



GLENBARD TOWNSHIP HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT #87

596 Crescent Boulevard, Glen Ellyn, IL 60137-4297, (630) 469-9100, www.glenbard87.org

POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

GLENBARD DISTRICT 87 ADMIN. CENTER

Monday, November 9, 2020

The Policy Committee held its monthly meeting via a Zoom Web Conference on Monday, November 9, 2020. The meeting was called to order at 6:08 p.m.

In attendance:

Cindy Christiansen, Committee Member
Jennifer Jendras, Board Member
John Kenwood, Board Member
Richard Mazzolini, Committee Member
Josh Chambers, Asst. Superintendent
for Human Resources

Melissa Creech, Executive Director for
Teaching & Learning
David Hennessey, GEA Representative
Patris Haxhijaj, Student Liaison
Grace Chambers, Student Liaison
Diana Flint, Recording Secretary

Quorum requirements were met and the meeting was able to proceed. Chambers advised that one Glen Ellyn community member, Grace Daigel, had asked to virtually observe the meeting. The agenda packet was presented on a shared screen for the attendees to view.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the Policy Committee meeting for September 14, 2020 were reviewed. The meeting for October was cancelled.

Action: Motion made to accept, seconded, and carried.

Public Participation

Chambers asked Daigel if she would like to contribute during public participation on any item noted on the agenda. Daigel requested that her comments be reserved until the end of the meeting and asked that a copy of the agenda packet be emailed to her during the session.

Items for Discussion

1. Policy 6:185, *Remote Educational Program (New)* - Creech stated that Glenbard has a proposal to allow on-line courses with 80% or more of the course content delivered online, in a mix of synchronous and asynchronous learning opportunities. In order to do this, we have to have a policy in place. Therefore, 6:185 is being proposed as a new policy that complies with Section 10-29 of the Illinois School Code for establishing a remote educational plan. This policy does not have anything to do with the pandemic or

with school emergency days. It would allow the District to be able to offer any online or blended class course now or ten years from now. The policy is being brought forward for recommendation because there is a proposal going before the Board tonight for a new course for the 2021-22 school year: an Online Wellness PE class for zero hour. The question was posed on whether a licensed employee had to run the class. The Committee was advised that ISBE requires that educators be licensed. Clarification was requested if the policy could be used for students to take AP classes that we do not offer at particular schools. Response: yes, it could be utilized in that respect. The question was posed on whether a course could be taught by a Non-Glenbard teacher. Response: in order to offer a course, the District would be required to have the course approved by the School Board and be provided by a Glenbard educator. The Committee was advised that the District currently allows students to take a limited amount of credits outside of Glenbard and transfer them in. This new policy offers the District more opportunities to investigate options being offered to students. The policy would allow the District to offer a remote or blended course, but it does not require or compel the District to do so. We want to be really specific and intentional on the courses the District plans to offer in this way. Some courses do not lend themselves to have this type of model. However, we identified during the “pandemic” summer school that by combining schools online we actually had enough kids to offer the course. We are thinking that summer school is one of the places that we can offer online courses to students. The Committee was further advised that there are currently students that have to travel between campuses because we do not offer a course at a particular building which creates some scheduling conflicts. This would allow more scheduling flexibility which would be highly beneficial to our students.

