

Representatives of the Staff and Community: Lucy Liu, John Freeman, Bruce Hancock, Heidi Eby, Brian Shiflett, David E. Fisher, Michelle Kinsey.

1.03 Flag Salute

Mr. Stover led those gathered in the Salute to the American Flag.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2.01 Approval of the September 26, 2011 School Board Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Mrs. Chabal and seconded by Mrs. Sheffey to approve the minutes of the September 26 School Board meeting. All Board members present signified by a Yes vote.

MOTION CARRIED

INFORMATION AND PROPOSALS

3.01 Announcement of Executive Session

Dr. Donahue: I'd like to announce the Board met in Executive Session prior to the meeting to discuss legal issues, matters that must be conducted in private to protect lawful privilege, and certain conferences and working sessions.

3.02 Announcement of Working Session

Dr. Donahue: When the meeting adjourns this evening, the Board will reconvene a public work session. Tonight the Board will discuss an issue during a less formal session and that will be the issue of the calendar, because of cancelled classes due to the flooding, we're going to have to make some adjustments on the calendar, so we'll be discussing different options in that regard. The public is welcome to attend that meeting.

3.03 Recognition of Citizens (Agenda Items)

None.

3.04 Student Representatives' Report

Mr. Cole/Mr. Haverstick: As you may know, last week was the District's Homecoming. This year's unprecedented success was not achieved though without a few roadblocks, literally and figuratively.

Despite last minute changes to the route, the parade ran very smoothly and the turnout was exceptional. Students and community members across the District came out at both participants and supporters. It was great to see the alumni involved as well, as the Class of 1969 even featured their own float in the festivities.

The football game followed and was attended well as usual and the football team came away with the victory to cap off that Friday night.

The next night over 700 students enjoyed a night in Paris. The student council put on a great deal of effort into creating a beautiful rendition of that theme that many of the students thoroughly enjoyed. They said it was not only perhaps the best Homecoming of their career, but also the best Homecoming weekend of their career.

The only negative comments that came out of the weekend centered around students' frustration with not being allowed into the dance without student ID, but this issue was made clear to them well in advance so I think it was just an isolated case of student laziness.

This past Thursday as well, students in Grades 6, 8, 10, and 12 participated in the Pennsylvania Youth Survey, which was produced by the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency. This 45 minute survey offered 125 questions concerning controlled substances and violence. Some students, specifically those who valued and understood the surveys intentions took the survey seriously, responding to all questions genuinely. Some, however, did not take the lengthy as seriously as they could have. Post-survey some students expressed a desire for faculty administering the survey to further explain its purpose. This, they felt, would have provided more genuine data.

In conclusion, we just want to briefly sum up what the overall pulse of the student body – what's basically going on in the High School right now. You could say these are very hectic times and stressful times. Students are tackling hectic schedules with fall sports and also extracurriculars and clubs that are well underway now. Also juniors and seniors are beginning to tackle the college admissions process with college visits. The standardized test season is also underway so students are taking aim at that dream score, but as you may know that's putting a lot of stress on them.

Other than that, the school year is off to a fantastic start and that concludes our report.

Dr. Donahue: Thank you very much. Are there any questions for our Student Representatives? Great thanks.

3.05 2011 Assessment Presentation

Dr. Donahue: This evening we have a presentation – the 2011 Assessment results, Dr. Lillenstein and Mr. McFarland.

Mr. McFarland: Mr. President, thank you for the opportunity to address the Board tonight on our results from our PSSA testing last spring. As you recall, we've been putting a good deal of emphasis on our curriculum aligning to standards and transitioning to the common core standards. One area that we focused on last year was our 11th grade. The High School faculty and Administration spent a lot of time helping the students understand the importance of doing their best. I think you'll see the fruits of that work tonight as Dr. Lillenstein shares the results District-wide and also at the 11th grade so I'll turn it over to Dr. Lillenstein.

Dr. Lillenstein: Thank you. I will explain each slide what you're looking at so hopefully this will be pretty clear and straight forward. The first slide, this is an overall summary of the performance of the achievement level for all the grades in the District combined by subject area relative to the state. So this takes all the students that took the PSSA last year and combines them. As you can see our achievement is above the state averages across the board in each subject area and we're also fairly consistent across the various subject, unlike the state averages.

This is a graph that breaks down the achievement level or the performance by subject by grade. You'll see that I have the schools grouped by color to separate them. The targets last year for the 2011 PSSA increased from the 2010 year from 56% to 67% in math and from 63% to 72% in reading so keep that in mind as you're looking at those percentages to see how we compare to the targets for AYP. The targets for next year as they currently stand are 81% for reading and 78% for math. There are no targets for science and writing as they do not factor into AYP, but we feel that they're important to present in this charts as they do have PSSA subject tests.

So how did we do? As I said, across the board we met the targets. In reading, we range from 73% in 5th grade to nearly 94% in 8th grade. In math their performance level is slightly higher ranging from nearly 80% proficient and advanced in 11th grade to almost 95% proficient or advanced in 4th and 7th grade.

You'll notice that in science we range from almost 71% advanced or proficient in 11th grade to 92% advanced or proficient in 4th grade. In writing we range from nearly 81% in 8th grade to nearly 95% in 11th grade. The slide, however, does not tell us much other than our level of performance or our achievement level. It does not touch on growth and we will cover that in a little bit, nor does it touch on past performance for our comparison with the state so we'll go to the next slide to start looking at the different subject areas.

The first is reading. This slide lumps together or groups together all of the students who took the PSSA in reading. This is a capture of the achievement level. It combines all grades. Keep in mind though that when you're looking at the 2011 results with 2010, with 2009, we're looking at different cohorts of students so it's not a clean comparison, but, overall, you can see what the general achievement levels are.

