



Policy Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

Plymouth-Canton Community Schools
March 12, 2024 – 5:30 p.m.
Meeting Location: Collaboration Conference Room
454 S. Harvey, Plymouth, MI 48170

Committee Attendees: Patti McCoin, Dr. Monica Merritt, Abdul Madyun, Kurt Tyszkiewicz, Chris Allan, and Aamina Ahmed

Others Present: John Kava, Beth Rayl, Latisha Thomas, Josh Patterson, Lisa Rasmussen and John Johnston

1. The meeting was called to order at 5:33 p.m. Member McCoin welcomed the group and asked each member to introduce themselves
2. Citizens Comments: None
3. The Meeting Minutes from February 27, 2024 were reviewed. One correction was made. On Page 7, Mr. Tyszkiewicz's name was misspelled. The correction was made.
4. Mr. Tyszkiewicz reviewed the agenda. He spoke about the policy timeline. There are seven Policies on the Board Meeting agenda for this evening. Policy 3131/4141 Reduction in Certified Staff, was missed in the last group that went to the Board for first read, it will go to the Board tonight along with two other Policies; the Citizen's Advisory Committee and Facilities Utilization and Boundary study . The remaining Policies are waiting to be uploaded into the NEOLA portal.

5. Old Business:

At the last Policy Committee meeting we discussed Policies that needed to be looked into. John Kava brought back information to the Committee.

Non-Disclosure Agreement. Mr. Kava spoke about the members of the community that serve on committees, such as the Citizen's Advisory Committee and the Facilities Utilization and Boundary study and whether there should be a signed, non-disclosure agreement. He gave the committee a handout regarding FERPA and the acknowledgement of volunteer responsibilities. Mr. Kava said if the group were in agreement, a form could be created for P-CCS to use.

Member McCoin mentioned an issue that came up in the past regarding a spreadsheet that was shared with people in the community. It contained the student's personal information. This

information included student's email addresses, first and last name and their school. She asked if this information would be protected?

Mr. Kava said typically the student's name isn't necessarily protected. It depends on what they're engaging in. Some information is allowed to be released without the parent's consent. The P-CCS Directory information would have to be looked at.

Member Allan asked when talking about privileged information, even if it's directory information, does it have to be personal identifiable information and can that be in the scope of the NDA?

Mr. Kava said we can broaden the scope and there's a number of ways to protect information.

Member Allan asked if community members were responding to surveys, and had expectations that certain information wouldn't become public, would they be informed ahead of time regarding how this information would be shared?

Member McCoin stated that some information shouldn't be discussed in public while committees are still deciding on how to proceed.

Member Allan asked if the information needed to be narrow in scope to just PII or can it be aggregate information?

Mr. Kava responded and said we can make it broader. A general form could be created and tailored for specific needs while abiding by the law

Member Allan commented on taking surveys and wondered if a person's opinion becomes public, could that affect the way they respond to the survey?

Mr Kava read the current directory information from Policy 8330 STUDENT RECORDS, which states as follows:

- A. a student's name;
- B. address (except for students participating in the address confidentiality program act);
- C. date and place of birth;
- D. major field of study;
- E. participation in officially recognized activities and sports;
- F. dates of attendance;
- G. date of graduation;
- H. awards received;

- I. school photographs or videos of students participating in school activities, events or programs.

Mr. Kava said this information can be disclosed unless the student and/or their parents opt out of having that information released. The district has an obligation to ensure that it's reviewing opt outs before the information is released. Mr. Kava asked if we'd like to proceed with creating a form for P-CCS?

Member McCoin said she would like to see it broadened enough so people feel confident that their information is being protected.

Mr. Madyun asked if the form was subject to FOIA?

Mr. Kava said the question is; is the information subject to FOIA or not? He said the form we're talking about is preventing individuals from releasing information.

Member McCoin stated that the district would redact information.

Mr. Patterson said things that are typically redacted are name, email addresses and home addresses. He said moving forward, information could be redacted before information is shared.

Member McCoin said the problem is that it's a lot of work to have someone redact thousands of surveys.

Member Allan suggested making a copy of the sheet and redact the information that shouldn't be made public.

Mr. Patterson said that even if it was FOIA'd, you'd only be able to FOIA the document that was provided.