2. Policy 6:240, *Sponsored and Non-Sponsored Field Trips and Educational Tours (Name Change)* -- Creech discussed the variety of policies, administrative procedures, and exhibits on the agenda. At the onslaught of the pandemic in March, we had many trips that were scheduled both nationally and internationally. It became very apparent that the District needed to provide additional information on how to deal with those trips and also how to ensure we have the structure necessary when traveling to keep students safe. Therefore, we have a couple of proposals to the field trip and educational tour policies. In general, a field trip is tied to a class and is a day trip. An educational tour requires an overnight stay. Our trigger for Board approval is that if a trip is over 100 miles and/or requires an overnight stay, it has to be authorized the Board. We are cleaning up the language in agenda items 3, 4, 5 and ensuring they specify both field trips and educational tours. In the first document, policy 6:240, we are changing the title to be more specific and more clearly identifying between a Glenbard sponsored and non-sponsored event. This became an important distinction with the pandemic and how we handled things. We have tours and trips that are tied to a class/curriculum or extracurricular activity -- they are Glenbard sponsored and a Glenbard staff member attends. What became gray is that there are non-sponsored trips. A Glenbard staff member may be working with a tour company and it is not made clear that it was not a Glenbard sponsored trip. The major change for 6:240 is the added red paragraph. It stipulates a staff member must let the district know at least 14 days in advance of talking with parents or students that they are taking a non-sponsored trip or tour and that they must not utilize the Glenbard network/email, identify themselves as an agent of Glenbard, or use Glenbard logos/identifiers for correspondence. This new paragraph also eliminates

the need for Policy for 6:242. Clarification was requested to be inserted on page 1 - Item 2 on trips abroad as to whether the District pays for these trips. Discussion took place on fundraising opportunities and potential activity funds or donations being utilized for assistance for any student being denied due to financial reasons. It was requested that a line be added to incorporate students who qualify for Free or Reduced or to set a dollar limitation. Staff will look into this more and talk with an attorney about how to clarify before it goes to the Board. A request was made to ensure everything aligns with the District's transgender policy as far as ensuring inclusion. A second request was made to tighten up the wording if a staff member is participating as a parent versus an agent of the school -- i.e., if I am a mom and an employee of Glenbard, it is clear that I am not saying I am sponsoring the trip. -- we do not want it to be viewed from the standpoint of "this is a safe trip because one of the parents is a staff member of Glenbard." A third request was made to better define "field trip versus educational tour" and "sponsored versus non-sponsored" -- we need more straight forward definitions for a parent to interpret. The Committee was referred back to the new red paragraph.

3. Administrative Procedure 6:240-AP1, *Student Field Trips* (Comments noted within Item 2.)
4. Administrative Procedure 6:240-AP2, *Educational Tours* (Comments noted within Item 2.)
5. Policy 6:240 Exhibits 1-6 (Comments noted within Item 2.)
6. Policy 6:242, *Excursion Tours* - With the update to 6:240, this policy is no longer relevant and is being recommended for deletion.
7. Policy 4:180, *Pandemic Preparedness; Management; and Recovery (Name Change)* -- Chambers advised that some of these we talked about at the last Policy Committee meeting and due to technical difficulties, we are bringing them back. The question was raised on whether the red-lines were from PRESS or our attorney. The Committee was advised that the only item we requested attorney guidance is on page 2 of 3 in the yellow highlighted area. The law does not require the Board to approve the pandemic learning plan. The law states that the District shall adopt a pandemic learning plan. The two paragraph options were read and discussed. One of the concerns raised was since we are already in remote learning, will option 1 create confusion. Does the current plan in place now need to be reapproved since the policy is being approved after the fact, or is this policy going to apply to the next time we have to create a pandemic plan? Clarification was provided that the policy did not apply to every single time the District would have to go into remote or hybrid, but to the learning plan itself -- (what is your schedule, what is the plan going to look like). Discussion took place on past and future communications with the Board on the subject matter. The question was raised: is it necessary for expediency for the Superintendent to be able to act without bringing in the Board? This is part of the problem that our attorneys have cautioned on. That is why the law was written as District so the Board would not have to take action every time. P.R.E.S.S. is very clear in their belief of a Board governing structure. It has also been suggested that there be language written in for caveats that in certain circumstances you do not have to wait for Board approval. Discussion took place on the Board meeting calendar and if the

