

LAMOILLE UNION DISTRICT #18 BOARD  
POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES  
GMTCC COMMUNITY EDUCATION CENTER  
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2009

Committee members present: S. Reber, B. Penberthy, P. Ingvoldstad.  
Others: C. Hinds, B. Schaffer, J. Teegarden, D. Taylor, D. Whitcomb, S. Bernath.

The meeting started at 5:30.

S. Reber suggested the committee review the policies that had been mentioned at previous meetings, and prioritize them. There is the substance abuse policy. There is a policy on students expelled from other schools. B. Schaffer explained that the policy only talks about students expelled from other schools in VT. He contacted the state Board of Ed to ask about students expelled from school in other states, and they said LUHS must either provide an education to such a student or go through the expulsion process again. The policy should be brought into alignment with statute. We might want to look at the policy on residency of pupils and consider allowing a prorated transportation fee.

S. Bernath and D. Whitcomb arrived at 5:34. B. Schaffer introduced S. Bernath, who will be sharing student rep duties with Jen Prescott.

There is the student medication policy. B. Schaffer said the VSBA model for that works fine with current practice. S. Reber said he had emailed out the revised version of the driver's ed policy, which is ready to take to the board for warning.

S. Reber said an updated policy manual is ready for distribution. He asked, do we want to continue to present the manual on the website? Do we want to update the entire document whenever we update one policy? P. Ingvoldstad said he thought we should just make sure the web version is up to date, but not print out new paper copies every time there is a change. S. Reber said the manual needs some standardization. Some policies have a "date reviewed" and some have the dates they were warned and adopted. S. Reber asked what this board means by "date reviewed." It was agreed that that does not refer to legal review, but to a date when the policy is reviewed but not changed. It was agreed that that information should be shown on the bottom left of the page from now on. P. Ingvoldstad reviewed the VSBA recommendation for warning and adopting policies: to warn the policy at one meeting, then discuss it at a second, then adopt it at a third. It was agreed that the committee should mail out copies of proposed policies before the meeting where the policy will be recommended for warning. S. Reber said people will be able to get the updated manual on paper, on a CD, or by downloading from the website.

There was discussion about whether a student medication policy is required. S. Reber will check on that. P. Ingvoldstad asked how the board can know required procedures are in place. D. Taylor suggested there could be reports from administrators. B. Schaffer said he is pretty confident LUHS procedures are up to date, and we have needed ones.

The committee discussed Policy 4.10 (Substance Abuse.) S. Reber had mailed out the VSBA model policy. B. Schaffer said he had some questions/concerns about this policy. One is the

definition of a drug. It doesn't address over the counter drugs, or the method by which students ingest the substance. Sometimes students buy over the counter substances and crush and snort them. B. Schaffer would like something in the policy about method of ingestion in the definitions section. B. Schaffer said the current policy mentions parent information and training programs, but he is not sure what those programs are supposed to consist of, or who is supposed to provide them. Also, the policy is laden with procedure. And B. Schaffer noted that possession, consumption, or intoxication are easy to demonstrate, but sale, distribution, or exchange are hard to demonstrate. Do we want to treat having drugs differently from sale of drugs as far as consequences? The current policy requires that for the first violation, a student must show proof of a scheduled appointment with our SAP before returning to class. He would advocate for stronger language, requiring the student to actually meet with the SAP, not just make an appointment. He also asked if the language in the policy should be changed so that there is more administrative choice about which students need to appear before the board.

D. Taylor agreed that the policy should say students must have attended an appointment with the SAP. She said we have received legal guidance regarding the substance abuse policy and students with disabilities. SPED law usually trumps local policy and procedure. Our policy conflicts with federal law which says that only the IEP team should determine placement for a student on an IEP. She has some recommended language for the policy.

J. Teegarden said he thinks there is no value in the policy's provision that selling or distributing tobacco requires a student to be removed from school for 10 days. He feels it is ridiculous for him to have to enforce a rule against passing around cigarettes. He thinks the penalties for tobacco use are very harsh and don't solve the problem.

C. Hindes said he thinks the language in the policy needs to be further refined and made more concise, and we need to work on procedures to support the policy. B. Schaffer agreed; he thinks we should remove some procedure from the policy.

D. Whitcomb said we should look at home suspension. Students love it. It is better to have in-school suspension for small infractions. C. Hindes said sometimes having students at school can be a safety issue.

S. Reber asked everyone to read the VSBA model policy on substance abuse for next time and be ready to discuss what is wrong with it. J. Teegarden asked S. Bernath to read it and talk it over with other students to see what they think. He will do the same with kids in his school, to see if students think this policy is a good way to accomplish what we want to accomplish.

C. Hindes said he thought it would be good to collaborate with community partners, to learn from them about best practices, etc.

D. Taylor said the hiring practices policy calls for related procedures to be developed, but there is some legislation pending that will give direction about how to address contractors. Rather than putting procedures in place now that might conflict with a new statute, she would like to wait until the new statute is passed, then adjust the policy if needed or proceed with implementation.

The meeting ended at 6:32.