

**CENTENNIAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
Warminster, Pennsylvania**

**MINUTES OF WORK SESSION/REGULAR MEETING
HELD SEPTEMBER 26, 2000**

CALL TO ORDER

A Work Session/Regular Meeting of the Centennial School Board was held on September 26, 2000, in the Administration Building. The meeting was called to order by Mrs. Huf at 7:37 p.m. The following people registered their attendance:

Board Members:

Scott Avery
Joseph Faust
Eugene Grossi
Al Hertenberger
Betty Huf
Joan Jankowsky
Jerry Locke
Harve Strouse
James Wybar

Administration:

Barbara Fash
Sandy Homel
Victor Lasher
Dr. Michael Masko
Dr. Nancy Reid
John Rhodes
Jean Rollo
Dr. Thomas Sexton
Timothy Vail

CEA/Teachers:

Dolores McAdams
Joe Kruvczuk
Ed Austin
Tim Walker
Jeff Czekaj
Shannon McCall
Dean Roberts
Cathy Janos
Steve Rubenstein
Mick Sander
Dave Buday
Shirley Kelly
Dennis Dettra
Carolyn Fisher
Steven Beal
Judy Hoffman
Fred Prout

Dawn Denisi
Maureen Walker
Mary Ellen Donnelly
Charlotte Blake
Susan C. Doletski
Tom Mokes
John Senske
Joe O'Connor
Jon Kircher
Pat Stubel
Bridget Gil
Eric Goldsman
Robert B. L. Raymond
Woody Martin

Public:

Kathleen Simpson
Mark Miller
Colleen Hartman
Kristin Hartman
Anthony Wolehasty
G. Wolehasty
Janet Marinoff
Lee Speiser
Barbara Loftus
JoAnn Carey
Ralph Carey
Carole Hibbert
Kathleen Walker
Fred Cohen
Mrs. Fred Cohen

Donna Marie Saul
Donna Tinari Siegfried
Jen O'Brien
Jacqueline Genesio
Erin Dooley
John G. Corcoran
Glenn F. Bosworth
Edward F. Paulsworth
Maureen Lichtner
Marie Morton
Gerald Goldsman
Renee Goldsman
Patty Delpino
Sina Baranski

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mrs. Huf led the group in the Pledge of Allegiance.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mrs. Huf announced that the Board had met in Executive Session prior to this meeting relative to a legal issue regarding a policy and a personnel matter regarding objectives.

Mrs. Huf also reported as follows:

- She had attended the Leary School parents and staff meeting and that it was very well attended.
- She had attended the Hall of Fame Dinner, along with several other Board members.
- The Alumni Breakfast would be held on December 22nd in the Tennent Cafeteria.
- She extended congratulations to Dr. Reid and her husband on becoming the proud grandparents of a new grandson.

Mrs. Jankowsky advised that the 35th Birthday Party for Stackpole would be held on November 22nd. In response to a question by Mr. Faust, she indicated that the dedication of the library would be held on a separate occasion but that no date had been set yet.

GOOD NEWS/PRESENTATIONS

Mrs. Homel spoke about the German Exchange Student Program and introduced Mr. Raymond and two students, who thanked the Board for letting them share news about their trip. Mr. Raymond spoke about the German American Partnership Program. The students presented a scrapbook to the Board with pictures and memories of their trip.

COMMUNITY COMMENTS

Jacqueline Genesio of 1455 Estate Lane, Southampton, addressed the Board regarding rumors that were circulating about cutting block scheduling. She stated that the students were doing their best to adjust to this huge change. They didn't know yet how it would work but asked the Board to let them try. She encouraged the Board to have confidence in the students.

Jennifer O'Brien of 153 Horseshoe Lane, Warminster, stated that she was not sure if the article that appeared in *The Intelligencer* was correct but that it was interpreted that the District wanted to cut teachers to save money. She felt that a small student-to-teacher ratio was essential for learning.