Dr. Merritt said if a document was provided to a committee it can still be subject to FOIA because someone in the district would have the document that retained all of the information.

Mr. Kava said that is correct unless a third party was conducting the survey and the information was kept anonymous from the outset. They could also use something like numbers in lieu of using names.

Member Allen asked how broad can the request be made to keep information private?

Mr. Kava said the document can include something for individuals to sign as part of a committee saying they cannot release information received as part of the committee. He said the issue is what is the enforcement mechanism? Unless something is released that is contrary to the law that someone can be prosecuted for, or there could be a civil suit against the individual, there's limited enforcement mechanisms other than telling the individual they are no longer part of the committee. The Board could also request that someone is removed from a committee.

Mr. Madyun commented that it's worthwhile to have a person sign an acknowledgement because it keeps them cognitive of the fact that they signed the document and the information shouldn't get out

Mr. Allan said because people feel there is no transparency, how do you balance the line of keeping things private without making it look like something secretive?

Dr. Merritt said if something is potentially highly controversial we could use a third party to conduct the survey and would go out with numbers that are assigned, instead of names. The district wouldn't keep the information but would get the responsive document. We want students and families to feel comfortable taking surveys.

Mr. Johnston asked if it's the policy that's the problem or the dissemination of someone's name that's the problem? Until a policy is ready to be voted on to be adopted, the community will have something to talk about regardless.

Member McCoin said it's not policies, policies are discussed in an open meeting and anyone can come. It's about information that is discussed in closed committee meetings. There is information that shouldn't be released until the committee is ready to give the Board the information that was discussed. Once the committee is ready to make a recommendation, then it will become public but the work leading up to that will be discussed in closed committee meetings.

Policy 7250.01 RENAMING EXISTING FACILITIES/MASCOTS/LOGOS

- A. Mr. Kava said retention schedules are still being reviewed and the committee will continue to review this policy

Policy 5410 PROMOTION, PLACEMENT AND RETENTION

- A. Information was requested from the last meeting regarding current practice. The Teaching & Learning department has been reviewing this policy and the current practice. The Policy Committee and the Teaching & Learning department had suggestions regarding language that needs to be cleaned up.

Ms. Rayl suggested that the following be stricken from the policy - *demonstrated the degree of social, emotional, and physical maturation necessary for a successful learning experience in the next grade.*

Ms. Rayl said the language is something that cannot be measured and should be removed from the policy.

Mr. Tyszkiewicz asked the group if they had any objection to removing the language. There were no objections.

The Teaching & Learning department made a suggestion to change: *Following sound principles of child guidance, the Board discourages the skipping of grades to Following sound principles of research related to child development and evidence based best practice, The Board discourages the skipping of grades and the retention of students.*

Member Allan said from reading the language in green that he understood it as the retention of a student shouldn't be based solely on the request of a parent? He also asked if the Board discouraged all retention of students?

Ms. Rayl said when we look at the evidence and research around retention and the long term ramifications on students, it would be looked at as a last resort. The research of a student who has been retained one time in their educational career, often gets off track for graduation

Mr. Kava noted that the policy really doesn't say anything about retention other than what has been added recently. He said the policy should reflect the practice and should include the building Principal would have the final say because the Principal would know what's appropriate for the student and the other students in that building

Mr. Johnston asked if a child can only be held back one time and moved on the rest of the time what would be the equity of learning?

Ms. Rayl said it would be the district's job to provide additional support for that student.

Member Ahmed asked what is the data for the district around retention?

Ms. Rayl said she believes one student was retained last year but she will check to be sure. She said retention should always be in the best interest of the student

Mr. Tyszkiewicz asked if the committee would like this brought back to the committee with the language cleaned up or should we move it forward?

Member McCoin asked that the cleaned up version be brought back to the committee

Policy 5420 REPORTING STUDENT PROGRESS

- A. Teaching & Learning had been reviewing current practice and Mr. Tyszkiewicz wanted to check NEOLA to make sure there weren't any updates that weren't adopted. He couldn't find any that weren't adopted. There was contract language, possibly an MOU regarding this policy around the time MISTAR came about where parents would have the ability to see their student's progress through Parent Connection.

Ms. Rayl said the MOU outlined some timelines regarding when assignments needed to be submitted in MISTAR. This was a change from paper report cards and progress reports that were sent home to an online platform that sends information home in real time.

