

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  
Mrs. Jennifer Opdyke, Asst. Principal Groveland Elementary

Mr. Weldon called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment.

**REVIEW OF MEETING NOTES**

The September 27, 2017 Policy Committee Meeting minutes were reviewed and approved without changes.

**INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS**

TOPIC	NOTES	FOLLOW UP
000.5 – Organization – <b>Under Review</b>	Mr. Kopicki presented an update on questions discussed at the previous committee meeting regarding the ability of a committee to vote. Mr. Kopicki reported that PSBA and district solicitor Jeff Garton were consulted, and both responded that Committees are advisory boards that do not have the ability to make voting decisions. Whether a quorum of board members is present or not, the committee structure is strictly advisory, not operating as a Board during committee meetings. Committees do not make decisions, only recommendations to the full Board. Mr. Weldon noted that he believed moving items to full board <u>were</u> decisions, which required a vote of committee members. Mr. Gamble agreed. Mr. Kopicki reiterated Mr. Garton’s comments that, under Agenda rules Board members may bring items up for discussion at full board meetings, but the Committee structure is “advisory only”. He noted that, under the Sunshine Law, notice that the committee was going to vote to take action would have to be advertised. Committee meetings are not advertised as voting meetings. The function of the Committee is to advise that certain items come before the full Board, who will then discuss and take voting action on the item. Mr. Weldon asked if Committee meetings were published. Mr. Kopicki responded that all Committee meetings are published, but as Committee meetings not meetings where voting action will take place. Mrs. Evans asked if it would be	<b><u>Under review – pending further discussion with Mr. Garton</u></b>

Policy Committee Meeting  
October 25, 2017

	<p>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. Mrs. Collopy commented that while it was true any Board member could bring up an item for discussion at the Board meeting, the only way to have an item officially listed as an agenda item for the Board meeting was to have it approved by the Committee. Mr. Weldon noted that Committee meetings were not simply venues for discussion of items under consideration, it was the function of the Committee to decide whether those items warranted full Board consideration. That decision is made by a vote of Committee members. Mr. Kopicki reiterated that Mr. Garton’s advice was that Policy 000.5 could be moved to first read “as is”. Mr. Kopicki’s recommendation is that the Committee not get caught up in the semantics of the policy. Items that come forward from the Committee are defined as recommendations to the Board, not items the Committee took voting action on. Mr. Weldon requested that additional discussion take place with Mr. Garton to further explore the issue of whether a Committee can vote. Mr. Gamble also has concern about procedure when there isn’t a quorum of the committee present.</p>	
<p><b>000.4</b> – Membership <b>000.6.1</b> – Attendance via Electronic Communications <b>123</b> – Interscholastic Athletics <b>123.1</b> – Concussion Management <b>123.2</b> – Sudden Cardiac Arrest</p>	<p>These policies appeared before the full Board for first read. Mr. Garton did not review the policies until after first read, and has submitted some recommendations for Committee consideration. Mr. Weldon noted that Mr. Garton’s recommendations aren’t actual changes, but questions the Committee needs to discuss and should have discussed before moving the policies to first read. Mr. Kopicki recommends a change in procedure which would ensure that Mr. Garton reviews the policies and submits recommendations to the Committee before they begin their review. Mr. Weldon and Mr. Gamble remarked that having a solicitor attend Policy</p>	<p><b><u>Under review</u></b></p>

CENTRAL BUCKS SCHOOL DISTRICT

Policy Committee Meeting  
October 25, 2017

	<p>Committee meetings would be helpful. Mrs. Collopy noted that she had questions about some of Mr. Garton’s recommendations, and felt it would be helpful if he were in attendance to assist the Committee with any legal concerns regarding policy items. Mr. Kopicki believes that this “back and forth” issue will be resolved by having Mr. Garton either attend Committee meetings or review policy and submit advice prior to Committee consideration. Mrs. Evans believes it would be preferable to have Mr. Garton review policy <u>and</u> attend meetings in case there are questions about his recommendations. Mr. Gamble and Mr. Weldon agree.</p>	
<p><b>000.11</b> – Principles for Governance and Leadership</p>	<p>Mr. Kopicki noted that the issue was the requirement that Board members sign the policy. He commented that the policy language could be left “as is” because it cannot be enforced, or the policy could be changed to delete the signature requirement. Mr. Weldon reiterated that he felt the signature requirement was insulting, and that the language regarding advocating for public schooling was unnecessary. Mrs. Collopy stated she will not agree to leave language in requiring a signature when she has no intention of signing the policy. Mrs. Evans remarked that the language in the current policy was preferable. The Committee agreed that the signing requirement and the “Advocate Earnestly” paragraph be removed from the proposed policy, which could then be moved to first read.</p>	<p><b>Moved to first read – the first sentence requiring Board member’s signature and the paragraph entitled “Advocate Earnestly” will be deleted</b></p>
<p><b>100</b> – Comprehensive Planning</p>	<p>There are no changes to current Policy 100 indicated on proposed Policy 100.</p>	<p><b>Moved to first read</b></p>
<p><b>101</b> – Mission Statement/Shared Values</p>	<p>There are no changes to current Policy 101 indicated on proposed Policy 101. Mr. Kopicki commented that parents, teachers, administrators and the public had told him that they were pleased with the district’s mission statement. Mr. Gamble remarked that the current Policy 101 is not structured exactly like the proposed policy, however there were no changes indicated in bold in the proposed policy. The title of the policy had also changed. Dr. Bolton noted that both Policy 100 and Policy 101 were adopted in 2002. Revisions have been done since 2002, however the district did not act on those revisions. CB follows the revised policies, but because they were not acted on by the district, the bolding and redlining are not appearing in the current proposal. Mr. Weldon feels it is important that any changes to current policy be easily identified in the proposed policy, even if it is just a matter of structure change not language change.</p>	<p><b>Moved to first read</b></p>
<p><b>102</b> – Academic Standards</p>	<p>Mr. Weldon asked for verification that the changes indicated were asked for by PSBA. Mr. Kopicki verified that was the case. Content areas are not listed under the current policy, they are delineated in the proposed policy. By law, the district would be required to teach all courses listed. Mr. Weldon noted that</p>	<p><b>Moved to first read – with the grammatical correction to the sentence “For</b></p>

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 &amp; 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><b>purposes of Board policy, the term academic standards shall be deemed to encompass PA Core Standards, state academic standards, and local academic standards”.</b></p>
<p><b>103</b> – 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><b><u>Under Review – pending solicitor review</u></b></p>
<p><b>103.1</b> – 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><b><u>Under Review – pending solicitor review</u></b></p>
<p><b>104</b> – 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><b><u>Under Review – pending solicitor review</u></b></p>
<p><b>105</b> - 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><b><u>Moved to first read – change in language as indicated in notes</u></b></p>

CENTRAL BUCKS SCHOOL DISTRICT

Policy Committee Meeting  
October 25, 2017

	<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><b>105.1</b> – Review of Instructional Materials by Parents/Guardians and 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. Colopy 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 need to be monitored simply to view curriculum materials.</p>	<p><b><u>Moved to first read – with the grammatical correction to the first paragraph “...including academic standards to be achieved, instructional materials, and assessment techniques”.</u></b></p>
<p><b>105.2</b> – Exemption from Instruction</p>	<p>The Committee had no comments for the proposed changes.</p>	<p><b><u>Moved to first read</u></b></p>

**FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE**

The scheduled date for the next Policy Committee meeting is November 22, 2017.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:32 p.m.