Mr. Grossi responded to the concerns of the students. He indicated that there were some issues that had been raised that there may be more time on task needed. He stated that there were a lot of things to be considered and that we need to have programs and systems in place that benefit children first, the community next and then the staff that we have agreements with.

Donna Siegfried of 667 Dick Avenue, Warminster, indicated that she was the parent of two children in the District and stated that she had always been happy with the District. She felt that having had no tax increase for the past seven years was a double-edged sword and that an increase would have to come sooner or later. She indicated that she was a statistician and that she had analyzed the figures contained in the "Report Card" which appeared in *The Intelligencer*. She reviewed her analysis and summarized by saying that she felt that the District was on track and she hoped that it stayed on the track it was on.

Mary Ellen Donnelly of 460 Springfield Drive, Southampton, (a special education teacher at Tennent and parent of children in the District) stated that her daughter went through high school with the six-period day schedule and was frustrated by the fact that she couldn't take the courses she wanted. Her younger daughter was now in 10th grade and has been happy to fit in more of the courses she wanted to take this year. She requested the Board not to look back at the six-period day since there were so many flaws in it. She stated that she was impressed by how hard the staff was working to make the new schedule successful.

Donna Marie Saul of 589 Lowell Road, Warminster, stated that she did not feel that technology replaces teachers. She felt that there are those who would rather not have information disseminated on a timely basis than to be involved in the headlines. She felt that it is not honest to compare the Star Day with the five period day. She stated that as a parent of two children in the District, she was very happy with the change to block scheduling. She felt that most parents in the District have an interest in their schools, the style of delivery and the programs that are given. She also felt that the faculty was very dedicated to trying to make block scheduling work and she was disturbed by the options being looked at. She invited all interested parents to join her at the Warminster Free Library on October 2nd to discuss this matter further.

Lee Weinstein of 1799 Brandywine Drive, Southampton, stated that he knew there had been a lot of rumors going around about the new schedule and felt that the students should be given a fair chance to try to make the schedule work.

Mr. Grossi responded that the District was going to develop a management plan and look at every possible option. He indicated that the Board's goal was to make education better.

Marguerite Genesisio of 1455 Estate Lane, Southampton, stated that the amount of people attending the meeting showed support for the system currently in place. She asked for clarification about the intentions of the Finance Committee.

Mr. Grossi replied that they would be examining the use of the existing facilities and whether or not they were being used efficiently, would address at this meeting the fair share cost, would examine how many empty classrooms there were and what the contingency plan would be if Shenandoah Woods shut down and there was an extra school. Mr. Grossi also indicated that they had examined what options meet the contract, and that this must be re-examined. He indicated that they were trying to get a business plan in place by December 2000.

Mrs. Genesisio questioned why block scheduling was being looked at. Mr. Grossi responded that it was part of a five-year business plan and that hundred of ideas were being considered.

Mrs. Genesisio felt that the Board was sending a vote of no confidence on the decision they made. She also felt that it was embarrassing to have the same budget for the past seven years and that taxes had not been raised in all that time.

Mrs. Huf stated that the Board had done a lot of work and that no one wanted to throw out block scheduling. The Board planned to stand by it, they have made a commitment to it. However, it might need to be tweaked. She indicated that every Board member's main concern was the students and that the Board appreciated everyone's concerns.

A recess was called at 8:40 p.m. The meeting resumed at 8:54 p.m.

COMMITTEE MINUTES

None

POLICIES

Discussion:

2.18 – Employment of Co-Curricular Coaches and Advisors

Section V., *Duration of Contract* – Mr. Faust pointed out that there was no actual statement indicating the duration of contract. He believed that all the co-curricular contracts were for a one-year period. He felt that should be stated. Dr. Sexton and Mrs. Jankowsky indicated their agreement.

Section I. G. – Mrs. Jankowsky questioned how it could be determined whether someone had the “*ability to comply with District policies, regulations and procedures.*” Dr.

