

**Mahomet-Seymour  
COMMUNITY UNIT DISTRICT NO. 3  
Champaign County, Illinois  
Meeting of the Board of Education Policy Committee**

Held in the Board Conference Room

Date: September 30, 2019

**12:30 Policy Committee Meeting**

**1. Call to order**

The Policy Committee Meeting was called to order at 12:30 p.m.

**2. Roll Call**

Policy Committee members present for the roll call were Lori Larson and Meghan Hennesy. Also present was Superintendent, Dr. Lindsey Hall and Board Recorder, Dawn Quinley.

**3. Pledge of Allegiance**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited by all in attendance.

**4. Approval of Agenda**

Mrs. Larson requested that Committee Purpose be added to the agenda.

**Motion** was made by Hennesy, seconded by Larson, *to approve the agenda as amended.* The motion passed.

**5. Approval of 8/12/19 Minutes**

**Motion** was made by Larson, seconded by Hennesy to approve the minutes as presented. The motion passed.

**6. Public Comment**

Dr. Lindsey Hall called for any public participation forms. There was no public participation.

**7. Credits for Graduation Policy for MSHS, Policy 6:310**

Mr. Lybarger and Mr. Benedict reviewed proposed revisions to Policy 6:310. There are three areas encompassed by the proposed policy: credit recovery, courses exceeding MSHS curriculum, and supplemental courses.

- **Credit recovery:** Mr. Benedict reviewed the criteria for receiving credit in credit recovery situations. The proposed policy removes the current limit of one credit that can be transferred back for credit recovery.
- **Courses exceeding MSHS Curriculum:** Mr. Benedict reviewed criteria for students to receive credit for courses that exceed the curriculum offered at the high school. Mrs. Hennesy asked if thought had been given to students who may need or want to rearrange their schedule because of work load or learning styles, not just for students who have exceeded the curriculum. Mr. Benedict explained that the thought among administrators and counselors is that if the high school offers a course, students should take it from MSHS. There may be exceptions to the rule on a case by case basis with approval by the principal. Mr. Lybarger further explained that often courses that are offered over the summer are intended for credit recovery and not acceleration, so students often come back with holes in their knowledge of the subject and struggle with classes that follow in that area. Math is currently the area that sees the most number of students who have exceeded the course offerings at the high school level.
- **Supplemental Courses (courses not offered at MSHS):** Mr. Benedict reviewed criteria for students to receive credit for courses not offered at the high school. Mrs. Hennesy asked how often these types of requests are received for these types of courses and stated that she would want the Board to be aware of trends so that new courses can be considered if needed. Mr. Benedict indicated that the computer science course is a good example of this and the course will be offered at the high school in the future.

Mrs. Larson asked what common courses are that students go out of District for. Mr. Lybarger indicated that they see the least number of requests for supplemental courses, and credit recovery has the most requests. He commented that he has seen students take psychology and photography courses from other institutions. Mrs. Hennesy asked what areas are students needing courses that exceed the curriculum. Mr. Lybarger indicated that they see this the most with math. There are also about a dozen students participating in ECCA (Early College and Career Academy) at Parkland. This program allows students to get high school and college credit in several different areas. Dr. Hall commented that the proposed policy will be presented to the full Board for a first reading on October 21.

**8. Updated Proposed Policy 2:240 & 2:20**

Ken Keefe explained that the only thing that has changed from the last time the committee met and reviewed the changes to Policy 2:240 was the addition of a sentence recommended by the IASB of the role of the policy committee. The Policy Committee discussed the proposed changes including the proposed forms and the additional procedures that would be needed to complete and store the forms. The Committee also discussed sending the policy to the Board and whether it has committee approval. The consensus was to send it to the Board for consideration to be voted on at the next meeting, highlighting the change to the proposed Board Consideration form, and indicating committee approval.

Mr. Keefe explained the reason for changes being recommended to Policy 2:20 which seeks to add a 20<sup>th</sup> power to the powers of the school board. Mrs. Larson mentioned that she noticed that Mr. Keefe left out a legal reference and that she is not comfortable with taking out legal references when it comes to policy. Mr. Keefe explained that the statute referenced has been repealed and that as he worked on the policy, he looked at why it was left out. Larson explained that she has a hard time comparing the old policy and proposed policy without the redline version. Keefe said that he would be sure to explain proposed changes in his presentation and in the rationale page he is proposing. The Policy Committee agreed to send the proposed policy to the Board for consideration to be voted on at the next meeting indicating committee approval.

**9. Proposed Policy 7:40**

Colleen Schultz reviewed the current policy and her proposed changes. She explained that it is very similar to what the IASB recommends. She indicated that several surrounding counties, and other schools in the state, allow homeschool and other non-public school students to participate in school district extracurricular activities. Surrounding school districts not allowing homeschool student participation include Champaign, Monticello, Gibson City, and Mahomet. School districts allowing homeschool student participation include Urbana, Blue Ridge, Fisher, and Unity, along with some others. Mrs. Larson stated that she has some questions about the financial implications, and how to monitor in-school eligibility. Mrs. Schultz indicated that there are two things required by the IHSA: they must live in the District, and they need to have curriculum approved by whoever the Board decides will approve it. She further explained that eligibility is determined by the teacher, so in this instance, this is the parent. Financially, Mrs. Schultz commented that homeschool parents pay the same taxes as everyone else, and they are not asking that they create additional activities for homeschool students. Mrs. Hennesy stated that she thinks it would be good to figure this out for parents. She acknowledged that determining how to implement this in the District, including what sort of manpower would be required and at what cost, would need to be determined. Dr. Hall clarified that the District is not one of only four schools in the state who do not allow homeschool students to participate in District extracurricular activities, and also that there are no schools in the District's athletic conference allowing it. Mrs. Larson said that in order for her to consider it, she would like more information about the numbers of students who might be interested in this option, and what it would look like to oversee the process. Mrs. Schultz indicated that she would be willing to compile data on the number of students who might be interested and what activities they might be interested in participating in, but that it would be a best guess as she is not aware of specific students who want to participate in specific activities.