In reading when all the grades are combined, you'll see that in 2011 year, nearly 86% of our students were advanced or proficient, and it compares to 83% in 2010. You'll notice that the performance is essentially in line with the two previous years and it's above the state average, which fell at just under 74% advanced or proficient.

Next we'll go on to math. For the 2011 PSSA in math, nearly 90% of our students were advanced or proficient. This compares to slightly more than 88% on the 2010 PSSA and 86% in 2009. Again, the state average last year was 77.1%.

Next we'll go on to science. For the 2011 PSSA in science which is assessed in only grades 4, 8, and 11, you'll notice that we were slightly over 82% advanced or proficient. This compares to 76% advanced or proficient in 2010, and the state average was just under 61%. At first glance 82% may seem low, relative to the state it's a significant difference and you'll see in a few slides how that compares to others in the state.

Next slide takes a look at writing. Writing is assessed in grades 5, 8, and 11. You'll notice here that for 2011 we were nearly 86% advanced or proficient, which compares to 80% in 2010, and the state average is 75%.

So what does all this mean for AYP? This is the state summary of AYP status. What we want to see is a green in every box and we want to see a yes in every box, so what you'll see there is a yes and green. This indicates that we made AYP across the board at all grade levels and that also includes all subgroups, because if you don't make it in one subgroup, then you're not determined to make AYP. This indicates that we did make AYP across all subgroups, both in math and reading across all grades. We also made AYP in terms of attendance rate and graduation rate.

Now we're going to go on and take a look at the PVAAS. PVAAS is the Pennsylvania Value Added Assessment System. It's not a new assessment or another test, but rather it's a calculation on the PSSA results that shows or predicts growth. It looks at growth in terms of forward growth projections, how students are predicted to perform in the future as well as growth from the past. The slides that we're looking at here portray growth from the past. These are the 2011 results, but are actually reflecting growth from the 2010 PSSA.

On our chart at the top, you'll see that there are four colors. We actually would like to see one color and that would be dark blue, however, dark blue is better than light blue, which is better than green. Those three colors indicate that we either met or exceeded the growth standard so we want to see anything a green, light blue, or dark blue. Where we see red, what that indicates is that growth was not achieved. We may have

performed well, but growth was not achieved. The descriptors are a little bit different this year than they were last year. This year the descriptors have changed so for both red and yellow, what red and yellow suggest is that there is either moderate or significant evidence that we did not meet growth whereas green is that there's evidence, blue is moderate evidence, and dark blue is significant evidence that we exceeded the growth standard.

This chart also gives us the three year average so you can see under the box that says 2011, you'll see three year average. This shows how last year's cohort compared to the three year average before. As we look at this, you'll see that we have red for both the 2011 school year as well as the three year average. While this is similar to what we saw last year with 5th grade, the rest of the chart is an improvement over the previous years with the other grades. With further analysis, what we have learned in 5th grade is that this is largely explained by limited growth with our students predicted to be advanced so it's our higher achieving students. Students are probably still performing advanced, but they didn't grow relative to the year before.

Essentially though the growth chart in reading is an improvement for 2011 over the 2010 year, and as we pull in the achievement levels, you'll see that for 5th grade not only was growth below the growth standard achievement levels were also lower. Here we can look at both what are achievement level was as well as our growth.

Now we're going to look and see how do we compare to others in the state. This is a new feature within the PVAAS system, and if you go to the PVAAS site, there is a public reporting site that is available to anybody to take a look at how districts across Pennsylvania compare in terms of achievement and also growth.

This slide shows all so the schools in grades 4 through 8 in the state. We actually want to be in the upper right corner of the diagram, because what that indicates is that you are high achieving and high growth. Conversely, the lower left quadrant indicates low growth/low achievement so we want to be in the upper right. The orange arrow is pointing to our students and you can see we're in the mix and we're towards the upper end of the state performance. You'll see that in general we compare well to other schools in Pennsylvania for reading in grades 4 through 8, but there is some room for improvement.

If we go to the next slide, we'll take a look at how we compare in 11th grade. This shows all of the schools that have 11th grade in the state. The orange arrow points to our students in 11th grade. Again, we want to be in the upper right corner and you can see how we compare to the others in the state. Again, strong performance; there is some room for improvement.

If we go on to the next, we'll take a look at math. This looks at growth from 2010 to 2011 in math. Here you'll notice, again, a caution for 5th grade. It's in red and also for 8th grade. This reflects growth. We're going to look at achievement in a little bit, so just keep in mind that the red is for growth. A deeper analysis again tells us that where we

were missing the growth target was our students predicted to be in the advanced range in both 5th and 8th grade. Again, students who probably performed advanced, but they didn't improve their relative standing from 2010 to 2011. This is, however, significant improvement from last year. When we compared last year's chart with the chart that you're looking at, this is significant improvement from last year. If we pull in the achievement levels, this is classic example of how achievement and growth are two separate issues with the PSSA. Our achievement level in 5th grade – 89.8% of our students were advanced or proficient in math and in 8th grade 92% were advanced or proficient. That's pretty good. So you can see there the achievement level was good, but the growth was not as strong.

So how do we compare to others in the state? You can see the orange area points to where we are and in comparison to others in the state, again we performed pretty strong, however, there is also some room for improvement, particularly in the growth area. You can see achievement-wise, we're one of the top four schools when you lump 4th through 8th grade together, but where there is room for improvement is in growth.

If we go to the next slide, we'll look at 11th grade. The 11th grade slide is spread out a little bit more state-wide. You'll see, again, that relative to other schools we performed pretty well, but again, there is some room for improvement in terms of growth and achievement.