Mr. Patterson asked if Ms. Rayl could restate what she said regarding the timeline of when assignments were expected to be updated in MISTAR

Ms. Rayl said that when an assignment is submitted the expectation is, it's reviewed, graded and given feedback within a week. with the exception of major papers. Ms. Rayl said if that's not happening then the student should have a conversation with the teacher.

Mr. Patterson said it's widespread and some teachers choose to grade at different times.

Ms. Rayl said that is not the expectation.

Mr. Madyun said it's unfair to students because if a teacher puts everything in MISTAR at the end then the students are unaware of their grades.

Mr. Patterson said "that's the problem".

Member Allan said he has an assumption that not every parent pays attention to the portal and wondered if parents can opt in to receive paper report cards?

Ms. Rayl said parents can request paper report cards but the majority check MISTAR and notices are sent to the families.

Member Allan wondered how many people pay attention to their email and if they're aware of any notices sent by the district?

Mr. Tyszkiewicz said the district can provide the information but whether the parents read it is out of our control. The district provides communication using different methods.

Mr. Patterson suggested that maybe the district needs to communicate the MISTAR expectation to teachers because he doesn't think it's known.

Dr. Merritt said her suggestion is that students who are experiencing this should go through the proper channel and this will empower the students to feel comfortable communicating this to their teacher.

Mr. Patterson said then maybe it needs to be communicated to students so they know what to do if this is happening.

Mr. Madyn stated that Mr. Patterson had a good point and if it is widespread then the students need to know how they should handle this situation.

Member Allan asked if the students would be comfortable talking to their teacher about this?

Mr. Patterson said he didn't know if he would feel comfortable questioning a teacher and sometimes there are extenuating circumstances that contribute to grades being posted late.

Dr. Merritt said this is also something that could be a parent communication. The parent might ask their child to advocate for themselves and if that doesn't work then the parent will step in. A parent might also say they will contact the teacher and ask their child not to. The district does ask that this is communicated in the teacher's syllabus at the beginning of the year.

Member Allan asked if the seven day rule is in the Administrative Guidelines?

Ms. Rayl said it is in the MOU with the PCEA but doesn't know if it's in the Administrative Guidelines.

Mr. Tyszkiewicz asked if we should bring the MOU back and add language?

Mr. Madyun said he would see if he could locate the MOU.

Policy 5464 EARLY GRADUATION

- A. This policy was brought to the last policy meeting and the Teaching & Learning department was reviewing it. There is a pronoun change that needs to be made.

Ms. Rayl said there is a process for early graduation. The student would work with their counselor and then fill out the required documents. The documents are then reviewed by

the Principal. The student would also have the option to graduate with their graduating class.

Member McCoin said the committee wanted someone from Teaching & Learning to see if this policy is reasonable for today

Mr. Tyszkiewicz said this policy will be brought to the Board for first read, with the correction

Policy 2451 ALTERNATIVE HIGH SCHOOL

- A. This policy was being reviewed by SPA and/or Teaching & Learning. The policy committee wanted language changed to reflect more positivity regarding the alternative high school. There were also questions raised such as when students could enter Starkweather and the capacity of the school? Mr. Tyszkiewicz said there was work done on this policy prior to the last policy meeting that he was unaware of, which was noted in the updated copy given at this meeting.

Member McCoin said she had some edits that Member Sidhu suggested. Member Sidhu would like language added regarding extra curricular activities and suggested some language changes within the policy.

Ms. Rayl said a legal review would be needed for Member Sidhu's proposed language. We want to make sure it's inclusive and not restrictive.

Mr. Tyszkiewicz said it can be edited and brought back to the committee, Mr. Kava will look at it as well.

- B. Ms. Rayl spoke about the age requirement for students entering Starkweather. Currently freshmen aren't attending Starkweather but it could happen in the future. Conversations will continue due to the adult education program that attends Starkweather and the ages involved.

Member Allan suggested that another term be used in place of young people.

Other suggestions were made such as: High School aged students or students.

6. New Business:

Due to time constraints, the committee decided to discuss this at the next policy meeting.

Future Scheduled Meetings:

April 23, 2024

May 28, 2024

June 25, 2024

The meeting was adjourned at 6:40