

Policy Committee Meeting
June 4, 2020 4:30 PM
Central Services Board Room

1. Call to Order - Mr. Tom Netherton
2. Moment of Silence / Pledge of Allegiance - Mr. Tom Netherton
3. Approval of Committee Minutes
4. Policy 2.9001 Board Funding of Student Competitions
5. Policy 6.303 Interrogations and Searches
6. Policy 6.202 Home Schools
7. Other Discussion
8. Adjournment

**Policy Committee Meeting
May 7, 2020
Central Services Board Room**

The Policy Committee met on Thursday, May 7, 2020, in the Central Services Board Room and electronically with Zoom where Mr. Tom Netherton called the meeting to order at the approximate hour of 4:30 p.m. He welcomed everyone to the meeting and appreciated everyone for attending.

PRESENT:

Mr. Tom Netherton, District 6
Mrs. Janet Graham, Director of Schools
Mr. Jim Inman, District 1
Mr. Tony Brock, District 5
Mrs. Kelly Smith, SMHS Principal
Ms. Cassie Warner, CCHS Asst. Principal
Mr. Earl Patton, Attorney

Mrs. Rebecca Hamby, District 7
Dr. Rebecca Wood, CAO
Dr. Scott Maddox, 9-12/CTE Supervisor
Ms. Kim Herring, Student Information Administrator
Mrs. Stephanie Barnes, Phoenix Principal
Mrs. Kacee Harris, CFO

ABSENT:

1. **Call to Order** – Mr. Tom Netherton
2. **Moment of Silence/Pledge of Allegiance** – Mr. Tom Netherton
3. **Approval of the March 5, 2020 Minutes** – Brock made a motion to approve.

VOICE VOTE: Hamby (mover- yes)
Brock (seconder –yes)
All Ayes

MOTION: Carried unanimously

4. Policy 4.602 Class Ranking

Netherton introduced the policy and asked for any comments on the policy. Brock asked, “Something I didn’t quite understand on line 14, it has the word and scratched out between AP and Dual is that necessary or intentional?” Netherton asked if it is alright to leave “and” in the policy. Hamby and Brock agreed it should be there. Boston inquired, “Is the policy that we impromptu changed at one of the meetings involving class ranking? Have we gotten with the principals and everyone concerned to repair that wording?” Netherton responded, “If I remember right this is the policy that we put off for one month for people to provide more input.” Boston asked, “Did we impromptu change where we would release the class ranking if the students requested it? Has that been reworded where everybody is comfortable with it?” Netherton asked Wood to address. Wood responded, “I think that the discussion was whether or not we leave the statement in, because that leaves us again still working in from two different worlds. Dr. Maddox may have a report about what he found out about the scholarships and whether or not that ranking needs to remain in there. Dr. Maddox I will let you report what you understand as far as those scholarships.” Maddox commented, “I have followed up with phone calls to all the scholarship folks that offer those and any scholarship that offers up the question of ranking. I contacted those, I think there was a total of 8 or 9. There was only one that was online and there was some discrepancy that it was an online scholarship. A lot of concern from board members that it would hurt a student that didn’t have that ranking. They thought that was going to cause them to be at a

disadvantage. I didn't find that to be so. What I was finding out with my conversations was the people who were talking with that they were not using the ranking to not include a student but to exclude a student. They felt that the scholarship, the higher ranking a student had, they exclude them because they were getting other scholarships. It was two-fold. It would help some students and it would hurt some students. For the most part, all the people I spoke with wanted to remove that question entirely. At the last meeting we had, I think it was on page two, line 4 or 5 the last sentence *Upon request by the student, that student's class rank will be released for the purpose of scholarships and/or extended education.* I personally wish we weren't playing in both worlds, because we did go through a long process of deciding we weren't going to rank and then we put it right back in there that we were going to rank and give it to them if they needed it. If they wanted it and asked for it, but we weren't going to make a big deal out of it. Not having top ten recognitions and so forth. As long as that is the case and they come to us with the request of wanting that for online scholarship purposes, then we would give that. You don't publish it system-wide or by school. As long as we don't do that, I'm ok with it." Boston asked, "Do they have to have some kind of letter, scholarship email, something that would show you that they are requesting it for the purpose of scholarships for extending education?" Maddox responded, "Yes, I think that was brought up at that meeting. I think that would be an excellent idea, if they produced a document requesting that information for a scholarship. It is my understanding that most of the scholarship applications online have a drop-down menu. Most school systems don't rank anymore. I don't think Cumberland county students were at a disadvantage. I think the perception was that they were at a disadvantage. We've done our research on that, but I don't know if there is any way to convince everyone that it doesn't hurt the students. That is why I'm willing to go ahead and leave it in there. I think your idea is good to have them produce something to the guidance counselor, I don't think that is a bad idea. Boston mentioned, "That could be in procedures, it doesn't necessarily need to be in policy. Netherton asked for Wood's viewpoint on this. Wood responded, "I really like the procedure route. Then it is not in policy, it doesn't look like we are trying to live in 2 different systems. If you leave it in procedure, then you can develop the forms and those kind of things as well. I think our high schools did a good job of navigating that and I know the will continue, either way that you decide, to do that. I know we can make it work either way. I do have some wording regarding the Middle College Students. Several of you were contacted about the Middle School Students and their ranking. If you leave the statement in, I do have my screen shared so you can see the new wording." What we are suggesting on page 3, line 11 to add the bullet, if we are going to hand out rankings upon request, then we would like to add this bullet: Middle College students will have all college course work transcribed into their official record. These students will receive a CCHS Middle College or a SMHS Middle College class rank separate from high school students, not classified as Middle College students. Our difficulty came when we were trying to bring those Middle College students back to rank them. From what I have understood from counselors and principals, it's again back to the two separate systems. It's not exactly comparing apples to apples. We thought a separate ranking would be appropriate. Wood gave an example. This would all depend on if we decide to leave this sentence in. If we decide to provide a rank. If we do that then we need to address what to do about the Middle College Students. Netherton asked, "If we take the sentence out is it appropriate to put it in procedures?" Wood responded, "Yes, and then as we have our Middle College meeting with our students just to make sure that that is part of the wording so they understand that before they leave for Middle College exactly what will happen. Yes, we could put that in procedures as well. Maddox asked if they wanted to put the line about ranking in procedures or the line about Middle College? Brock and Hamby responded, "Both!" Wood said as long as it is part of the paperwork. When we have our Middle College meetings and we are able to have that in writing and have them sign that they understand how all that works, then we could accomplish that in a procedure. Netherton asked Brock for his thoughts on that? Brock replied, "It seems that is the best compromise for not hurting anyone and helping everyone that we can. I think that's our goal. Netherton asked Hamby for her opinion. Hamby responded, "I agree, I think we should take it and put it in procedure. Netherton asked Graham and she responded, "Absolutely!" Netherton asked if anyone else had any comments. Inman said the only problem I have with taking it out of policy and putting it in procedures only. Procedures can be changed by whomever is at central office anytime