If we go to the next slide, we'll look at writing. Writing you'll see that there's caution in 8th grade in writing, but strong growth in writing in 5th and 11th grade. The writing is the one sub-test that is somewhat subjectively scores so there tends to be a little bit more than variability in performance from year to year, but nonetheless, we have strong growth in 5th and 8th grade. This is improvement from last year's chart.

If we look at the next slide, you'll see how we compare to the state and you'll see that in terms of achievement we're near the top of the pack and in terms of the growth, we're actually near probably the top 12 or 15 schools in the state, but again there is some room for improvement there as well.

If we go to the next slide, we'll take a look at science. This is a good slide. If only the light blue were dark blue and it looks like we're almost there, but it still is very good. This shows that each grade, 4th, 8th, and 11th who were administered the PSSA in science realized strong growth.

So how do we compare to the state? Relative to the state, we're one of the top three or four schools in terms of achievement and growth being combined. I guess you could say there's room for improvement, but in terms of science we're pretty strong. The overall achievement levels in science are lower than the other tests.

That's a snapshot of how we performed. Any questions about our PSSA, AYP, or PVAAS?

Dr. Hagan: I have a question. It's probably a simple question. Does every registered student take the PSSA test? Everybody across the board.

Dr. Lillenstein: Everybody who is in attendance is supposed to be taking it.

Dr. Hagan: Okay.

Dr. Lillenstein: Our participation rates are very high. It's normally like 98%-99%. I don't have the participation rates, but it's high. There are some students who may take one or two of the sub-tests, but then are absent for one or two and so they may not be counted for all, but we do give it to everybody.

Mr. McFarland: And the only exemption given by the state is for religious objection.

Dr. Donahue: I had a question. I have the same questions I had last year, and it's mostly because I have trouble understanding the numbers. Annual yearly progress is strictly a percentage improvement?

Dr. Lillenstein: No. AYP can be met several different ways. One is by achieving the targets that are set by the state. Okay? So a percentage target, but there are multiple ways that you can be found to meet AYP. If you show an improvement in student performance, there's a growth calculation, there's a confidence interval, there's safe harbor, there are a number of different ways that you can actually be found to meet AYP, even though maybe you miss the achievement level target.

Dr. Donahue: And it's not a number that district's budget, for instance, as far as predict where they're going to be. This is all based on state guidelines, correct.

Dr. Lillenstein: The targets . . .

Dr. Donahue: In other words you don't give yourself a target number for the next year?

Dr. Lillenstein: That targets are established by the state. I guess a district could set their targets . . .

Dr. Donahue: But you don't routinely do that.

Dr. Lillenstein: No.

Dr. Donahue: So if you're achieving in one particular – if your number of the percentage of proficient and advanced are, I've asked this before, 99 ½%, can you still meet your progress goals?

Dr. Lillenstein: Yes.

Dr. Donahue: So give me an example on what you would improve if you were at 99, let's say you were at 100%. You had 100% of your students were advanced or proficient, what could you do to demonstrate that you made progress?

Dr. Lillenstein: If we were at 100%, I probably wouldn't be worrying too much about it, but . . .

Dr. Donahue: I'm asking just so I understand the process.

Dr. Lillenstein: A student can still improve the relative standing compared to other students or a group of students can still improve their relative standing compared to others in the state. Right now the PVAAS, as I had shown you, does not necessarily factor in to AYP determination.

Dr. Donahue: So, yeah, I was referring to the AYP, because the PVAAS is a little more, as I understand it, a little more complicated formula.

Dr. Lillenstein: Yes.

Dr. Donahue: The reason I'm asking is because since these scores have come out, you've seen all the newspaper articles that suggest that it will be extremely difficult to meet the targets next year and nearly impossible, if you believe the newspapers, nearly impossible in 2013. Are the papers right and is that true for our District?

Dr. Lillenstein: Well in 2014, the target is 100%. Now that may change between now and 2014. I don't know what's going to happen then. The article that was in the paper last week was somewhat incomplete, because it talked about meeting AYP just based on a certain percentage target.

Dr. Donahue: Right.

Dr. Lillenstein: But there are many other ways that you can meet AYP and the article did not touch on that.

Dr. Donahue: That's clearly the impression I got from reading the article was that it's purely a percentage thing. Even the AYP is more complicated than just percentages and the PVAAs is even a little more complicated. Thank you.

Dr. Lillenstein: PVAAS is very kind.

Mrs. Sheffey: Have you had a chance to look at the detail of the data to figure out what's happening in our 5th grade and, if you haven't had a chance yet, are you planning on looking at it and what do you plan on doing?

Dr. Lillenstein: We actually had a meeting today talking about what we could do to provide some enrichment enhancement to our math instruction in 5th grade. We

included our math coach and our gifted support teacher. It's not just the students identified as gifted, that's a small percentage. There's a fairly sizeable percentage of students who are very strong performers in that they perform at the advanced level, but they're not improving their relative standing to either meet or to exceed the growth standard and so we started that discussion. We actually started the discussion last year and we've continued it this year - what we could do to be set up.

Mr. Gräb: One quick question. Did the results for the 11th grade include the students who take the PSSAs at the Tech School?

Dr. Lillenstein: Yes. All of those students get attributed back to us.

Mr. Gräb: Thank you.

Dr. Lillenstein: It also includes the other students that we have off campus, like at the Intermediate Unit, at Yellow Breeches. Any other program that we would utilize, they all get attributed back to us.

Mr. Gräb: Thank you.

Dr. Donahue: And my follow up to that was is there a disproportionate number of 11th graders that are not from our school or is it mixed for all the other grades also?