Sexton responded that basically we are saying that we want them to follow the rules. He indicated that this could be rephrased.

Section I. H. – Mrs. Jankowsky questioned why a principal would be determining the practice sessions for a particular sport. Mrs. Homel stated that what was implied was the Athletic Director, who answers to the building administrator. She felt that this could be clarified by adding a statement about the Athletic Director.

Section III. D. – Mrs. Jankowsky questioned why rules and regulations were to be reviewed with the “*non-district employee*”, rather than all employees. She felt that there might be new staff members who were not familiar with the rules and regulations. There was consensus on this point.

Attachment B, page 2 – Mrs. Jankowsky questioned the designation at the bottom of Section II stating “*High School Only.*” Mrs. Homel clarified that there was an asterisk preceding that statement, which indicated that the designation applied only to item *M*.

Mr. Grossi pointed out that the rules should be in some sort of document that should be shared with coaches on an annual basis and that any revisions should be highlighted.

Section I. H. – Mr. Faust asked if this section applied to middle school also. Mrs. Homel replied that in middle school the evaluation of the coaches was signed off on by the principal, who would also get input from the people in the building who oversee the athletic program.

Mr. Faust asked what the responsibilities were of the Athletic Directors at the middle schools. Mrs. Homel responded that the duties included communication on budget issues and the overall program.

Mr. Grossi felt that the criteria for evaluation should be uniform throughout the District and that it should be the responsibility of the AD. Mrs. Jankowsky felt that evaluation of the coaches might fit somewhere else. Dr. Reid pointed out Section IV, regarding evaluations.

Mrs. Huf indicated that this policy would be brought back for Board approval.

4.10 – Video Cameras on School Buses

A motion was made by Mr. Locke and seconded by Mrs. Jankowsky to resolve that the Centennial School Board approves Policy 4.10, Video Cameras on School Buses.

The motion passed 9-0.

5.7 – Reporting Student Progress

A motion was made by Mr. Locke and seconded by Mrs. Jankowsky to resolve that the Centennial School Board approves the revisions of Policy 5.7, Reporting Student Progress.

Mr. Strouse stated that there was a portion of this policy that had not been through the process. He indicated that he would like to bifurcate it from the policy for further consideration at another time.

A motion was made by Mr. Strouse and seconded by Mrs. Jankowsky to amend the motion by deleting item VIII. Honor Roll.

Mr. Faust stated that, while he agreed with Mr. Strouse, he had a problem with using the word “delete.” *He suggested adding the language “to be reviewed and resubmitted as an attachment to this policy.” Mr. Strouse and Mrs. Jankowsky agreed to the change.*

Mr. Grossi indicated that he would vote on this with the understanding that it would be coming back.

The motion to amend passed 9-0.

Discussion continued on the amended motion.

Section VI. Report Cards. – Mrs. Jankowsky stated that since the previous discussion on this, she had thought more about the concept of eight report cards. She was concerned about the opportunity for students to make some adjustments should their progress and performance in a course not be good. She had legitimate concerns about four times per course. She suggested that it would be good for students to reduce the number of report cards to two per semester. She felt that would benefit staff also. She felt that expecting staff to generate enough data to develop a grade for a student might not produce a valid assessment of a student’s progress.

Mr. Faust felt that if the Board decided to go back to two reports per semester, it should again consider progress reports.

Mrs. Huf stated her concern that if there would be only two report cards, there should be some method of communication between the teacher, student and family. She did not feel that two report cards were enough.

Mr. Grossi reminded everyone that the reason the report card was going to be delivered earlier was because remediation, if needed, would be swift and immediate. There would be a program to help the student get back on track quickly.

Mr. Faust felt that a progress report would still give an idea of what was happening.

Mrs. Jankowsky agreed that there should be two progress reports and two report cards. She felt a responsibility to provide a mechanism for students to be successful.

Mr. Wybar felt that the preparation of a progress report was much different from the preparation of a report card. He suggested three reports per semester.

