



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, January 11, 2021

The Policy Committee held its monthly meeting via Zoom Web Conference on Monday, January 11, 2021. The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

In attendance:

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

Patrick McGill, Executive Director for
Teaching & Learning
David Hennessey, GEA Representative
Patris Haxhiaj, Student Liaison
Diana Flint, Recording Secretary

Quorum requirements were met and the meeting was able to proceed.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the Policy Committee meeting for December 14, 2020 were reviewed.
Action: Motion made to accept, seconded, and carried.

Public Participation

(Public Participation was held during discussion and is noted within text below.)

Items for Discussion

Chambers advised there were two administrative procedures for review. The second procedure has a revised version for consideration and a request from a community member in attendance to remove the procedure completely. As we move forward to discussion for the second procedure, Grace Daigel will be given five minutes for public participation to explain why she believes the procedure is not needed and then the committee can review the revision that came through SPA (Student Parent Association). If there are any additions or concerns, the Committee can make changes during the meeting.

1. Administrative Procedure 5:30-AP2, *Investigations*: The procedure was modified with an additional clause that the Superintendent or designee will notify the State Superintendent's office within ten days of a pending charge of any employee for any of the enumerated offenses set forth in the statute. If the district were to become aware of

an arrest or pending charges, it is the District's responsibility to notify the State Superintendent's office. Under the new law, the State Superintendent can pull and suspend the license while the charges are pending in court. Discussion took place on whether the suspension would take place with pay. The committee was advised that the District would have a discussion with the Board in this instance.

2. Administrative Procedure 6:310-AP7, *Schedule Changes*: The floor was then turned over to Daigel to present her reasoning for the Committee to remove the procedure in its totality. Daigel advised that the procedure was established in 1999 on dropping courses. It was a simple, short document that said that the student can drop courses within the first ten days of a semester. Sometime in late 2008, people wanted to repurpose the procedure to become not just a drop policy, but a schedule change one. In October of 2008 during a series of meetings, the District Administrative Council reached out to School Counselors who wanted a cut-off date of April 30. At that time, East and West appeared to be very interested in this deadline. Changes in 2015 were just a couple of housekeeping issues. Things remained quiet until the fall of 2020 when McGill met with the counselors who said they wanted to get rid of the April 30 deadline. Daigel stated she wanted to go over the history to see why the procedure existed at all. She stated it is human nature that when things already exist, you want to revise it or keep it going because you think that is what you are supposed to do; it is more difficult to say we do not need this anymore. She used the analogy of finally getting rid of something you have been holding on to at a garage sale. Daigel went on to elaborate that she did a 42-district survey and no other school district in DuPage County has this in their policy manual. She advised she went beyond DuPage County and could not find anything comparable. She felt that the initial drop procedure from 1999 was not a big deal, but things became more substantial in 2008. Daigel stated we need to rethink if this procedure should even exist. Perhaps, the District made these revisions for transparency reasons, but the procedure is actually hiding under Policy 6:310 *High School Credit for Non-District Experiences; Course Substitutions; Re-Entering Students*. It is a needle in a haystack. The other school districts put things like this in the course catalog, student handbook, and Guidance Department webpage -- logical places you would look. The procedure is also being used as a floor. If the Board policy is very restrictive and it does not let kids pick anything after April 30 and then someone at the high school level extends the deadline to be less restrictive, they are actually violating Board policy. At the SPA meeting one of the Principals emphasized it was important for things to be user friendly. However, the suggested revisions do not read well and do not appear to be something a student would understand. The fact that it exists interferes with the student/Counselor relationship. According to ASCA (American School Counselor Association), eighty-percent of a Counselor's time is supposed to be spent interacting with the student not having spreadsheets behind the scenes where they are coming up with ways to figure things out. It would be better to just say to the student, "Hey, what is going on with you? I understand you want this changed. Can you tell me more about it?" That is the eighty percent of time. The spreadsheet time does not count. It gives the student the perception that the Counselor is a very important person, but somehow does not have the authority to make the routine changes they would need. It undermines the Counselor. So, what is the purpose of this procedure? It is not to protect the Counselor from volume because a Principal advised at the SPA meeting that the building does not get a tsunami of requests.