Dr. Lillenstein: It's mixed.

Dr. Donahue: Okay.

Dr. Lillenstein: Any student that we have that is in a PSSA eligible grade gets attributed back to us.

Dr. Donahue: Any questions? Thank you very much.

3.06 Presentation - Middle School Field Trip and Recommendation

Dr. Kepler: I will take care of discussing data, slides, and recommendation from the Administration and Dr. King will step in and help us where we need with any questions and where we're headed for our 6th and 7th grade field trip.

If you recall, some weeks ago on our District website, we had a brief survey and did a Connect Ed message indicating and communicating to our community the purpose of the field trip survey. The initial slide, you can see that approximately 2/3 of our respondents were parents and another 26% were from our student body so nearly 90% of the respondents of the survey were comprised of individuals in our community here in Derry Township. Another near 5% were from our citizens that did not comprise a student or a parent household.

When we looked at our first question in the next slide, we took a look at what do the respondents think regarding overnight field trips as a part of our middle school education. You can see a strong evidence in 'strongly agree' and 'agree', again pushing 90% feeling that an overnight field trip is an important element to the education we provide our middle level students.

In very similar data, almost the opposite question: should we eliminate overnight field trips due to budget constraints? Approximately the same percentage is indicating 'no' that, again, it's of value to the School District and the students in particular.

Question 4 sought input on provisions being made by the District to provide funds for families who may not have the financial ability to provide monetary contribution to the trip. Again, there as Mr. Tredinnick's pointing out, a large portion of the respondents felt there should be some financial aid to students who may have an inability to pay. It just is a reminder there, as an aside, where approximately 14% of our student body at this time receiving free and reduced lunches.

Our 5th question, again, the respondents in large quantity though that a school managed fund raiser should be conducted for each student to raise money and families electing to not participate would be responsible for the full cost of the trip. Again, nearly 200 of those respondents indicating a 'agree' or 'disagree' so not as heavily emphasized in agreement than the first couple of questions.

The 6th question sought to obtain how much, at least in a span, would families desire or be able to contribute financially. You can see 16 ½% indicated that no financial contribution – in terms of their willingness; nearly 16% - \$10-\$25 contribution; and you can see 15% said \$26-\$40; 19.3% - \$41-\$55; and just over 1/3 of the respondents indicating \$55-\$75 contribution would be something they'd be willing to contribute.

The final question tried to take some elements regarding the trips and have respondents indicate a rank, a number 1 choice, a number 2, and a number 3. The first item had a rating average of 1.51 and it was the highest average and that is every student is able to take part in the trip, including students with disabilities so that had the highest value among the respondents. The second highest 1.83 – the majority of the activities take place during the trip are directly tied to the academic curricula, and the third highest is down as the 5th item on the list and that was at a 1.98 – all students in the grade level attend at the same time. When we looked at the data to help us drive decision making as to what trip to move forward with here in the 2011-2012 school year, we started out first looking at the data on family willingness to contribute. If the Board recalls, we have made the decision in the budgeting process last year that families would contribute \$10 towards our day field trips that leave in the morning and return that afternoon or evening. In fact, some of those letters have gone out to families.

With the overnight trip based on cost, the recommendation is that a \$25 fee would be asked of parents to contribute for their son or daughter to go on the trip being that it's a multi – three day/two night, I believe, trip historically.

Then when we looked at the data that you see in front of you here, with every student being able to take part in the trip, including students with disabilities, as the most important of these items listed, that fits well with the recommendation to continue the trip to Kenbrook. It's in closer proximity than Sandy Hill. Our students with disabilities, in the past, have been able to be transported to and from on a daily basis. Those students that can't stay overnight are able to participate where at Sandy Hill they are unable to do so. So all students at Kenbrook has a much greater opportunity for participation.

The second item with rating average there – the curricular length. We feel both trips had strong curricular ties and really provided no – either trip would certainly meet that second ranking category.

Then the third – all students in a grade level attend at the same time is complete opposite. Sandy Hill all our students can attend at one time where at Kenbrook they have to split the grade level so making it a recommendation and decision is ultimately torn among those top three, but looking at student participation in that first item that was labeled as most important – the notion of having a 6th grade trip to Kenbrook would be our recommendation as we move forward.

Dr. Donahue: Any questions for Bernie? Okay.

Dr. Cronin: I have a comment.

Dr. Donahue: I apologize Dr. King for saying Ms. King. Donna?

Dr. Cronin: Are we going to discuss this? I don't have any questions for Bernie, but I didn't know if we were going to discuss the findings or . . . ?

Dr. Donahue: Discuss the . . .

Dr. Cronin: Anything about the survey.

Dr. Donahue: You can discuss it if you'd like or ask questions.

Dr. Cronin: Okay, I didn't know if this was the right time. Question 6 asked parents if they would be willing to – what amount they'd be willing to contribute for an overnight field trip. When I answered this, I just assumed it meant for an overnight field trip – any overnight field trip – not necessarily if there was only one and I'm not sure if we're accurately representing what parents are thinking by assuming this meant only one field trip, because I think if we were to ask parents if we could keep both field trips, what amount would you be able to pay; I think would be something that's important. I don't

know what the response would be, but my guess would be that they'd be willing to pay the same amount for one or two. Not having that information, I think, we don't have all the data necessary to already say that – or to specifically say that we could only afford one, because, in fact, we have 53 – over half of the people who responded – say they would pay at least \$50. If we had every parent pay \$50 for both trips and consider that Mr. Leonard was willing to donate \$5,000, the numbers would leave us about \$5,000 short to do both trips, which you could break that up amongst 300 students going both times and it will be maybe an extra \$5 to \$10 more per trip.

