

LAMOILLE UNION DISTRICT #18 BOARD
POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
GMTCC COMMUNITY EDUCATION CENTER
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2009

Committee members present: D. Osborn, S. Reber, K. Roberts.
Others: B. Schaffer, J. Teegarden, C. Hindes.

The meeting started at about 5:35.

B. Schaffer recommended adopting the VSBA model policy in place of our current drug policy. D. Osborn asked how the VSBA policy is different from what we have now. B. Schaffer said what we have now is very prescriptive, and violates special ed law. He would like to have more flexibility. Also, the current policy makes distribution a worse offense than possession, but it is hard to prove distribution is occurring. D. Osborn asked J. Teegarden if the current policy has the same limitations at the tech center. J. Teegarden said he has an issue with the tobacco part of the policy, which puts tobacco on par with drugs. D. Osborn said the VSBA model separates out tobacco from drugs. J. Teegarden said it doesn't make sense to have such a severe penalty for distribution of cigarettes.

The VSBA model is divided into policy and procedures. Some of the procedure part seems to be required by state statute. B. Schaffer will come up with a recommended version, answering the question of whether some of the procedure has to be part of the policy. S. Reber suggested we could adopt the new policy soon, but say it takes effect later – in June or July – if that works better for the school. D. Osborn suggested B. Schaffer could get a copy of the new recommended policy to C. McFarlane before the policy committee's next meeting.

J. Teegarden hasn't done anything yet with the HIPAA policy, but he said he would come up with a recommendation.

The 2nd meeting in November was moved to the carousel meeting night. D. Osborn can't be here for that meeting. B. Schaffer and J. Teegarden can email their policy recommendations so the committee can review them before its next meeting.

There had been discussion about updating the background check policy to align with new state statute. B. Schaffer said he and S. Cano have had numerous conversations on this topic. One subsection requires that the commissioner provide the legislature with recommendations about required actions for volunteers and work study students. So the committee might want to wait until the state does some work first. The state's work should be done by Jan. 15, 2010. (*C. Hindes arrived at 6:04.*) K. Roberts asked, should we look at our policy in light of rewriting it to align with statute, but give it flexibility so that it will still align if the law changes? K. Roberts will take a look at the current policy and get in touch with S. Cano regarding her work, and also check and see if VSBA is working on anything related. She will bring what she learns back to the next meeting.

J. Teegarden said he has been working with S. Cano too. He wrote a procedure regarding background checks. An important question is whether an employee will be unsupervised with students. Employees include anyone you pay – for instance, someone who gives a presentation to students. Then there is the question of people at businesses we send students to for co-op experiences. Maybe instead of waiting for the state to come out with recommendations, we should think of all the situations that may arise and tell the state to be mindful of them. K. Roberts suggested putting together a letter telling the commissioner about things we would like him to consider. D. Taylor could deliver it to him when she meets with him this month. J. Teegarden said he will bring this up as an agenda item for the monthly directors' meeting. K. Roberts suggested J. Teegarden could put together some thoughts to be included in the letter. She can work on the letter. B. Schaffer said we pay some students a small amount to do jobs such as acting as ball boys or ball girls at games. The policy seems to require that we do a background check on those students. J. Teegarden noted that there are students at the tech center who are on the sex offender list and could potentially be alone with other students.

D. Osborn said D. Taylor had recommended that we update the background check policy to say that we require a sex offender check for work study students and volunteers. The administrators said they do that now. K. Roberts said maybe we can see if we can add that to procedure without changing the policy.

D. Osborn said she wondered about parents, and the public's right to know vs. someone's right to privacy. What if she gives permission to another parent to pick up her kid and the school knows that parent is on the sex offender registry? C. Hinder said he would let her know the other parent was on the registry. It's a matter of public record. D. Osborn suggested we could tell parents what resources they could access, and that they should be aware of who their kids are riding with.

The meeting ended at 6:23.

Minutes submitted by Donna Griffiths