members can be summoned for an unscheduled meeting within a few hours. It was commented that we are trying to solidify communication and collaboration. Clarification was requested -- When the Governor declares a disaster, it has to be every 30 days -- does that mean the Board has to vote every 30 days? The question was asked: if a Governor declares a disaster does that mean we have to follow the guidelines or does it have to be issued as an executive order -- i.e. a disaster in Southern Illinois does not necessarily affect us. Discussion took place on a public health emergency and regions of the state -- request to have verbiage possibly expanded or clarified "as in the case of a pandemic for DuPage County." Concern was raised on what rights does the District have? It was agreed to move the policy forward to the Board with clarification of declaration of disaster or executive order being discussed with the attorney. A change was requested on page one in the third paragraph to be revised to: "other members as noted in Exhibit 4:180-E1." A request was made to have changes from P.R.E.S.S. indicated in red and others from the attorneys or administration in blue going forward. Clarification was provided that the Committee is always advised if an attorney has included remarks, but staff would look into this. A request was made to go back to the last paragraph on the first page where it stipulates: "The Superintendent shall consult with the Board to determine the extent to which continued payment of the salaries and benefits will be made to the District's employees." A concern was raised that this did not say the Board has to vote. The Committee was advised that the district has multiple collective bargaining agreements (CBA) that would take precedence. This paragraph would impact only those not in a non-bargaining unit such as confidentials or administrators, but these people are generally under contract. If a memorandum of understanding on a CBA was needed, the Board would be required to vote. Part of the issue is that this is all things the Board needs to be aware of, but the Board should have to vote on every single thing involving the pandemic. Everything has to happen very quickly. After discussion, the consensus was to keep the term "consult." A vote was taken on which paragraph option to use on page 2 of 3. Consensus was to include the paragraph that stated "the Superintendent shall approve and present to the Board for adoption a Remote and/or Blended Remote Learning Day Plan"

8. Administrative Procedure 4:180-AP1, *School Action Steps for Pandemic Influenza or Other Virus/Disease (Name Change)* -- No comments made.
9. Exhibit 4:180-E1, *Pandemic Planning Team Structure (New)* - The question was asked on what is the difference between a Board Committee and Superintendent Committee. Clarification was provided that it was the number of members. Concern was raised on the exhibit noting the District 87 Pandemic Planning Team as Superintendent based. The Committee was advised that P.R.E.S.S. recommends the Superintendent format. Concern was raised on the make-up of members shown and the fact that community members would be represented from those that are a part of the Superintendent Advisory Committee. This may preclude the District from someone's expertise or knowledge from a different perspective. The Committee was advised there is nothing that impedes you from putting more people on the committee, it just stipulates the bare minimum.
10. Administrative Procedure 4:180-AP2, *Pandemic Influenza Surveillance and Reporting*

Due to time constraints, Items 11 (Policy 5:220) and 12 (Administrative Procedure 6:20-AP1) will be continued to the next meeting in order to accommodate the public participation request. Items 1 through 10 will be moving forward to the Board. Prior to the switch in schedule, a request was made that another Policy Committee be held on November 30th or earlier, if possible. Chambers will discuss further after the meeting and send an email to the Committee as appropriate.

Daigel advised that the Committee had the same language as paragraph 1 in policy 4:180 presented to them at the last meeting and it was interpreted that the Superintendent can make the decision unilaterally - now you have the same paragraph under consideration and you are saying it goes the other way, which is incorrect. The Committee will not gain what they think they are. Daigel further stated that she spoke with the ISBE's legal department and the ROE. The ROE conveyed that the Board has to vote on it because it is part of the Board's policy under 2:20. The language in both paragraphs does not make that happen and she questioned who wrote it. Secondly, Diegal stated that just including community members participation into the exhibit is not going to work because it does not have the force of a policy. You really need to get the language straight. Diegal stated she had talked with the P.R.E.S.S. people and they do the floor (basic plan) -- when they recommend something that does not mean it is what you should adopt. Thirdly, the difference between a Superintendent Committee and a Board Committee is that the Board one has eyes on it, there are committee minutes and public accountability. A Superintendent committee does not have that and she believes this should be a Board committee.

Action: Motion made to adjourn the meeting, seconded and carried.

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Signed:

<small>DocuSigned by:</small>	
<i>Jennifer Jendras</i>	12/14/20
<small>716366C4CC4C4AC...</small>	
Jennifer Jendras	Date
Policy Committee Chairman (or designee)	