I think it would be premature to say that we can only do one trip based on this survey or that parents are okay with just one trip, because we didn't specifically ask that. I wish we had a survey that said, if you had your choice – one or two trips – what would you be willing to pay; I think the fact that the data shows us that people want all the kids to go together and also that all students can take part, both trips do help us satisfy the top three components that this survey elicited.

Dr. Kepler: Just to clarify – the cost of each respective trip exceeds \$50,000 apiece, so even at \$50 a student contribution at 300 students is \$15,000 so we're far from the \$50,000 it takes to go to Kenbrook or \$50,000 it takes to go to Sandy Hill.

Dr. Cronin: We budgeted – our original budget for this last year, we discussed it was \$83,000 - \$40,000 and \$43,000 for the other and our current budget that we approved was \$40,000 from the School District and \$10 for 300 students so an additional \$3,000 coming from students. So we budgeted \$43,000 for one trip so unless it's gone up significantly, they were the numbers that we approved last year. So we're denying the second \$40,000 based on \$10 per students, but if we would get \$50 or \$55 or \$60, I mean we have a long range here, we could entertain going to both still.

Mrs. Sheffey: I just want to address the budget a little bit. When we did the budget last year, first of all, the amount that's just in that 7th grade or 6th grade line item is not the total cost of the trip, because we also have all the costs for substitutes, so there are other costs that are not in that portion of the budget. The other thing to remember is we had decided last year to do just one overnight trip and then the other grade level would have a regular field trip. The \$10 that kids would contribute to that regular field trip would not cover the cost of just a regular field trip so we knew that that money in the one grade level's budget, some of that would have to be used to pay for the other grade's regular single day field trip.

Dr. Cronin: So the \$43,000 that we approve for the budget does not cover the whole trip? There are some other hidden costs somewhere?

Dr. Kepler: There are items in the personnel budget that are relative to each field trip that is an overnight trip, substitutes that are back here in the middle school, limited service contracts associated with the trips for a respective grade level those things alone are pushing \$10,000.

Mr. Rineer: With regard to the budget, I don't have the numbers in front of me, but the \$40,000 field trip is a \$40,000 and the contribution by the students or their parents would be used to defray that \$40,000 cost to a lower number, it didn't automatically become a \$40,000 outlay by the District and \$3,000 from contributions to a total of \$43,000. It's \$40,000 less the \$3,000 to end up with a net cost to the District of \$37,000.

Dr. Parrish: Correct me if I'm wrong, but I thought the purpose of the survey was not to decide if we do one or two trips, but to decide which single trip we do.

Dr. Donahue: That's correct. We decided . . .

Dr. Parrish: That was last spring we already made the decision to do one trip, is that correct?

Dr. Cronin: Just to make a final comment. I thought that after Mike Leonard had pledged that money that we were at least revisiting the possibility. That was my understanding.

Dr. Donahue: Other comments or questions? Thanks.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

4.01 Unfinished Business

None.

NEW BUSINESS

5.01 Anticipated Agenda Items for the October 24, 2011 Public Meeting

The following items will be on the agenda for the October 24, 2011 Public Board Meeting:

1.	Standing Committee Report
2.	Presentation
3.	Approval of September 2011 Finance Report
4.	Budget Transfers
5.	Requests for Payment
6.	Approval of 2011-2012 High School Music Department Overnight Field Trip/Excursions
7.	Request for Overnight Field Trip/Excursion - National High School Honors Orchestra

	Festival - Atlanta, GA
8.	Requests for the Use of Facilities
9.	Personnel
10.	Announcement of Staff Development Conferences
11.	Students of the Month

5.02 Requests for the Use of School Facilities

The Administration recommended the approval of the Requests for the Use of Facilities:

<i>Group:</i>	Derry Township Police Department
<i>Date/Time:</i>	October 15, 2011 TBA
	October 16, 2011 4:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.
<i>Requested Facility:</i>	Middle School Parking Lot, Cafeteria
<i>Event:</i>	Base Station for Police Officers Assisting with 2011 Hershey Half Marathon
<i>Fee:</i>	None
<i>Group:</i>	Hershey Aquatic Club
<i>Date/Time:</i>	November 6, 2011
<i>Requested Facility:</i>	Middle School Auditorium and Cafeteria
<i>Event:</i>	Awards Ceremony and Banquet
<i>Fee:</i>	As Per Lease Agreement
<i>Group:</i>	Hershey Youth Basketball Association
<i>Date/Time:</i>	Saturdays December 3, 2011 to March 3, 2012 8:00 a.m. - 6:00 p.m.
	Sundays October 9, 16, 23, 30, 2011 November 6, 13, 2011 1:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
	Sundays December 4, 11, 18, 2011 January 8, 15, 22, 28, 2012

	February 5, 12, 19, 26, 2012 1:00 p.m. - 7:00 p.m.
	Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursdays November 21, 2011 to March 1, 2012 6:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.
	Fridays December 2, 2011 to March 2, 2012 6:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.
<i>Requested Facility:</i>	Middle School Gym
<i>Event:</i>	Practices and Games
<i>Fee:</i>	As per Lease Agreement
<i>Group:</i>	Hershey Youth Basketball Association
<i>Date/Time:</i>	Saturdays December 3, 2011 to March 3, 2012 9:00 a.m. - 6:00 p.m.
	Monday, Wednesday, Fridays November 21, 2011 to March 2, 2012 6:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.
<i>Requested Facility:</i>	Primary Elementary Gym
<i>Event:</i>	Hershey Youth Basketball Practices and Games
<i>Fee:</i>	As per Lease Agreement
<i>Group:</i>	Music in the Parks
<i>Date/Time</i>	Fridays May 4, 11, 18, 25, 2012 June 1, 8, 2012 7:00 a.m. - 11:30 p.m.
	Saturdays May 5, 12, 19, 2012 June 2, 2012 7:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m.
<i>Requested Facility:</i>	High School Auditorium, Music Rooms
<i>Event:</i>	Music in the Parks
<i>Fee:</i>	As per Lease Agreement

Dr. Cronin moved the Board approve the requests and was seconded by Mr. Stover.