they want. If it is in policy, then we have it set that this is the way it is going to be done. I'm just not comfortable taking it out of policy. I don't mind the compromises. I really am not comfortable taking it out of policy and just putting in procedures because then it could be changed later on down the road. Smith asked, "I understand Middle College would be separate from the high school regular traditional student. The high school traditional student would be one through whatever number we have and one and two would be val. and sal. Would be Middle College rankings be one through however many we have, but they are number one Middle College? Would they understand that they are not the Valedictorian?" Wood responded, "I think that has to be part of that paperwork when we sit down with Middle College students, that they fully understand before they go to Middle College, I think we work on how to word that appropriately so that there is no confusion from there on." Smith commented that she wanted it in writing. Netherton asked Inman "What do you see as a fix?" Inman responded, "I apologize, I got on here late and did not hear about the compromises you had already talked about. Like I said, I don't care about the compromises as long as we are doing what's best for the students. I'm just not comfortable taking stuff out of policy and putting it in procedure when it could be changed any time." Netherton asked, "Procedures follow policy, right? So, would that be a conflict?" Inman responded, "If we don't have a policy, how can they make the procedures?" Netherton responded, "We have a policy. The question is whether we want to put this particular sentence in the policy or put it in procedures." Brock said, "Please just read the sentence that is causing the issue, just so everybody.. Netherton read the sentence: *Upon request by the student, that student's class rank will be released for the purpose of scholarships and/or extended education.* Hamby stated, "That's all we're putting in procedures, not the policy." Brock said, "Ok, I don't have a problem with that being in policy, if it doesn't say that we'll do it just because a kid doesn't want to beat his buddy out. It really could be a situation, the way it is worded to me, it means it's there if you need it for a scholarship or help you get into college. I don't have a problem leaving it in as it is." Inman addressed Netherton, "I may have misunderstood but what I was understanding you were talking about was that was taking that out of policy and just putting it in procedure." Netherton responded, "We were going to take that one sentence and move it into procedure. That way if someone needed it, they could ask for it." Inman asked, "So you are going to delete it from the policy" Netherton responded, "That was the intent, where we would have, instead of being under two sets of rules we were going to we would be under one set of rules. Is that not correct Ms. Wood?" Brock addressed Wood, "I'm failing to see what the problem with it being in procedures because it just says that you may get it and it even spells out how you can go about getting it. Am I missing something in the way that is worded?" Wood responded, "Well, I think that is part of the discussion that Mr. Inman missed. We talked about if we moved that sentence to a procedure then we could include the form that student used to ask for that. It's not promoting the ranking where everyone gets it and putting it out there. It is still trying to move more toward that Latin system instead of ranking. We would put it in procedure and include the form they would fill out that says I would like to get my ranking for the two reasons we talked about, scholarships or extended education, and then we have a record for why they asked for it. Then we can put the Middle College steps in that as well. Brock said, "But the way that policy is written, the way that sentence is written, and the way I am interpreting it, it says you may get your ranking if it's for scholarships, so it's already there. The fact that you may want to clarify it and accent it in policy so that all the students in the future are going to be affected by it. That's Great! Because that's what the difference is between policy and procedure. I think procedure spells out some of the information in detail. I don't think we should take that sentence out." Wood said, "I think that is what Maddox is saying with the high schools. We can make it work both ways. It does still leave impression that we are ranking. That is the whole purpose of the Latin system was to move away from ranking. The Latin system, in fact, acknowledges more students. We do the ranking, because we have to do it to get valedictorian and salutatorian. The ranking is automatically done. But we wanted to move away from that being the emphasis." Brock responded, "It does, but for those students and until the whole transition is across the state, it's there and if at some point it becomes something that is no longer never used, then we can get rid of it. As it's written it gives the guidance office the option of helping a student out that does need it. So why not leave it in?" Netherton asked Hamby if she had any more thoughts on it. Hamby replied, "I'm ok either way. Whatever is best for our students. I'm good

either way, I just want to make sure we take care of our kids.” Maddox said, “I agree with Mr. Brock and Mr. Inman both. I don’t want to hurt our kids at all. That is not our intent. I think what we are trying to do is just make sure that we’re not playing, and that is the same thing the principals were saying, we don’t want to one foot in the Latin system and one foot in the ranking. We know the importance of the students being able to get the ranking for a scholarship purpose. I think if we take it out of the policy saying that we are on that Latin system, but once the student is requesting and the principal and counselors know they know, we can get the ranking to the students based on procedure. And we should get it to them for scholarship and to advance their education. We’re not going to hurt the students, but in the policy itself it looks like we are on the Latin system and we’re not playing in both fields but in the procedures, it’s allowed to be given to the student for scholarship purposes. We’re still going to give them everything that you want. It’s just that we won’t be in both worlds on the policy. I think that cleans up the policy, but at the same time we are still doing what we can for the students to help them out with scholarships. We provide that rank for them when asked upon request. So, it would still be in procedure. I can’t imagine anybody wanting to take that away from the students. Brock said, “I can’t either, but I think it is a toe across the line and not a foot. And if that toe helps one kid out next year, I want it to be there. I know our guidance counselors are going to take care of the kids. This is the only sentence in that entire policy that fudges just enough to allow the information to be released if the student has a good reason for needing that ranking. So, leave it in there in my opinion.” Netherton asked Hamby if she had anything to add? Hamby stated, “Ms. Wood, If we leave this sentence in, then the statement that you have also needs to be added to the policy. Wood responded, “I agree.” Netherton made a motion: Based on the information I have so far, I make a motion that we approve this policy with the addition of the statement that Ms. Wood wants added.