Mr. Grossi suggested a compromise of using four reports, but using only the second and last in the computation of the GPA. Mrs. Jankowsky felt that was a good compromise, as long as the first and third reports were not included in the GPA. She felt that if the progress report gives more information than the report card, we should go with that.

Mr. Strouse stated that there was more information on the progress report than on the report card.

Lee Weinstein of 1799 Brandywine Drive, Southampton, felt that Mr. Faust and Mrs. Jankowsky made valid points. He indicated that he had a very high rank and that if he gets a B he tries even harder. He felt that a report card every three weeks would be tough but that the progress reports worked well. He thought that having two reports that counted toward the GPA would be fine.

Scott Kachelries of 513 Penrose Lane (a Senior) stated that he felt going with progress reports every two weeks was a great idea and that he would like to see two report cards per semester.

Mrs. Jankowsky felt that having progress reports every two weeks would be putting a lot on the staff. She felt that two within a course was reasonable but that it did not need to be limited to two. If a teacher felt they wanted to do more, they would be permitted to. She asked whether the transcripts submitted to colleges contained the individual report card grades or just the final grade in the course. Dr. Masko replied that they contained only the final grade for the course.

Mr. Grossi agreed to the second and last reports. He felt that if the progress report gave more information than the report card, then maybe there was a problem. He felt the report card should give as much information as the progress report.

Mrs. Jankowsky indicated that she would like to provide direction to Administration. She indicated that there were three points of view, as follows:

1. Four report cards per course; first and third reports not counting towards GPA.
2. Two reports cards and two progress reports.
3. Three report cards.

There was a consensus to go with two report cards and two progress reports.

Dr. Sexton asked for clarification of the language. Mr. Faust pointed out that AP courses are one course over two semesters. It was clarified that there would be two report cards and two progress reports *per semester, not per course*.

Section IV. – Mr. Strouse suggested that this be changed from “*Middle School*” to “*Secondary School*” and that in Section A it be changed from “6-8” to “6-12.” This was agreed upon.

Mrs. Homel voiced her concern with saying “*Secondary*” in items B and C. She felt that in high school there would be an enormous amount of paperwork involved in requiring Progress Reports to be signed. Mr. Strouse felt that this was a logistics problem and that there should be a way to solve it. Mr. Avery didn’t feel that it would be any more of a logistical problem than anything else.

Janet Marinoff of 51 Fern Road, Southampton, stated that when reports cards are issued, there are teacher conferences that would give the same information as a progress report. She pointed out that there was nothing on the report cards to be signed and returned to the high school. Mr. Grossi asked if she thought there should be.

Mrs. Marinoff stated that parents should be aware of when the reports were coming out and should make sure they saw them.

Mrs. Jankowsky suggested that we look at incorporating into the budget the mailing of the reports.

Mr. Hertenberger asked who would give out the reports, the first or last period teacher. Mrs. Homel stated that she would have to check into that.

Mr. Grossi felt that the reports should be mailed out and that he had no problem with adding that into the budget.

Scott Kachelries of 513 Penrose Lane felt that everyone put too much confidence in his peers. He indicated that the report cards were usually given out at the end of the day but he did not know what they would do now.

Mrs. Jankowsky encouraged the Board to move on. She felt the Board was getting too bogged down in operational issues. Mr. Grossi, however, felt that it was incumbent upon the Board to guarantee that the report cards arrived at the students’ homes.

Mrs. Huf stated that she would like to make this effective as of September 1, 2000, and that this should be put into the motion.

Mr. Faust stated that he felt the students had to take responsibility at some point and so should the parents.

Mr. Avery felt that at some level the Board must assure that the students who were getting unsatisfactory marks were getting the reports home to the parents. He felt the issue needed to be addressed and that the Board needed to make sure there were safeguards for the students who were not high achievers and whose parents might not be aware of the schedule. He felt that it might be possible to state that any progress report with a *D* or an *F* would need to have a signature and that maybe this would alleviate some of the logistical issues.