Roll Call Vote:

Chabal – Yes
Cronin – Yes
Donahue – Yes

Gräb – Yes
Hagan – Yes
Morelli – Yes

Parrish – Yes
Sheffey – Yes
Stover - Yes

9 Yes

MOTION CARRIED

5.03 Personnel – General

1.	The Administration recommended the approval of the following appointments:
	Classified:
	Bushman, Jennifer Substitute Library Aide District-wide Salary: \$10.97 per hour Effective: 10/11/2011 (pending receipt of Act 34 clearance)
	Finton, Jacquelin * (replacing Geri Moose) General Food Service Worker High School Level A: 4.0 hours per day Split Position: 2/3 days per week Salary: \$11.01 per hour Effective: 10/11/2011
	McNeal, Benjamin Information Technology Intern District-wide Salary: \$10.00 per hour (no benefits) Effective: 10/11/2011 through 01/31/2012 (pending receipt of Act 34, 151, and 114 clearances)
	Moses, Karen * (replacing Geri Moose) General Food Service Worker High School Level A: 4.0 hours per day Split Position: 2/3 days per week Salary: \$11.01 per hour Effective: 10/11/2011
	Murray, Gabrielle

	<p>Substitute Nurse Assistant District-wide Salary: \$21.82 per hour Effective: 10/11/2011 (pending receipt of Act 114 clearance)</p>
	<p>Under, Fatma Pinar * Substitute Library Aide District-wide Salary: \$10.97 per hour Effective: 10/11/2011</p>
2.	<p>Reclassification of Classified Hours:</p>
	<p>Kennedy, Pamela * General Food Service Worker High School From: Level B: 6.5 hours per day To: Level C: 7.5 hours per day Effective: 09/23/2011 (retroactive)</p>
3.	<p>The Administration recommended the approval of the following request in accordance with District Policies 435 & 439:</p>
	<p>Zenter, Jessica Kindergarten Teacher Early Childhood Center Paid/Unpaid Childbearing/Rearing Leave Effective: On or about 12/07/2011 through 03/05/2012</p>
4.	<p>The Administration recommended the approval of the following additions to the 2011-2012 Substitute Teacher List:</p>
	<p>Fulk, Irene B.A. in Social Studies from The Pennsylvania State University</p>
	<p>Garofalo, Jeffrey B.S. in Biology from Susquehanna University with secondary education certification from Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania</p>
	<p>Heisey, Julie M.E. in Deaf and Hard of Hearing from The Pennsylvania State University (pending receipt of Act 34 and 151 clearances)</p>
	<p>Spotts, Kelcee B.E. in Elementary Education from The Pennsylvania State University</p>

	Weidensaul, Melissa B.S. in Elementary and Special Education from Lebanon Valley College
	Winslow, Christa B.A. in Elementary Education from SUNY at Cortland, NY
5.	The Administration recommended the approval of the following additions to the 2011-2012 Guest Teacher List:
	Bialas, Jennifer Forsyth, Yi-Chen Jessep, Gwendolyn
*	This individual is currently an employee and/or volunteer. Clearances are on file.

Dr. Cronin moved the Board approve the personnel as recommended and was seconded by Mrs. Sheffey.

Roll Call Vote:

Chabal – Yes

Gräb – Yes

Parrish – Yes

Cronin – Yes

Hagan – Yes

Sheffey – Yes

Donahue – Yes

Morelli – Yes

Stover - Yes

9 Yes

MOTION CARRIED

DELEGATES REPORTS

6.01 Dauphin County Technical School Report

Mr. Gräb: The Dauphin County Technical School will be meeting Wednesday evening at which time we will be voting on both the support staff contract and the teachers contract. I will not provide any details yet, because those are still confidential and after they are approved we can share them with the rest of the Board.

Dr. Donahue: Thanks John. Any questions? Anything to add Mr. Morelli?

Mr. Morelli: Nope.

Dr. Donahue: Great. Thank you.

6.02 Harrisburg Area Community College Report

Dr. Cronin: No report. They have not set their meeting for the fall yet, which should be coming soon. I'm hoping for later this month.

Dr. Donahue: Great. Thank you.

6.03 Capital Area Intermediate Unit Report

Mrs. Chabal: The next meeting will be held October 27.

Dr. Donahue: Thank you.

6.04 Derry Township Tax Collection Association Report

Mr. Stover: No report.

Dr. Donahue: Thank you.

SPECIAL REPORTS

7.01 School Community Information Report

Mr. Tredinnick: I just wanted to call to everyone's attention that the Hershey Elementary and the Hershey Middle School PTOs have pulled together and are working with the District on a project to help provide flood recovery assistance here in the Township. In fact, drop off boxes have been placed at all of our school buildings now and we have begun to accept those donations. Donation boxes can be found in the front of the elementary school and in the cafeterias at the middle school and high school. What the PTOs are seeking is basically new or gently used clothing, coats, shoes, books, towels, washcloths, toys, DVDs, games, and small appliances that can be used to help out those families that are still going through the process of flood recovery. Although the flood itself is now one month ago, many of the families that were hardest hit in the District are still trying to come to grips and get back to a sense of normalcy and have not yet been able to replace many of the personal items that they and their students, in particular, need to be able to come to school well dressed – have their basic needs met, and so this is an effort by the PTOs to help fill some of that gap while the recovery process is going on.