VOICE VOTE: Netherton (mover-yes)
Hamby (seconder-yes)

All Ayes

MOTION: Carried Unanimously

5. Policy 3.204 Threat Assessment

Netherton mentioned this policy was brought back for more discussion and asked for comments. Boston stated, “This was proposed to us last year. It was amid the governor approving this bill. He signed it in November 2019. This policy has none of the statutory requirements listed in the TCA Code.” Boston invited Patton to comment on this policy. Patton stated, “The statute has a lot of “shalls” that are not in the policy. It’s not to say that the policy itself violates the law. It is a shell of what the Threat Assessment could be. There is a lot that is in the statute that is not in the policy. That is not always a bad thing, but in this situation, you’ve got a director in the future who looks at this policy and is not very careful to look at the statute then I think that you potentially have some problems. Hamby asked, “Is this something that needs to be fixed? This is a very important team. Everybody knows where I stand on this. I back it 100%. So, we need to do what we need to do to get the policy written the correct way so we can get this in order. Brock said, “In a full board meeting, I talked to all the security people and they felt like it was a good thing, a necessary thing. We do have our security person present. I don’t mind going above and beyond what the state requires and so anything we can do to make our kids safe and professionals say that’s the thing to do then let’s do it. Magnusson stated, “I agree. Right off the bat it says that a threat assessment team shall be created. Tennessee code says LEA may. In that first sentence they depart a little bit. I think what their intention here is keeping it simple, allowing for the flexibility for how we want to do it. But on line 7 on the TSBA one, I think that is where they are trying to encapsulate the reference to all of the laws. Where they say this will be done to comply with the state law and state board of education. It is a blanket statement that says we will follow all of that. I am game to do whatever we need to do. I recall Mrs. Boston said if we aren’t careful, we are bind ourselves up with all of those requirements, and if we continue doing what we are doing without calling ourselves

that, then we have a little more flexibility or a little more freedom.” Boston responded, “You have the access to any resources, you have the access to the same resources that would be in this policy. It says we do not have to have a specific labeled team. We can still go by their guidelines. Whether we have a policy or not. If we have a policy, I would like to put it in there this is what the state of Tennessee says that we shall do. If we don’t have a policy, have you had any issues in gathering up those resources and using those?” Magnusson responded, “Not at all. If you go back to when we were first discussing this. The light bulb went off when you said that, it gave us that freedom to not bind ourselves to tightly with this. That is why the policies are good, but we also don’t want to bind ourselves. I have no problem with that at all.” Patton said he would be happy to rewrite the policy to conform and provide some more specifics, but he did have one question that the board may need to consider. It says that the Director of Schools shall appoint the members. The statute says the LEA shall appoint the members. If the board is creating this team, I may need some direction as to whether or not this board wants to appoint those team members or just hand that off to the Director of Schools?” Magnusson mentioned, “If we keep it the way we are right now, again doing the same thing we are doing without constricting ourselves or without confining ourselves, I agree with Mrs. Boston, we aren’t doing anything wrong just because we don’t have a policy about it. We are doing good things. I don’t have a problem with keeping things the way they are, unless we are required to. Graham said, “I think the threat assessment team may look differently depending on the situation you are in. It might involve this group of people for this type of threat and it might involve another team of people, just depending on the circumstance. I agree, we don’t want to box ourselves in by saying you have to have this, and it may branch off to something else. Boston said, “If you’ve got a threat and you have this group of resources, for this particular threat you may need more mental health providers, that we have available to us. If you have a different type of threat, then you are going to need more law enforcement. An Assistant District Attorney would not need to be involved in a mental health issue. That is who they state shall be a part of this team, if we create this. If we don’t have a problem, why fix it?” Magnusson stated, “I like the flexibility we have now. It doesn’t confine us. The goal we are working on is to give this power to the schools themselves. It’s not our thing, it’s our SRO, it starts with the school. When their cup is running over its then they have access to the resources we have established. I like what we are doing” Patton asked, “How is the team reporting now? How are they reporting threat activities to the board?” Magnusson responded, “We started last year collecting data. There is different software out there we have been looking at. There was a company that offered up, after our situation. We didn’t jump on that yet. There were some changes going on, where we were going with it, what was expected of us. We are fully prepared to present annually or bi-annually to the board. I think we need to put some stipulations there, every single threat, if we do that, we are talking about a lot of things going on in the schools. If we put stipulations on there that if it reaches a certain level, that we report. That is the input that I have. The principals know that someone is going to threaten someone every day, because they took their pencil. We were definitely starting to collect that data last year.” Netherton asked Patton, “Do you think we need to have this policy right now, or do we need to leave things the way they are?” Patton responded, “You don’t have to have this policy right now. The statute says that the LEA may adopt a policy to establish a threat assessment team. It doesn’t say shall. This board has the option and if you are happy with what you’ve got going on, then there is no need to adopt a policy necessarily. Unless you feel like the statute as written gives you a benefit that you aren’t getting now.” Netherton asked Hamby her thoughts. Hamby responded, “I agree, we don’t have a policy. The way it is working now, leave it alone.” Safdie stated, “I would like to get some clarification on the threat assessment team’s report to the board. Can you remind me of the frequency that this has happened?” Magnusson replied, “We have not reported yet. It was in its infancy last year when we started. We weren’t an established team following that requirement. We as a team did discuss the need to do that, but we have the data of the threats we worked and the charges that were filed, the actions that were taken. We are prepared to report. We could put into procedure that we report to you twice per year or whenever you want. Netherton asked Brock if he would like to add any thoughts: Brock responded, “If Bo thinks our current safety measures are doing the job and our students are safe then I have no problem with not putting in another policy that is evolving. I don’t believe in making rules just to make rules. Bo I will say, we discussed in a couple of