Mr. Locke felt that there should be a mailing program with a return envelope to the Administrative Office. He felt this would take the matter out of the students' hands. Mrs. Jankowsky felt that the Board needed to provide Administration with some latitude.

Mr. Grossi suggested that the Board move forward with two progress reports and two report cards, with the second and fourth counting towards the GPA. He indicated that he would like to receive a report from Administration regarding whether the reports got home to the parents. If they did not, then the Board could entertain a fiscal note to handle the problem.

Mr. Avery felt the Board needed to make a decision. He suggested that, initially, the existing system could be used for mailing progress reports. When it was time to issue report cards, he would like to have a set procedure.

Mr. Faust stated that this policy would be coming back so that the Honor Roll portion could be reviewed. He suggested that, before spending a lot of time mailing things, the Board should keep in mind that a student could get to the mail before the parents.

Section VII. – Mrs. Jankowsky pointed out that weighted grades were not mentioned anywhere in this section, although they appeared in the chart. Mr. Strouse indicated that this was discussed and the committee felt that the chart was self-explanatory. There was a consensus that this section should stand as written.

Section VII. E. – Mrs. Jankowsky raised the issue of how the GPA was computed. It was decided that this section should be changed to indicate that the average would correspond to the numeric average of the *two* marking period grades and the final exam grade.

Mrs. Jankowsky asked if a teacher of an AP course would give a final exam in addition to the AP exam. Mrs. Homel responded that this had been discussed and it was determined that a final exam was necessary in addition to the AP exam since the AP exam results would not be received until summer, after issuance of report cards.

Lee Weinstein of 1799 Brandywine Drive, Southampton, pointed out that the calendar stated that report cards would be issued, but now it was being changed to progress reports. He felt that progress reports should be signed and returned but not mailed out. He felt the students had the right to see the reports also.

Laura Andekian of 143 Wellington Drive stated that she felt parents should be notified by the school if a student is failing. She thought the money should not be spent on mailing, but on getting in touch with the parents. She did not feel it should be left up to the student to bring the information home, it was up to the school and the teachers to call the parents to notify them if a student was failing. She felt that mailing reports would be a waste of time.

Dr. Sexton stated that he felt this issue was handled under Section II. C. of the policy.

A motion was made by Mr. Strouse and seconded by Mr. Faust to call the question.

Janet Marinoff of 51 Fern Road, Southampton, stated that she was in favor of two progress reports and two report cards. She asked how the weight of the final exam would factor in. Dr. Sexton read the proposed changes for clarification.

The motion to call the question passed 9-0.

The amended motion passed 9-0.

Mr. Faust requested that this policy be processed again for review after the changes were made.

NEW BUSINESS

8. Exception to Policy 7.18

A motion was made by Mr. Locke and seconded by Mrs. Jankowsky to resolve that the Centennial School Board approves an exception to policy 7.18 to allow John Pultro to continue to attend William Tennent High School during the period when he resides outside the Centennial School District awaiting housing in Warminster. This exception is granted only for the period between the family's move from their current apartment to December 31, 2000.

John Pultro, Sr. of 345 East County Line Road, Hatboro, (father of the student) explained the circumstances surrounding the request and indicated that housing would be available within the District in the next month or so. He indicated that he would provide transportation for his son during the interim period.

A motion was made by Mrs. Jankowsky and seconded by Mr. Grossi to amend the motion to state that the parent would provide transportation to and from school for the student.

In response to a question by Mrs. Jankowsky, Mrs. Homel indicated that Administration supported this request.

The motion to amend passed 9-0.

The amended motion passed 9-0.