It probably actually hurts flexibility. SPA was advised there was an infinite number of schedule change scenarios that come up and we cannot come up with a policy to cover everything. We need to repeal this procedure.

McGill, Executive Director for Teaching & Learning - Curriculum and Pathways, then spoke. He stated that in 2020 through the pandemic and certain situations, this procedure was brought to our attention in that it was not necessarily what was happening in our buildings, nor necessarily all we can do for our students in terms of flexibility and accommodations for schedules. The first thing we did was look at what we are currently doing and what are other districts around us doing. To narrow the focus a little, there are a few key pieces referenced in the old procedure, one being that a student can drop a class up until April 30 and after that they are rejected. Also, it says that class changes could be made after the school year begins but does not necessarily encompass all that we do. So, we looked to see what other districts do. We found six comparable practices.

- One has a date immediately after the schedule is done and does not allow changes afterwards.
- One has different dates based on the course.
- One has a mid-March date.
- One has a March 1 date.
- One has a June 1 date.
- One has no changes except for an appeal process required in writing or an administrator deems it is necessary.

Districts are doing different things, from being really restrictive to June 1 being the most laxed. When we talked with our Counseling Department Chairs (DC), they said if there is room in a class and it is best for the student; it aligns with the student's post-secondary plan; and, we talked with both the Department Chair and parent, they would make the change anyway. The Counseling DC's made the initial recommendation to do away with the April 30th date. They discussed it with their staff and then shared it with the Assistant Principals of Instruction, as well as their Principals. Therefore, we deleted the April 30th deadline. We added some more situations that could and do allow for more schedule changes, and we added clarification on who can approve changes. This was discussed at SPA and two recommendations were made to the proposed revision. The word "Preference" was removed from the start of the second sentence of the second paragraph and item 4 was revised to remove the word "extreme" before social/emotional issues, as well as the verbiage "causing the student to fail multiple courses" from the same sentence because it could be just the beginning of school.

Since that time, Jendras and McGill have discussed additional changes. First, to have Item A be in the same format or layout as Item B so it is easier to read. Second, to have the language be more affirming so we say it will be granted based on the following considerations. Jendras elaborated that under item A, which is prior to the school year, a change can be made as long as these considerations or criteria are met. McGill stated that they discussed also adding to the first paragraph that each school will create a form that students can use to request a change and the pros/cons of SPA putting the form in policy so they did not have to revisit Policy Committee every time it needs to be revised.

Jendras recommended that for Item B to flip language around so it reads will be made with these considerations listed in A and then it has to be approved under the considerations noted in B. In Item A, before the school year, the student can make the request for whatever reason, but in Item B kind of extenuating circumstances or reason for the request. Discussion took place on what happens for the second semester. McGill explained that after the school year is started sectioning is done and a student is underway with their learning so more scrutiny needs to take place. It was agreed to insert language in Item B to cover this. Christensen commented that probably the reason it was made more difficult to drop a class previously based on verbiage written was because the District makes hiring decisions and whether to run a class on strict minimums of students enrolled. She expressed concern about students not taking their course registration seriously. Discussion took place on the potential effects of a class when it drops below the minimum enrollment. The Committee was advised that after sectioning is complete, a class would not be shut down. However, the District would not establish a new class once sectioning is complete. No Counselor is opposed to making a schedule change if there is course availability in another class. It is, however, a nightmare if you do not state that specifically. Students also have the ability to request a study hall if there are no openings as long as it is not going to impact their ability to graduate on time or their college needs.

Due to time limitations to make the Board meeting following, it was requested that 6:310-AP7 continue to the next Policy Committee meeting and be brought back with comments from this meeting. Administrative Procedure 5:30-AP2 will go forward to the School Board.

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

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Signed:



Jennifer Jendras

Policy Committee Chairman (or designee)

2/8/2021

Date