committee meetings that the board did expect to periodically have reports on what that team was doing. I do believe there should be oversight and you as the supervisor, don't make us make a policy where we tell you how often. It should be often enough that we're not surprised. I don't like surprises and I don't like community members coming up and asking me about something that I don't already know about." Boston said, "If we have a threat, and we have a couple of, you might say, level 5 threats. Your first order of business is to notify the powers that be, is that correct?" Magnusson responded, "Absolutely, I always notify, even early on, just so the Director is not caught by surprise. If I start assisting a school in a situation, before I know anything I typically let her know if it is something we are concerned about and she forwards that information to you all." Boston said, "That is my next comment, we may not know about the smaller threats, but the major threats, we have always been made aware of those." Graham commented, "I may suggest in response to Mr. Brock whether or not he wants to be informed and he should be. That is one of the items you might want to add to the annual planning calendar. The certain time frames in which you would report even the minor stuff, so you would know how many instances of threats and that sort of thing. I would think the annual planning calendar would be a good place to house that time that you would be notified. Boston continued, "Once a year is great, but I would like to be kept abreast of what we have got going on with the safety and security of our children." Magnusson commented, "What I would envision, and what I hope is already happening is; you're going to be notified, if I notify the director. I think you have received those, where we are working on something and it turns out to be nothing. I see that notification, so that social media doesn't get to you, it's going to get to you sometimes before we get to you because that is the nature of the beast. What I would also like to show is at a board meeting annually, put some graphics up and show what kind of threats we are seeing, what the courts are doing, without names of course. That is the kind of data we are expecting to show you, what kind of threats we are seeing, what is the disposition, how many were charged, and those kinds of things." Safdie asked, "Would the threat assessment team also be responsible for compiling the data on how many fights in each of the schools?" Magnusson responded, "I don't think that is getting into the school's business as far as what they are doing. What I see this more as is a significant threat. It could be an angry parent. The threats are not always kids to kids. It could be a volatile situation that we know about, for instance, we get calls from the road officers at night. If they were at a home and there was a bad situation that occurred at a home, they might call us and say, "this kid might have a little stress on them today". That is a bigger picture than just getting into fights as school." Netherton said, "We have a motion on the floor to not pass this policy. I'm going to second that motion, but also, I am going to make another statement. I like the idea of reports coming into the board about what's going on, I think that will be a DOS decision as far as putting it on the calendar. But I think it would help if you put it on the middle of the school year and the end of the school year where you could compare the two. The motion was to not adopt this policy at this time made by Brock.

VOICE VOTE: Brock (mover-yes)
Netherton (seconder-yes)
All Ayes

MOTION: Carried Unanimously

6. **Policy 3.402 Special Use of School Vehicles**

Netherton asked why we have two different policies? Graham responded, "One is our policy and the other one is TSBA's model policy. Netherton asked for thoughts. Brock said, "I have a question, this essentially is mostly due to two positions using a vehicle, am I correct there, transportation and maintenance?" Graham and Netherton confirmed that is correct. Brock continued, "Do they want to use those vehicles?" Graham said, "I think the answer is yes, they want to keep their vehicles and use them. But the IRS audited us and we had to come back and pay because they had not been taxed for that. We had to pay, we were charged and fined as a school district." Brock asked, "When they use these vehicles, are we paying for the insurance and gasoline?" Graham confirmed we were paying those costs.

Brock continued, “When they are driving the vehicle to home from work and from home to work, we are providing a benefit. Now if they need the vehicle to respond to emergencies, be a maintenance emergency, waterline break or a bus has had a mechanical issue or something like that. That is school business. I just want to know that we are not providing somebody an extra vehicle and they are going to Walmart in it. Netherton said, “My viewpoint is I like the policy they sent from TSBA. It is short, simple and it covers all the bases. Netherton asked for any other comments. Inman said looking at the options on the bottom of the page he likes option 1. Hamby said if you do the TSBA one, it’s cut and dried and if they need those vehicles, if they get an emergency call and need to be out. They are assigned these vehicles but it’s taxed. What is the better solution, I don’t know? Netherton said the policy from TSBA covers that, it allows the Director of Schools to come up with a list of people to come before the board who they think should be assigned those particular vehicles. Plus, the very last statement in the policy states “They use of these vehicles for personal use is prohibited”. Inman said he didn’t have a problem with it he was just looking for a simple solution. Brock stated, “Under that policy, Tom is it your understanding that if there is an incident with a bus, maybe it is traveling to an away game. That maintenance supervisor, if they needed to go help, they would not be liable for taxation and treat that as a benefit. That is part of their work schedule. Is that your understanding of that rule?” Netherton read the statement in the policy “Employees assigned full time use of vehicles shall be on call 24 hours a day to perform services required by their job responsibilities.” Graham stated, “There are some very specific guidelines that the IRS laid out as to what makes one of those trucks an emergency vehicle. Our trucks do not meet that requirement. It requires them to have wenches and other equipment. The IRS was very specific as to what equipment has to be on that truck to qualify.” Netherton asked Graham if she sees anything wrong with the TSBA model policy? Graham responded, “No.” Netherton said I make a motion we pass this policy 3.402 utilizing TSBA version. Brock seconded.

