MINUTES

MURFREESBORO CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION
SPECIAL CALLED BOARD MEETING--
POLICY WORK SESSION
Tuesday, June 12, 2012
6:00 p.m.—Central Administration Building

ATTENDANCE


Staff: Director Linda Gilbert, Gary Anderson, Tammy Grizzard, Ralph Ringstaff, Lisa Trail, and Priscilla Van Tries.

Others: Staff Attorney Kelley Baker.

I. CALL TO ORDER BY BOARD CHAIR

Chair Wade called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF DISCOVERY SCHOOL EESI CHANGE ORDER

Mr. Anderson explained that the bid for The Discovery School HVAC system came in lower than expected allowing the project to expand to include the gymnasium and cafeteria with a remaining balance of $5,662.57. The project also has $20,000 for contingency expenses. Dr. Brown moved to approve the Change Order as presented; Mr. Campbell seconded the motion. The motion carried by acclamation. The building will now have windows.

III. BOARD POLICY REVIEW

For Further Discussion: (Passed on First Reading)

PER 22—Personnel Records (Revision)

Mrs. Baker presented PER 22 as revised. Dr. Brown asked that lines 29-30 be specific as to the date the thirty-day period would begin. He also pointed out that line 71 through 81 is one sentence. Mr. Campbell suggested the items could be bulleted for easier reading. Mrs. Baker will make the revisions and bring the policy back to the Board for final approval.

STU 18—Child Abuse and/or Neglect (Complete Rewrite)

Mrs. Baker presented STU 18 to the Board; there were no additional significant recommended revisions other than typographical. Mrs. Baker will bring the policy back to the Board for final approval.
STU 43—Use of Personal Communication Devices in School  (*Complete Rewrite*)

Mrs. Baker presented STU 43 asking if the Board recommended any additional revisions; there were none. Mrs. Baker will bring the policy as presented back to the Board for final approval.

*For Discussion: (Requesting Approval on First Reading)*

SS 9—Child Nutrition Management  (*Revision*)

Mr. Anderson explained that revisions as indicated on lines 46-48 are based on changes in Federal law. There are five instead of four food component groups, and students must take three with one of those items being a fruit or a vegetable, although they can choose five items. In response to Dr. Brown’s question, Mr. Anderson explained that students are not allowed access to vending machines; however, a vending machine can be placed in the teacher work area for employees. Mr. Campbell voiced a concern about the principal’s authority relative to the operations of the cafeteria. Mr. Anderson explained that by Federal law, the cafeteria manager must have the authority to manage the food service program as they have received the training/information regarding Federal regulations that principals are not fully aware of. He stated that the principal does have a working relationship with the Supervisor of Nutrition on personnel issues, curriculum, etc. Dr. Gilbert stated that Mr. Campbell’s concern has been addressed through an administrative directive. Mrs. Rainier moved to approve the policy as presented on first reading; Mrs. Smith seconded the motion. The motion carried by acclamation.

IS 12—Grading System  (*Rewrite*)

Mrs. Hawkins reviewed the proposed Grading System policy and sharing that the student report cards are now reflective of the new state standards. Parents will have a more complete understanding of what their students are being taught and what they have mastered or are having difficulty learning. Mrs. Smith asked if the 93-100 grading scale is mandated. Mrs. Hawkins stated that she did not entertain any adjustments to the grading scale at the time she revised the policy, but that the grading scale had been a Board’s decision. Report cards will be printed each grading period, reflecting all grades up to that point, and parents will keep the report card each grading period signing and returning only the report card cover to the teacher. In response to Mr. Campbell’s question, Mr. Anderson stated that printers and supplies for the report cards will be provided to the schools. Mrs. Baker pointed out that in response to Mrs. Rainier, the following revision will be made regarding parent/teacher conferences: *The Board has assigned two administrative teacher contract days for parent/teacher conferences. This equates to six (6) hours in the fall and six (6) hours in the spring that teachers would be available to meet with parents in conference.* Mr. Campbell moved to approve IS 12 with the recommended revisions on first reading; Dr. Brown seconded the motion. The motion carried by acclamation.
STU 10—Student Safety (Revision)

Mrs. Baker reviewed STU 10 as presented asking the Board if they had any additional recommended revisions. Mr. Barrett asked if the parking lot should be added to item number two. Dr. Brown suggested that “school grounds” instead of “the playground” would be more inclusive of all areas. He also suggested that line 24 be reworded. Mrs. Baker stated that these revisions would be made. Dr. Brown asked if all schools have safety teams. Mr. Anderson stated that the schools do have safety teams or “first responders” usually comprised of 4-6 employees. Mrs. Rainier moved to approve STU 10 on first reading with the recommended revisions; Mr. Barrett seconded the motion. The motion carried by acclamation.

STU 20—Procedural Due Process (Revision)

Mrs. Baker presented STU 20 with the recommended changes. She noted that on line 17 “knew” should be changed to “knows.” She explained that the policy comes into play when a student has been suspended for ten or more days or for expulsion as a disciplinary measure. No additional revisions were recommended. Mrs. Rainier moved to approve STU 20 on first reading; Mr. Campbell seconded the motion. The motion carried by acclamation.