The high school then will serve as an area where those will need that assistance can come and pick up those items. Those times are going to be on Tuesdays and Thursdays 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. here in the high school cafeteria and on Wednesdays 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. those individuals who are seeking assistance can come and go

through what's been donated for their use. Certainly this is something that the District is very happy to support the efforts of the PTO and the PTO should be congratulated for working together for something that's really a District-wide need.

Dr. Donahue: Thanks Dan. Are there any questions for Dan?

7.02 Board Members' Report

Mr. Stover: I'd just like to report that six of us on the Board attended the Athletic Hall of Fame luncheon. To say the least it was an outstanding event. This was the first year that Sam had to turn people away. It was held at the Country Club so I think he's probably next year seeking a new venue. But, I would tell the members who weren't there and the public that it was quite an emotional event. The people who were honored were truly great athletes. Just to give you one example, Camillo "Mimi" Gasper, Class of 1947 told some funny stories about football, but I think his greatest accomplishment was that the high school did not have a high school baseball team when he went to high school, because of the war, but he qualified and spent spring training with the Philadelphia Athletics when he got out of school. We're talking about some pretty high level people and how he accomplished that without going through the high school learning process, but to say the least it was a great event.

Dr. Donahue: Thanks Chuck. Any other Board member reports?

7.03 Superintendent's Report

Dr. Faidley: Thank you Mr. President. I have two informational updates this evening. One is a status update on the Early Childhood Center and the other relates to our internal review of the District response to the September 7 flooding. I'll start with the response to the flood.

As a follow-up to the chain of events triggered by Tropical Storm Lee, the Administration requested staff members provide input into the District response to the heavy rains and subsequent flash flooding that took place on September 7. We encouraged input from all staff members across all departments by asking two basic questions: "What went well?" and "What could have gone more smoothly?" All the responses we received were then reviewed by our administrative team, who also added additional insight.

There were some common themes that emerged from this District-wide critical self-exam. One was the importance of following established protocols for incident response. We have in place a thorough – and quite frankly - voluminous plan that outlines responses to numerous potential incidents from unruly conduct to natural disasters and emergencies. These protocols have been developed by our staff and emergency management officials and are reviewed on a regular basis. The plan provides a good framework and we are well served by following it.

Communications – both internal and external – were another major area of discussion. Our review there covered everything from proper radio system protocol to ensuring we quickly identify back-up communication tools if need be. For instance, utilization of the public address system at the elementary would have expedited internal building-wide communications when the phone system was unavailable. An action item for further dialogue is reviewing with Township officials the existing protocol for communicating with the Emergency Operations Center.

We also reviewed the parent reunification process. Our experiences underscored the need to stick with a formal, uniform reunification process as prescribed by our incident response plan. We discussed safeguards to ensure the materials needed for parental reunification were readily available for use both on and off campus.

Finally, even after identifying some event-specific areas for improvement, there was a great sense of pride that we successfully achieved the overarching goal of preserving student safety. No children were injured and all were returned safely into the care of their parents.

Student safety provides a neat segue into my second item, an update on the ECC. Last Friday, we notified parents of students at the ECC of our intention to relocate the three kindergarten classrooms temporarily established at Granada Gym to the District Office. The use of Granada Gym was intended to be temporary and as it became increasingly clear that we would not be re-opening the ECC building quickly, we made the decision to centralize kindergarten. The classroom relocation was completed earlier today.

The building itself – and that relocation is at the District Office – the building itself, the ECC building itself has been stabilized against any further earth movement. Our consulting engineers continue to examine and analyze the building as they work to develop a recommended plan of action and construction timeline for the re-opening of the ECC building.

Throughout this entire process, we have been very transparent and open about the status of the ECC and we will continue to provide public updates. At this juncture, we simply do not yet know the exact extent of the remediation needed, the total cost or an exact timeline. However, our current expectation is that we will not utilize the ECC building the remainder of this school year.

We will hold a public informational meeting on October 18 at 5:30 p.m. in the High School LGI at which time we hope to share more complete answers regarding the long-term plan for restoring the ECC and to address any parent questions about their child's classroom for the remainder of the school year.

Mr. President, that concludes my report.

Dr. Donahue: Thanks Dr. Faidley. Are there any questions for Dr. Faidley?

7.04 Board President's Report

Dr. Donahue: I have nothing to report.

RECOGNITION OF CITIZENS (Non-Agenda Items)

8.01 Recognition of Citizens (Agenda and Non-Agenda Items)

Michelle Kinsey: I hope I can keep this three minutes. It's based on Homecoming this year and it was not due to the lack of my son being lazy. He got turned away at the High School Homecoming dance. He did try to get the form. They said an ID was needed, not only the school ID, but the school requires a permission form to be obtained. He has been talking to a girl from Lampeter-Strasburg school. She lives 50 minutes away, so they only get to see each other on the weekends and they also, you know, communicate through the electronic systems that they have. He got the form, brought it home to me; we signed it. He gave it to a friend who plays travel soccer with this student and – Gabby is his date – she didn't show up to practice, so she was unable to get the form. Unbeknownst to us, the form is on the website. We didn't realize that until after the fact. Gabrielle went and took it upon herself to go to her principal, Mr. Spencer at the Lampeter-Strasburg school who in return, in retrospect, had sent a fax to our High School. From there, Luke, my son, went to Mr. Ebert on Friday, the day before Homecoming and told Mr. Ebert that he was worried. He didn't hear anything, that Gabrielle told him Mr. Spencer sent a fax or communicated with our principal and what should he do. He was told, this was Luke's words to me, that Mr. Ebert stated, if the two principals talked, there should be no need to worry.