VOICE VOTE: Netherton (mover-yes)
Brock (seconder-yes)
All Ayes

MOTION: Carried Unanimously

7. Policy 4.210 Credit Recovery

Netherton asked for questions or comments about this policy. Wood responded, “We are somewhat divided on this particular policy, for some very good reasons. The State Board of Education has recommended the 50% that you see is in their board policy. We have the right to be a bit more stringent if we would like to. Our current policy says 60% and Algebra 1 is 65%. Algebra 1 is at 65% for the simple reason that we want to raise the bar. If a student has to repeat the class, as you know math is a subject that is built upon itself. If a student passes a 50 the chances of them passing the next course is more difficult. Here is the guide that we change that to 65. On one side of the fence, the principals are here, and they can speak for themselves., but I know that in the case of Phoenix High School they have a great level of difficulty getting students to a certain level to do credit recovery. We know that there is a limited amount of time in order for them to take the course in order to graduate. On the other hand, like I said before, not just in math but in the subjects where they are prepared to have skills, lowering that bar to 50 makes that much more challenging for some students. We have recommendations to leave it down to 50 and we have recommendations to make it all 60, just so it’s easy. We keep our bar high and we lower our Algebra 1 just a bit. It keeps it simple, if you have a 60 then you can do credit recovery. In summary we are all over the place, so I will let the folks that this affects to chime in.” Netherton said we will start with Maddox and then go to the principals. Maddox stated, “ I will go back in time a little bit, as a building principal I was instrumental in setting this policy and at the time agreed to the 65 in Algebra and 50 in the other courses. I also am a former math teacher. I know in teaching Algebra back years ago, that if I had a student that was lingering around 70 – 72 in Algebra 1 then they were going to struggle in Algebra 2. I have had a change of heart and I will tell you why. The state has set the 50 and

although we thought we raised the bar at 60 in requiring the students to get a higher score. The highest score they can possibly get is a 70. If they go through credit recovery they can't get higher than a 70% when they finish credit recovery. Credit recovery is based on standards. It is not based on time. There is no specific time in which they have to be finished with their credit recovery. It is standards based. I have found a number of and been in the middle of situations where there have been kids through no fault of their own, have been in situations that for instance we placed at Phoenix. They were failing with a 30 or 40 and they have lost hope, because they are pulling a grade up from a 35 or 40 up to 65 there was no hope for them. If they had a chance to pull it up to a 50 in order for them know that they are going to proceed forward with credit recovery, that gave them a glimmer of hope. I found a couple of kids that were good students that I thought that the policy actually hurt. I'm not in favor of leaving that policy at 65 and 60. I wish we would go with the state recommendation of 50. Some of the school systems surrounding us and across the state are going by 50. Instead of holding them to a higher standard, we are putting them at a disadvantage. Especially when it pertains to our student who are at risk." Netherton thanked Maddox and asked Mrs. Smith her opinion. Smith said, "I am not opposed to lowering, I was one of the people who felt like lowering the Algebra to a 50, it makes me very nervous. Even if you have a scenario of a student is they get a 50 and go to credit recovery, they get a 70 and go into geometry they get a 50 again, they go into credit recovery and get their 70, and each year. Algebra 1 is so foundational, I'm fine with lowering it from 65, but I think taking it all the way to a 50, I just don't think they are going to have those skills and build upon it. I just think that is going to create an issue in Math credit recovery. That is by biggest concern." Netherton asked Warner her thoughts. Warner responded, I think our biggest thing is we are concerned with the ripple affect with the math, because of the standards and this year. Bringing it down to a 50 is a bit too far. Barnes stated, "I agree with Dr. Maddox. When I look at my at-risk students, I am truly struggling by the time they get to me. If we want to adjust it somehow with some discretion, I am fine with that. Many of my students, when they get to me, they are working at a 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th grade level. They are so far behind in math, I'm trying to help them graduate, but we are having to take a course that we've taken 3 times and they are at this grade level. Netherton asked if the principals thought a 55 would be a good compromise? Smith and Warner said no. Smith said they went with 60 across the board. Barnes said, "I don't think a student that fails Algebra 1A, or Algebra B 3 times is going to benefit. We are putting them farther behind on graduation. Smith responded, "We understand, but you only get a small percentage of our students that are failing Algebra. Barnes added, "If there is something we can do for discretion, like tie in with attendance. We have put a clause in it for principal discretion. Can we say, we have tried x amount of times and it's not working and mention the state policy. Brock asked, "How many students do you get who have a 60 and above in Algebra when they show up at Phoenix or transfer to Phoenix? Barnes responded, "It's about split. Normally if they failed it you would say about half would have either had a 65 with failing it or they have failed it so many times, it is a lot lower. Brock said, "From what Mrs. Barnes pointed out and from my experience, if you have the number too high, you're going to eliminate quite a few kids from being able to recover. I think we that we ought to be consistent. I do not think that math should be treated any differently than history or English or Science. I think it ought the same. Whatever number we come up with, I don't think there should be an exception from that." Smith said, "I understand where that thought process is coming from, Math is the one subject that truly builds upon itself, more than any other subject area. This is why I think the policy is in place before and why we like the number 60, because it is about those skills. I'm sitting here thinking about, we may end up with potentially 50 students in credit recovery Algebra 1. Those kids need those skills to go on with their math classes or it's going to be the ripple effect of fail, fail, fail every single time. Go to credit recovery every single time. Netherton asked for other comments. Inman said, "We made differences for the two high schools and the Phoenix school. The graduations requirements and so forth. Why can't we just require, since both high schools want 60, let them do 60 and put it in the policy that Phoenix is set at 50. I don't see the difference, we make a difference in the graduation requirements, why can't we make a difference in this one. Hale agreed with Inman, "I was thinking along those lines, why not make an exception for the children at the Phoenix school. Because the children are trying harder. If we just keep discouraging them they give up. Why try again I'm just going to fail. You can't just keep giving them