STU 21—Interrogations and Searches (Revision)

Mrs. Baker presented STU 21 reviewing the revisions as indicated in bold. In response to Dr. Brown, she stated that constitutional rights were “Miranda” rights. She explained that the principal or principal’s designee can remain during an interrogation unless the law enforcement or DCS officials state that they must leave. In response to Dr. Brown’s question, she explained that on line 41, “constructive possession” means that the drug, paraphernalia, weapon, etc. are not on the student’s physical person, but in the student’s locker, backpack, etc. No additional revisions were recommended. Dr. Brown moved to approve STU 21 as presented on first reading; Mr. Campbell seconded the motion. The motion carried by acclamation.

STU 31—Communicable Diseases (Students) (Revision)

Mrs. Baker presented STU 31 reviewing the revisions as indicated in bold. Dr. Brown pointed out that a couple of the paragraphs could be moved to provide consistency in the flow of information, such as inserting lines 22-30 after the second paragraph. Mrs. Baker stated she will make the changes. Mr. Barrett moved to approve STU 31 with the recommended revisions on first reading; Mr. Campbell seconded the motion. The motion carried by acclamation.
Mrs. Baker reviewed STU 32. The Board did not recommend any additional revisions. Dr. Brown moved to approve STU 32 as presented on first reading; Mrs. Smith seconded the motion. The motion carried by acclamation.

Mrs. Baker reviewed the revisions to STU 34 indicated in bold, noting that more detail was added to more clearly define what is required by law. Items 1-8 came from state statutes. Mr. Barrett pointed out the reference to clothing in item one, and also asked if stimulant drugs such as the recently publicized bath salts are covered. Mrs. Baker stated that statutes have recently been revised to cover those type of “drugs.” No additional revisions were recommended. Mr. Barrett moved to approve STU 34 as presented on first reading; Mr. Campbell seconded the motion. The motion carried by acclamation.

Ms. Baker noted that the only revision to STU 35 was on line 13 with the deletion of “resource officer.” Dr. Brown stated he is aware that employees cannot smoke on hospital property. Following discussion, Mrs. Smith stated that although past law indicated that an employee might smoke on the school campus a certain distance from the building (50 feet), she would prefer that the Board ban smoking on a school campus. Mrs. Baker stated that she would review and share with the Board state statutes regarding how this is regulated. Dr. Brown moved to approve STU 35 contingent on changes relative to the law on first reading; Mr. Barrett seconded the motion. The motion carried by acclamation.

Mrs. Baker pointed out that the purpose of the policy is to state that MCS shall not permit the use of corporal punishment as a disciplinary measure in any school. Mrs. Rainier moved to approve STU 27 as presented on first reading; Mr. Barrett seconded the motion. The motion carried by acclamation.

Dr. Gilbert stated that she would like to delay review of this policy until she has had more time to review the policy with administration and with principals, and possibly determine with Mrs. Baker if a portion of the policy could be addressed in an administrative directive. The policy applies to students receiving special education services, but she would like to determine if the same protocol could apply to the general education population. She would also like to review the reporting forms.
Dr. Gilbert stated that every school has a person trained in restraint that can then train individuals in his/her building. Mrs. Baker stated that training is required annually. Reports are submitted to the state and to the school system. Mrs. Hawkins stated that the initial certification in restraint takes a day, but recertification takes less time. Assistant principals are trained to train employees in their buildings. Dr. Brown stated that ideally all employees should be trained, including ESP staff.

After discussion, STU 59 was tabled for review at a future board meeting.

IV. REVIEW OF JUNE 26, 2012 DRAFT AGENDA

There were no recommended revisions to the June 26, 2012 board meeting agenda.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

Mrs. Baker stated that special meetings are treated differently than regularly scheduled board meetings, and an Opinion has come down with specific requirements, as corroborated by Judge Corlew. Special meetings must be advertised, and the advertisement must include all topics to be discussed at that special meeting. Agenda items cannot be added once advertised. She stated that if the Board would wish to make the policy review sessions regular board meetings, meaning the City School Board meets twice per month, then the requirements regarding agenda items and advertisement would be the same as the regularly scheduled board meetings. This request would have to be submitted to City Council and be approved on three readings. Mrs. Baker will pursue this and communicate with the Board.

In response to Mrs. Smith’s question, Mr. Ringstaff stated that approximately 40 employees left MCS through either retirement, resignation or non-renewal. By law, new teachers are assigned two mentors. Dr. Gilbert stated that this year she had also acquired the services of Susan Gendrich and Sandra Parks who developed a program to secure and train mentors for our teachers. Next year, Mrs. Hawkins will put into place a mentoring program for new teachers and provide support for teachers who need assistance. Mrs. Hawkins briefed the Board on what that approach will be, ultimately providing intervention and helping teachers be successful.

Dr. Gilbert stated that the system has progressed and succeeded. Professional Learning Communities have been key. The focus has been on academics and also on the whole child, socially and emotionally. MCS has developed effective outreach programs with partnerships, such as the Mobile Health Unit. Olweus and COMP training have been provided. A new approach has taken place to address behavior issues involving small groups, guidance counselors, social workers, and interventionists. Dr. Brown stated that non-renewals are unpleasant, and new teachers should be given the help they need to succeed, but the first priority must be the students.
Dr. Brown suggested that principals attend board meetings to assure that they know what is being discussed and to provide input when needed. Dr. Gilbert stated that rather than make board meetings mandatory, principals can be invited to attend. Mr. Campbell suggested that work sessions would be the opportune time for principals to attend.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Mrs. Wade adjourned the board meeting at approximately 8:30 p.m.

________________________
Director of Schools

MISSION STATEMENT

To assure academic and personal success for each child.