So, I want you all to go back to your high school days with Homecoming, the preparation and the fees involved, not only for the students, but for us – the parents. It's a big deal, he's my only son. He's the most important thing in my life. It was Gabrielle's first date, first Homecoming. She got permission to go. We met her parents for the first time that night – taking pictures, dresses, nails, hair, suits. And I was told by our principal that I was lecturing him when I brought that up to him on the phone, because my son worried all day that he would not get into the dance. I said to him, don't worry about it. If there's a problem, call me, I will be over, and I will explain. He had his student ID photo, Gabrielle had hers. Mr. Ebert was at the door. He chose that end of the table to get permission to come in, because he knew that he had talked to Gabrielle, err talked to Mr. Ebert. When he went to the end of the table, there was a little discussion, one of the teachers complimented Gabrielle on her dress and then looked at another teacher and said, sorry you can't come into the dance.

My son then proceeded to leave, the couple that drove them – two other 16 year olds, turned away from the dance, because they were the transportation home. No one called me from the school to tell me that my son wasn't allowed into the dance. He took

it upon himself to call me, so had he not called me there's four 16 year olds in a car on a Saturday night at 8:30 p.m. with their parents assuming that they were at the dance chaperoned. I told Luke to keep his tickets, because I wanted a refund of the tickets. He didn't want me to go to the school, because he didn't want me to make a scene, which I can get a little hot headed. I feel they took the extreme to get the job done – to get permission to go into the dance.

When I called Monday, I talked to the principal, and, again, he asked me if I was lecturing him. I told him it was my understanding that the principal had tried to get in touch with him, whether it was via communication on the phone, e-mail, something, but Gabrielle was told by her principal that he took care of it. He asked me if I was going to believe her principal over him. So I put the call in to Lampeter-Strasburg – that principal did call me back. He was nothing but generous, kind, considerate. He went on to extend a invitation for Luke to attend their Homecoming. He said it would be an honor to have him at their Homecoming. I got no support from the principal when I called. I asked him what, you know, how he communicated. He said he sent a fax. I said, okay, thank you. I called back to the school. I spoke to Kathy, a receptionist. She confirmed that yes indeed a fax was sent. They didn't have a student to attach to Gabrielle, so they didn't do anything with it. So it sat. It wasn't at the table when the kids arrived in lieu of, you know, hey, did anybody bring in Gabby? Here's a form. Didn't make an announcement over the speaker to say, male students attending bringing a girl from another school come to the office and then say who is bringing Gabrielle Cook? Nothing. Lack of communication. It's unacceptable to me.

The other thing that I'm very upset with is that I wanted to know when the fax was sent, because Mr. Murphy did say to me, well when did Luke get the form. He did try to get the form to Gabrielle maybe 2 weeks, 2 ½ weeks prior to, because they were even down at King of Prussia looking for dresses at that time. I got in touch then with Mr. Ebert who I wanted to confirm if he talked to my son. I tracked down with Kathy if she handed that fax to Mr. Murphy. She said yes, and he passed it on to Mr. Ebert. I talked with Mr. Ebert on the phone and he told me that he had the fax and yes, it was sent on 9/30, which would have been Friday, the day before Homecoming, at 2:27 in the afternoon and I said I would like a copy of the fax. Well, with confidentiality, I asked for Mr. Murphy to call me back. Mr. Murphy said confidentially, we would need permission from Lampeter-Strasburg's principal and/or the parents. So I put in a call to Lampeter-Strasburg. I know the girl's mom, Tara, now. I knew she was on board with me. I invited her to come tonight, but she had to work. So, I put a call into them again, Mr. Spencer called me back and he said, you know, because of confidentiality, I would have to call Gabrielle's parents to get permission. I said, well there's no need to do that. You guys went far and beyond. I mean, he even apologized at one time for not following up with a phone call in reference to his fax even though he got a confirmation the fax was sent. I mean, kudos to that school. I was embarrassed by Hershey High School's whole handling of that situation in the eyes of Lampeter-Strasburg.

So the secretary that I talked to at Lampeter-Strasburg went as far as looking at the recent history of the fax machine for me and she indeed did confirm that the fax was

actually sent Thursday, 9/29 at 2:27 in the afternoon, which means it sat for a whole day prior to Homecoming.

The other problem that I have is sending four 16 year olds out in a car, no supervision. Had my son not been responsible – no teacher or faculty called me to let me know they didn't have access. So that's neglect as far as I'm concerned.

And the other point I want to make is, I just lost my train of thought, I apologize. We try to strive for excellence, that's what I wanted to say through the teachers and our staff here, and we can't expect it of our children if we're not showing it from their mentors. You guys all heard of Steve Jobs that just passed away. I was watching the news the other day and he had a quote about his children. It hit home, if I can say that myself, it wouldn't have been any better, but he said, "When you have a child, your heart is forever outside your body." That's what my son means to me and that's why I'm here tonight. So I hope the communication in the School District can be a little better so that other kids won't be turned away. Thank you.

Dr. Donahue: Thank you. Are there other community members who would like to address the Board?

ADJOURNMENT

9.01 Adjournment

Dr. Donahue: The next public School Board meeting will be held Monday, October 24, 2011 starting at 7:00 p.m. in the High School LGI room.

Dr. Cronin moved to adjourn, with a second by Mr. Morelli and, approved by unanimous voice vote by all members. The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Dr. Donahue: We'll take a five minute break before we start the work session.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen E. Rineer
Secretary to the Board
Approved at the October 24, 2011 meeting

Dr. Henry Donahue
President of the Board

LDM