zeros, you've got to give them extra credit. You've got to help them bring up their grade, somehow some way." Graham said, "I fully understand where Ms. Smith and Ms. Warner are coming from as high school principals because we have kids that are trying to skate through math through credit recovery, because they know they have that to fall back on. Some are not working to the degree that they are could. She talked about a student at CCHS who had struggled with bridge math and he wanted to do credit recovery. He was not allowed, and he made it through the class with a passing grade. I also understand Stephanie and where she is coming from because many of those kids have lost hope. We have made some exceptions for Phoenix. Maybe we should do 55 for Phoenix and 60 for the other high schools. Netherton asked Karge if she had a comment. Karge asked, "Isn't 60 a F? Graham confirmed it is. Karge stated, "I guess I don't see what the problem is with a 60 vs a 50, a f is a f a f a fs an f. I mean I've had a kid who has gone through credit recovery and was very successful with it. Because they've got a 50 and it worked. I understand with a 50 they would not have done as much as a 60 would have done and I get that, but an f is an f. Maddox said, "I like the thought of what Mr. Inman said, we do make exceptions for the Phoenix school by state guidelines require 22 credits to graduate and the have to have 27. If we were to make a compromise to help a kid, if Phoenix went with the state guidelines at 50% so Mrs. Barnes could work with her at risk students versus the 60% number that both principals at the other high schools would like to have so it would be the best option for everybody. Hamby agreed with Maddox. Barnes stated, "Please remember they are getting extra intervention and more one on one. So though their bar is a 50 they're getting more and more than they are in the larger school because they are in a smaller setting. Netherton asked, Dr. Wood for her recommendation to reword the policy. Woods said she could reword the policy to read just like the graduation requirements to read: Students at SMHS and CCHS at 60% using the same wording and then Phoenix at 50% using the same wording. I can word that in essence the two high schools at 60 and Phoenix at 50. Netherton made a motion to reword the policy and bring it back next month. Wood asked if they could reword the policy and move it forward. The schools are printing handbooks and they need that information before the school year. Hamby made a motion to approve the policy with the corrections. Brock asked on page 2 line 3. It says shall, we need to clean that up. Hamby amended the motion to include Brock's suggestion.

VOICE VOTE: Hamby (mover-yes)
Brock (seconder-yes)
All Ayes

MOTION: Carried Unanimously

8. Policy 6.204 Attendance of Non-Resident Students

Netherton asked for questions or comments. Brock made a motion to approve as written

VOICE VOTE: Brock (mover-yes)
Hamby (seconder-yes)
All Ayes

MOTION: Carried Unanimously

9. Policy 3.206 Community Use of Facilities

Netherton asked for questions or comments; Could we change the July 1, 2017. Graham stated we could make that change. Netherton made a motion to approve with changes.

VOICE VOTE: Netherton (mover-yes)
Hamby (seconder-yes)
All Ayes

MOTION: Carried Unanimously

10. Policy 2.804 Expenses and Reimbursements

Netherton asked for questions or comments; Harris stated, This is another policy on our calendar to review and I recommend no change. Hamby made a motion to accept as is. Netherton asked, “It states the rate of reimbursement will be made by the CCBOE. Don’t we go by the state’s reimbursement rates? Harris explained, “Currently we are at 46 cents per mile and the state is at 47 cents per mile. The committee discussed the meal amounts. Brock suggested we leave the rates the way they are. Netherton made a motion to approve as presented.

VOICE VOTE: Netherton (mover-yes)
Hamby (seconder-yes)
All Ayes

MOTION: Carried Unanimously

11. Other Discussion

12. Adjournment

VOICE VOTE: Netherton (mover-yes)
Hamby (seconder-yes)
All Ayes

MOTION: Carried Unanimously

Mrs. Janet Graham
Director of Schools

Tom Netherton
Chairman of the Policy Committee

Jane Franklin
Executive Assistant for the Director of Schools and BOE

Cumberland County Board of Education

Monitoring: Review: Annually, in April	Descriptor Term: Board Funding of Student Competitions	Descriptor Code: 2.9001	Issued Date: 06/22/17
		Rescinds: 2.9001	Issued: 06/03/04

1 The Board will provide funding to aid and assist students to compete in national sponsored competition
2 based on the following criteria:

- 3 1. School-sponsored activity;
- 4
- 5 2. Funding in the amount of twenty-five percent (25%) up to a maximum of \$1,500 per request;
- 6
- 7 3. Receipts or invoices shall be required; and
- 8
- 9 4. Recommendation of the director of schools.

10 Prior to final approval the following documents and/or requests must be completed and approved by
11 the Director of Schools and Board of Education.

- 12 1. Submit an overnight and/or out of county trip request letter.
- 13
- 14 2. Complete the Administrative Procedure 2.9001 – Board Funding of Student Competitions Form



Stone Memorial High School

2800 Cook Road · Crossville, TN 38571

Telephone (931) 484-5767

Kelly Smith

Principal

TO: Mrs. Janet Graham, Director of Schools
Cumberland County Board of Education

FROM: Kelly Smith, Principal and Lance Kennedy, Assistant Principal
Stone Memorial High School

RE: Board Funding of Student Competitions

DATE: May 20, 2020

Dear Mrs. Graham and B.O.E. Members:

Stone Memorial High School would like to request a review of Policy 2.9001. The current policy limits funding only for students competing in *national* competitions. Our request is to revise the policy to include *state* competitions in the event a state competition is the highest level a school-sponsored activity can attend.

Amendment of the policy would directly impact the 2019-20 SMHS Lady Panthers and their State Championship run. Our team reached the highest level of competition at the TSSAA State Tournament in March. COVID-19 prevented the continuation of the tournament, however the Lady Panthers had reached the Final Four prior to suspension of play. Additional expenses were accrued with the lack of availability of school transportation. Therefore, the team was required to seek alternative transportation via a charter bus.

A revision of Policy 2.9001 would lessen the burden of individual school accounts and booster clubs to carry all financial responsibilities. The policy is written to benefit students and groups striving to compete at the highest level and our Lady Panthers Basketball Team was honored to have this opportunity.

