr. Garton</u>
--	--	--

Policy Committee Meeting
October 25, 2017

allowable to advertise Committee meetings as voting meetings, or would that then constitute a Board meeting with quorum rules. Mr. Kopicki noted that the quorum ruling would be a separate conversation than the current issue of the ability of a Committee to vote at a meeting. Mr. Kopicki finalized his presentation of Mr. Garton's comments by noting that Mr. Garton felt Policy 000.5 could be moved to first read. Mrs. Collopy and Mr. Weldon reiterated their belief that the Committee votes to move items for Board approval. Mr. Weldon noted that the advertisement for Committee meetings meet Sunshine Act requirements. The purpose of a Committee is to decide whether an item should be passed to full board, and that decision is acted on by a vote. If three of the four committee members at a meeting did not want an item passed to full board, it would not be moved forward. Mr. Kopicki noted that the item could still be brought before the Board by any member, regardless of Committee approval.

CENTRAL BUCKS SCHOOL DISTRICT

Policy Committee Meeting
October 25, 2017

	<p>"adopted by the state board of education" was stricken from the current proposal. Even though the courses listed in the proposed policy are the courses adopted by the state board of education, he reiterated that any changes/deletions made to current policy should be indicated in some way on the proposed policy. Mrs. Collopy questioned the use of both terms "Pennsylvania Core Standards" and "state academic standards". She wondered if Pennsylvania Cores standards were being identified as a subset of state academic standards, or if the use of both terms was redundant. Mrs. Evans agreed that the use of both terms indicated that there were two sets of standards, core standards and state standards. Mr. Weldon inquired what the difference between the two would be. Dr. Bolton noted that there was a differentiation between the two standards. There are some areas delineated as PA core standards, and there are other areas that are not delineated as core standards but are simply state academic standards. He gave the example of Family & Consumer science courses – there are no PA core standards identified for those courses. There are, however, state academic standards identified. Mrs. Collopy asked if the difference could be determined by whether there was a standardized test. Dr. Bolton noted that was often the case.</p>	<p>purposes of Board policy, the term academic standards shall be deemed to encompass PA Core Standards, state academic standards, and local academic standards".</p>
<p>103 – Nondiscrimination in School and Classroom Practices</p>	<p>Due to the number of changes proposed, the Committee agreed to have Mr. Garton review the changes and make recommendations before Committee consideration.</p>	<p><u>Under Review – pending solicitor review</u></p>
<p>103.1 – Nondiscrimination – Qualified Students with Disabilities</p>	<p>Due to the number of changes proposed, the Committee agreed to have Mr. Garton review the changes and make recommendations before Committee consideration.</p>	<p><u>Under Review – pending solicitor review</u></p>
<p>104 – Nondiscrimination in Employment Practices</p>	<p>Due to the number of changes proposed, the Committee agreed to have Mr. Garton review the changes and make recommendations before Committee consideration.</p>	<p><u>Under Review – pending solicitor review</u></p>
<p>105 - Curriculum</p>	<p>Mrs. Evans asked how often the district participates in state-initiated pilot programs for educational research. Mr. Kopicki noted that there is a national pilot program the district has been involved in for many years. Dr. Bolton commented that there are occasional state surveys the district is asked to complete, but nothing more time-consuming than that. Mrs. Speese indicated that the Special Education department also participates in state surveys. Mr. Kopicki assured the Committee that any participation in a pilot program would be brought before the committee. The proposed policy states "The Board encourages, where it is feasible and in the best interest of district students, the participation in state-initiated pilot programs of educational research". The Committee agrees that the statement should be changed to read "With prior Board approval" rather than "The Board encourages". Mr. Gamble</p>	<p><u>Moved to first read – change in language as indicated in notes</u></p>

Policy Committee Meeting
 October 25, 2017

<p>105.1 – Review of Instructional Materials by Parents/Guardians and Students</p>	<p>questioned the language in #4 under Guidelines. He felt the language should simply state “all students”. The proposed change to “all students with disabilities” made it seem that the district would not offer a continuum of educational programs and services to all students, only to those with disabilities. Dr. Bolton noted that the proposed change references Policy 113, which only deals with students with disabilities. His conjecture was that Guideline #7 was meant to address requirements for all students.</p> <p>Mr. Gamble asked if “guardian” was defined anywhere. He gave the example of a divorce situation where one parent did not have legal rights as a guardian. Would the district still allow that parent the opportunity to review instructional materials just because they were a parent? Mrs. Collopy noted in that case there would be a court order and a document on file with the school, providing staff direction for the situation. She indicated that the district encourages interest in the curriculum, and she would have no problem allowing any guardian access to instructional material. Mr. Heineman commented that the court order often includes information on whether the parents have shared access to educational properties. Mr. Weldon asked the protocol for situations outside divorce, such as when someone other than a parent has primary guardianship. Dr. Salvesen noted that curriculum is public knowledge, and, unlike a student’s personal academic record, guardianship did not</p>	
--	---	--