Mr. Hensley shared that if the Board would choose to implement this policy, the District would be required to approve curriculum. He explained that philosophically, if curriculum were approved for four years, the District would be saying that the student has satisfied the requirements to be awarded a diploma from Mahomet-Seymour High School. The reason the District would choose to not approve curriculum is because we want to award diplomas to students who attend school in our building and complete our curriculum. Mrs. Schultz stated that there is a way around this of articulating courses as electives and not as required courses.

Dr. Hall asked for clarification about whether the intent of the proposed changes is just to include homeschool students or if it would extend to other non-public school students as well. Mrs. Schultz stated that the intent of the policy is to allow both homeschool and non-public school students who are not already attending a school that offers IHSA sponsored programs.

Consensus among members of the committee was to ask Mrs. Schultz to bring additional data on the subject to the October Board meeting, and to present the proposed policy for a first reading at the October Board meeting.

**10. Instructional Materials, Policy 6:210**

The Policy Committee discussed proposed revisions to Policy 6:210 and the timeframe for notification and mechanism for parents to choose to opt their child out of a movie being shown. Dr. Hall asked for clarification about whether the committee is suggesting permission for all levels of all movies, and suggested getting permission for junior high students and older for movies with a rating of PG-13 and above. She also recommended tacit permission unless a parent opts out. The Policy Committee discussed giving parents 48 hours of notification from teachers that a movie will be shown. Dr. Hall suggested using wording of "a minimum of 48 hours," and a reminder to parents closer to the date of the movie being shown. Dr. Hall also asked if the committee would be open to creating a table summarizing what level of permission/notification is required by movie rating. The Policy Committee agreed to include in the policy revisions a table summarizing level of permission/notification by rating, wording that indicates teachers should give a minimum of 48 hours of notification, sending a reminder to parents closer to the

time the movie is to be shown, and requiring parents to opt out of their child seeing any movie. The committee agreed that the revised policy will go to the full Board for a vote at the October 21 meeting.

**11. Parental Involvement, Policy 8:95**

The Policy Committee discussed Policy 8:95. The consensus among members was to include, “the Superintendent and Building Principals,” in the two sentences of the policy that currently only reference the Superintendent. The Policy Committee members agreed to send the revised policy back to the full Board with the proposed changes for a vote at the October 21 meeting.

**12. Proposed Changes to Technology AUP**

Mrs. Hennesy provided those in attendance with a copy of the changes she would like to propose and reviewed the suggested changes. She also suggested that the existing Chromebook Damage and Replacement Plan be added to the Technology Acceptable Use Policy.

Dr. Hall asked Jared Lynn, Director of Technology, to speak to some of the proposed language in item 7 under the Responsibilities section. This item details viewing, monitoring and archiving of District technology, student files, and student activity. Mr. Lynn explained that, by design, the type of software that is used for content filtering does not allow for monitoring and archiving to be turned off and then turned on once something has gone wrong. Whenever content is filtered, the software has to know what was accessed to know if the content is legitimate. There really are only two options with regard to content filtering: either it is off, which is not acceptable, or it is on. Additional follow up questions were asked about how content is flagged, how to determine if something that has been flagged is of concern, and how long items that are archived are kept. Mr. Lynn explained that the process is automated and includes alerts to administrators who determine whether flags need follow up, student data is kept indefinitely due to record retention requirements for student records. The district owns all data that is obtained via its devices and networks. Mrs. Hennesy commented that she would like to give this topic some more thought and asked Mr. Lynn to do the same. She stated that she wants to consider what the District can do to educate and protect students in this area. Mrs. Larson agreed that it is good to take a look at this issue, remember that it is evolving process that is not perfect, and there is learning happening along the way. Mrs. Hennesy explained that she would like to see the agreement written to reflect more of a partnership between the District and families, and wants to be very upfront with students and families about all aspects of the agreement.

The Policy Committee discussed bringing the proposed changes to the full Board with the exception of the language under item 7 under the responsibilities section to get the Board’s input. The technology acceptable use policy is not a Board level policy and follows a different route with the Parent-Teacher Advisory Committee. The proposed policy will go to that committee for consideration the next time it meets.

**13. Committee Purpose**

The Policy Committee discussed the purpose of the policy committee. The consensus among the committee members was to begin to use motions and voting as a way to make decisions and recommendations at the committee level.

**14. Adjournment**

With no further business to come before the Policy Committee, the meeting was adjourned by consensus at 2:32 p.m.

---

Max McComb, President

---

Merle Giles, Secretary

Submitted by Dawn Quinley, Board Recorder