Respectfully submitted,

Kelly Smith
Principal
Stone Memorial High School

Lance Kennedy
Assistant Principal
Stone Memorial High School

Cumberland County Board of Education

Monitoring: Review: Annually, in April	Descriptor Term: Interrogations and Searches	Descriptor Code: 6.303	Issued Date: 06/26/08
		Rescinds: 6.303	Issued: 05/06/04

1 ~~School personnel have a duty to report any reasonable suspicion that a student is carrying, or has carried,~~
2 ~~a weapon or is violating, or has violated, a provision of the Tennessee Drug Control Act to the principal,~~
3 ~~the principal's designee or, if the principal and the principal's designee are unavailable and the offense~~
4 ~~was committed on school property, to the appropriate authorities.~~[†]

5 INTERROGATIONS BY SCHOOL PERSONNEL

6 Students may be questioned by teachers or principals about any matter pertaining to the operation of a
7 school and/or the enforcement of its rules. Questioning must be conducted discreetly and under
8 circumstances which will avoid unnecessary embarrassment to the student being questioned. Any
9 student answering falsely, evasively or refusing to answer a proper question may be subject to
10 disciplinary action, including suspension.

11 If a student is suspected or accused of misconduct or infraction of the student code of conduct, the
12 principal may interrogate the student, without the presence of parent(s)/guardian(s) or legal custodians
13 ~~and without giving the student constitutional warnings.~~

14 INTERROGATIONS BY POLICE (AT ADMINISTRATOR'S REQUEST)

15 If the principal has requested assistance by the police department to investigate a crime involving his/her
16 school, the police shall have permission to interrogate a student suspect in school during school hours.
17 The principal shall first attempt to notify the parent(s)/guardian(s) or legal custodians of the student ~~of~~
18 ~~the intended interrogation~~ unless circumstances require otherwise. The interrogation may proceed
19 without attendance of the parent(s)/guardian(s) or legal custodians. The principal or his/her designee
20 shall be present during the interrogation.

21 The use of police women, if at all possible, or female staff members will be used for interrogation of a
22 female student.

23 POLICE-INITIATED INTERROGATIONS

24 If the police deem circumstances of sufficient urgency to interrogate students at school for unrelated
25 crimes committed outside of school hours, the police department shall first contact the principal
26 regarding the planned interrogation, inform him/her of the probable cause to investigate. ~~within the~~
27 ~~school.~~ The principal shall make reasonable effort to notify the parent(s)/guardian(s) or legal custodians
28 ~~of the interrogation~~ unless circumstances require otherwise. The interrogation may proceed without
29 attendance of the parent(s)/guardian(s) or legal custodians. The principal or his/her designee shall be
30 present during the interrogation.

SEARCHES BY SCHOOL PERSONNEL

In order to ensure a safe and secure learning environment, the Director of Schools shall develop procedures regarding the searching of students, lockers, vehicles and containers which are consistent with state law and regulations. The Director of schools shall develop additional procedures to ensure compliance with all of the provisions of the School Security Act of 1981.¹

Any principal, or his/her designee, having reasonable suspicion may search any student, place or thing on school property or in the actual or constructive possession of any student during any organized school activity off campus, including buses, vehicles of students or visitors (*Notice shall be posted in the school parking lot that vehicles parked on school property by students or visitors are subject to search for drugs, drug paraphernalia or dangerous weapons*), and containers or packages if he/she receives information which would cause a reasonable belief that the search will lead to the discovery of:

1. Evidence of any violation of the law;
2. Evidence of any violation of school rules or regulations or proper standards of student or faculty conduct;
3. Any object or substance which, because of its presence, presents an immediate danger of harm or illness to any person.

A student using a locker that is the property of the school system does not have the right of privacy in that locker or its contents. All lockers or other storage areas provided for student use on school premises remain the property of the school system and are provided for the use of students subject to inspection, access for maintenance and search. *Notice shall be posted in each school that lockers and other storage areas are school property and are subject to search.*

A student may be subject to physical search or a student's pocket, purse or other container may be required to be emptied because of the results of a locker search, or because of information received from a teacher, staff member or other student if such action is reasonable to the principal. All of the following standards of reasonableness shall be met:

1. A particular student has violated policy;
2. The search could be expected to yield evidence of the violation of school policy or disclosure of a dangerous weapon or drug;
3. The search is in pursuit of legitimate interests of the school in maintaining order, discipline, safety, supervision and education of students;
4. The primary purpose of the search is not to collect evidence for a criminal prosecution; and
5. The search shall be reasonably related to the objectives of the search and not excessively intrusive in light of the age and sex of the student, as well as the nature of the infraction alleged to have been committed.

USE OF ANIMALS

When necessary, dogs or other animals trained to detect drugs or dangerous weapons may be used in conducting searches, but the animals shall be used only to pinpoint areas which need to be searched and shall not be used to search the persons of students or visitors.

USE OF METAL DETECTORS

In view of the escalating presence of weapons in the schools, the Board of Education authorizes the use of hand-held or walk-through metal detectors to check a student's person or personal effects as follows: School officials or law enforcement officers may conduct metal detector checks of groups of individuals if the checks are done in a minimally intrusive, nondiscriminatory manner (e.g., on all students in a randomly selected class; or every third individual entering an athletic event). Metal detector checks of groups of individuals may not be used to single out a particular individual or category of individuals.

If a school official or a law enforcement officer has reasonable suspicion to believe that a particular student is in possession of an illegal or unauthorized metal-containing object or weapon, s/he may conduct a metal detector check of the student's person and personal effects.

A student's failure to permit a metal detector check as provided in this policy will be considered grounds for disciplinary action including possible suspension.

The director of schools shall develop procedures for use of metal detectors.

SEARCHES BY POLICE

If public health or safety is involved, upon request of the principal who shall be present, police officers may make a general search of students' lockers and desks, or students' or nonstudents' automobiles for drugs, weapons or items of an illegal or prohibited nature.

If the principal has received reliable information which he/she believes to be true that evidence of a crime or of stolen goods, not involving school property of members of the school staff or student body, is located on school property and that any search for such evidence or goods would be unrelated to school discipline or to the health and safety of a student or the student body, he/she shall request police assistance; and procedures to obtain and execute a search warrant shall thereafter be followed.