1. Student Physical and Dental Examinations
2. Adopt 2001/2002 Budget Calendar
3. Pupil Transportation Contracts 2000/01
4. Appointment of PSBA Delegates
5. Additional Curriculum Resource Team Member
6. Superintendent's Salary 2000/01

A motion was made by Mr. Strouse and seconded by Mrs. Jankowsky to resolve that the Centennial School Board:

- (1) Approves the extension of the timeframe for completing private dental and physical examinations to allow parents to present doctors' reports dated anytime after January 1 prior to the start of the school year.*
- (2) Adopts the attached calendar for the formulation and adoption of the fiscal year 2001/2002 General Fund Budget.*
- (3) Authorizes the services of pupil transportation contractors and rates as per attached supplement.*
- (4) Appoints the following three School Board Members as voting delegates to the Legislative Policy Council: Joseph Faust, Joan Jankowsky, Betty Huf. The meeting will be held on Thursday, October 19th during the PASA-PSBA School Leadership Conference 2000.*
- (5) Approves the addition of a secondary elementary position to the Professional Development Curriculum Resource Team.*
- (6) Approves the salary of \$113,850 for Dr. Nancy A. Reid, Superintendent of Schools, for the 2000/01 school year.*

On item 3, Mrs. Jankowsky asked why there were per hour rates on some items and not on others and why the per hour rates were different for each private contractor.

Mr. Rhodes explained that the contracts for private individuals were \$5.25 per hour and that the only exception was for a student in a wheelchair. Otherwise the rates were set by the individual schools.

The motion passed 9-0.

7. Fair Share Rental Rate

A motion was made by Mr. Grossi and seconded by Mr. Strouse to resolve that the Centennial School Board authorizes Administration to recommend to the Bucks County School District's Fair Share Committee that the "fair share" rates for special education rental of BCIU administered programs be set at \$15,000 per classroom for the upcoming 2001/2002 school year and that the rates for each year thereafter be adjusted based on the annual inflation rate as determined by the Consumer Price Index.

Mr. Faust questioned if the Consumer Price Index was the proper one to use. Mr. Grossi responded that the CPI was the normal offering price in these kinds of contracts.

The motion passed 9-0.

OLD BUSINESS

Budgetary Transfers, End-of-Year 1999/2000

A motion was made by Mr. Grossi and seconded by Mrs. Jankowsky to resolve that the Centennial School Board approves the Budgetary Transfers, End-of-Year 1999/2000.

The motion passed 9-0.

Strategic Plan 2000-06

A motion was made by Mrs. Jankowsky and seconded by Mr. Grossi to resolve that the Centennial School Board approves the Centennial School District Strategic Plan 2000-06 as a blueprint and guide for the advancement of the School District Educational Program.

The motion passed 9-0.

Mrs. Jankowsky stated that the members of the committee thanked the Board for their support for the plan.

PERSONNEL

A motion was made by Mrs. Jankowsky and seconded by Mr. Faust to resolve that the Centennial School Board approves the following Personnel items: Resignations/Retirements/ Leaves of Absences; Appointments; Change of Status; Curriculum Resource Team Members; Saturday School Proctors; Permanent Per Diem Substitutes; Per Diem Substitutes; Homebound Instructors; Kindergarten Bus Aides; Support Staff Substitutes; and Co-Curricular Additions, Changes and Deletions.

Mr. Faust asked who was doing the job of the Music teacher who resigned at Stackpole. Dr. Sexton stated that a per diem substitute was filling the position at the present time and that a permanent replacement was being sought.

The motion passed 9-0.

OTHER

PSBA Seminar Information

Mrs. Jankowsky stated that she wanted to inform Board members that over the past two weeks, Mrs. Huf, Mr. Locke and she had attended two in-service programs by PSBA. She reported that

the good news was that Centennial was already doing what was recommended on technology assessment. Regarding the “*Attracting and Keeping the Best*” seminar, Mrs. Jankowsky stated that she would ask Administration to distribute a chart on compensation, which she felt would provide a sound basis for discussion compared to what we have now.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Mr. Grossi and seconded by Mr. Faust to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed 9-0. The meeting was adjourned at 10:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Vickie A. Detwiler
Board Secretary