Anything found in the course of the search conducted in accordance with this policy which is evidence of a violation of the law or a violation of student conduct standards may be:

1. Seized and admitted as evidence in any hearing, trial, suspension or dismissal proceeding. It should be tagged for identification at the time it is seized and kept in a secure place by the principal or the principal's designee until it is presented at the hearing. At the discretion of the principal, the items seized may be returned to the parent or guardian of a student or, if it has no significant value, the item may be destroyed, but only with the express written permission of the director of schools.

2. Any seized item may be turned over to any law enforcement officer. Any dangerous weapon or drug as defined in TCA 49-6-4202 shall be turned over to an appropriate law enforcement official after completion of an administrative proceeding at which its presence is reasonably required.

1 Whenever the possibility of uncovering evidence of a criminal nature exists, the principal or his/her
2 designee may request the assistance of a law enforcement officer to:

- 3 1. Search any area of the school premises, any student or any motor vehicle on the school premises;
- 4 or
- 5 2. Identify or dispose of anything found in the course of a search conducted in accordance with this
- 6 policy;

7 If deemed necessary by the principal, and if requested by the principal, any assistance given by law
8 enforcement officers may include and be facilitated by the use of dogs trained to detect illegal drugs and
9 drug paraphernalia by odor. However, such dogs shall not be used to sniff the person of any student. Any
10 discovery of illegal drugs or drug paraphernalia will be handled by the principal as a school matter, and
11 thereafter, turned over to law enforcement officer for proper disposal.

12 The involvement of law enforcement officials is encouraged when there is reasonable cause to suspect
13 that criminal evidence is about to be uncovered.

Legal References:

- 1. ~~TCA 49-6-4202 through TCA 49-6-4212~~
TCA 49-6-4201 to 4219

Cross References:

- Procedural Due Process 6.302
- Child Abuse and Neglect 6.409
- Traffic and Parking Controls 3.403

Cumberland County Board of Education

Monitoring: Review: Annually, in April	Descriptor Term: Home Schools	Descriptor Code: 6.202	Issued Date: 02/23/12
		Rescinds: 6.202	Issued: 02/06/97

1 A "home school" is a school conducted or directed by a parent or parents or legal guardian or guardians
2 for their own children. Home schools which teach K-12 where the parents/**guardians** are associated with
3 an organization that conducts church-related schools¹ (as defined by §49-50-801) which are supervised
4 by such organization and which administer standardized achievement tests at the same time tests are
5 given in their regular day schools are exempt from the following provisions, but must follow procedures
6 issued by the State Department of Education.²

7 A parent/**guardian** wishing to conduct a home school shall meet the following requirements:²

- 8 1. Provide notice to the Director of Schools before the commencement of each school year of the
9 intent to conduct a home school;
- 10
11 2. Submit to the Director of Schools the name, number, age, grade level of children involved,
12 location of the school, curriculum to be offered, proposed hours of instruction, qualifications
13 of the parent/teacher; **whether a college preparatory or general course of education will be**
14 **taught in grades 9-12, and a description of the courses to be taught each year;**
- 15
16 3. Maintain attendance records, subject to inspection of the local Director of Schools;
- 17
18 4. Submit attendance records to the Director of Schools at the end of each school year;
- 19
20 5. Provide instruction for at least four (4) hours per day for the same number of instructional days
21 as is required by state law for public schools;
- 22
23 6. Possess a high school diploma or GED in order to conduct classes;
- 24
25 7. Cooperate in the administration to home school students of appropriate tests by the
26 Commissioner of Education, his/her designee or by a professional testing service **in grades five**
27 **(5), seven (7) and nine (9);**
- 28
29 8. Take action according to state law if home school student falls behind appropriate grade level;
- 30
31 9. Submit proof to the Director of Schools that the home school student has been vaccinated as
32 required by law;
- 33
34 10. Submit proof to the Director of Schools that other health services and examinations as required
35 by law have been received by the home school student; and
36

- 1 11. In the event of illness or inadequacy of the home school parent-teacher to teach a specific
2 subject, employ a tutor having the same qualifications as required of parent/teacher.

3 If one or more of these requirements is not met, the Board authorizes the Director of Schools to take
4 formal action to bring the child into compliance with the Compulsory Attendance Law (until the child
5 has reached age 17), either in the home school or in a public, private or church-related school.
6

7 FACILITIES USE

8 It shall be the policy of this Board that public school facilities shall be available for home school
9 instruction only when *all* of the following conditions exist:

- 10 1. Special needs courses are being taught which require services unavailable to the home school
11 student;
12
13 2. These services cannot be provided through any means other than the public schools;
14
15 3. Requests for services are made known by the home school parent when notice is given to the
16 director of schools of the intent to conduct a home school;
17
18 4. The director of schools investigates request and make recommendations to the Board;
19
20 5. No overcrowding, additional expenses, including providing transportation, or other special
21 situations which interfere with the normal operation of the school system shall be incurred; and
22
23 6. Approval by the Board on a case-by-case basis.
24

25 RECORD ACCESS

26 The director of schools, through the attendance supervisor, shall have the attendance records of the home
27 school inspected at least two (2) times each school year in order to provide assistance in implementing
28 the Compulsory Attendance Law.

29 ~~If a home school student falls more than one (1) year behind his appropriate grade level in his/her~~
30 ~~comprehensive test score for two (2) consecutive tests, as required in TCA 49-6-3050(b)(5)(A), and if a~~
31 ~~certified teacher who would have taught the child at his/her grade level determines through appropriate~~
32 ~~means that the student is not learning disabled, the director of schools shall require the parents to enroll~~
33 ~~the child in a public, private or church-related school.~~

34 ~~Home school students shall not participate in any regular school extracurricular activities.~~
35

36 STUDENT PERFORMANCE³

37 ~~The Director of Schools shall develop administrative procedures regarding necessary consultations with home school parents in regard to~~
38 ~~student performance.~~

Legal Reference:

1. TCA 49-50-801(a)
2. TCA 49-6-3050(b)(3)
3. TCA 49-6-3050(b)(6)