

Mr. Rasmus called the Millville Area School District Policy Committee Meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

Those present in the library were Joseph Rasmus, Susan Myers, Brynn Clark, Greg Hemsarh, Dee Davis, Matthew McWilliams, Nicole Guise, Jestine Myers, Jennifer Bodnar, Natasha Fisher, and Laura Koons.

REVIEW OF AGENDA

- Mr. Rasmus began the meeting by reviewing the proposed agenda for the Committee members and members of the public in attendance.

USAGE OF DISTRICT FACILITIES

- Proposed Board Policy 707
 - Mr. Rasmus began by discussing Policy 707: Use of District Facilities and the proposed “local” changes, explaining that much of the language in this policy came from the Public School Boards Association (PSBA) and was reviewed by their legal counsel. He added that the changes made to this policy were predominantly “local” in nature based off the feedback from the school board. Additionally, Mr. Rasmus explained that there were two Administrative Regulations to accompany this policy.
 - Mr. Rasmus reviewed the updated language stating that requesters who submit requests for usage falling prior to the Board’s approval would be denied. Next, he explained some language regarding the appropriate paperwork and certifications required for a request. Mr. Rasmus reminded the Board and the public that the district recently purchased the online platform Master Library to streamline the Building Usage process. He explained that internal and external requesters would follow prompts and make their requests via the platform. Additionally, there would be a calendar on the website visible to the public about the use of facilities and the availability of dates for ease of scheduling.
 - Then, Mr. Rasmus explained that no payments for fees would need to be submitted before the Board’s approval. The new language in the policy stated that all payments would need to be paid no less than 7 days in advance.
 - Mrs. Clark then asked for clarification if an outside group is “bumped” for the usage of facilities due to an in-district event happening on the same day, would the district hold the payments so that they are not deposited and therefore, need to be re-issued to the original requester.
 - Mr. Rasmus answered that they would not deposit the payments. He further explained that a change could happen when an event is not known in advance for the in-district group. Every effort would be made to honor the original request, and the district would work with the outside requesting group to reschedule. Finally, he added that if a payment was deposited, the district would reimburse the group or try to find another date/time for the event.
 - Mr. Hemsarh then added that the Administrative Regulation referenced in the section being reviewed was incorrect as it was related to Field Trips. Ms. Rosenberger said she would correct the number reference.
 - Mr. Rasmus then went on to explain that outside requesters must advertise or state clearly on any advertisements that their event is not sponsored by Millville Area School District.
 - Next, Mr. Rasmus discussed the language about additional fees being applied for outside usage on Sundays and/or holidays for personnel. Going further, he explained about changes/cancellations due to weather, sharing that when there is a school closing, all events would likewise be cancelled.
 - Mrs. Clark then asked for clarification on groups like Little League being “bumped” for in-district events. She asked if the Little League and groups like them could submit a “blanket form” for usage without dates, provided they meet all other aspects of the policy.

- Mr. Rasmus answered that there are pros and cons with this proposal. In the past, there have been situations where outside organizations have submitted forms in between board meetings for approval, and it has caused issues due to the last minute nature.
- Mrs. Sue Myers then added that even if the group has blanket approval, they would still need to submit a request more than 14 days before the proposed event, adding that two groups could then end up submitting for the same date because there was no specific date applied to the blanket approval.
- Mrs. Clark commented that it would be first come, first serve in that instance.
- Mr. Hemsarth then asked about the new platform and whether it would allow two groups to request for the same time and place as well as how it would be prioritized.
- Mr. Rasmus answered that it would be first in-district requesters, then after, the usage would become first come, first serve.
- Mr. Hemsarth asked that if we have all of these systems in place, why is the district still reluctant to let go of timelines.
- Mrs. Myers shared her concern that if the district lets go of the timelines, there may be more disagreements among requesters when one requester submits far in advance with no dates and another submits following the 14 days policy guideline and is denied because the original requester now set a date.
- Mr. Hemsarth then explained some groups using athletic fields may have weather cancellations and rescheduling where they would need to re-submit many times for approval if the date must be included on the form. However, if they were able to submit for “blanket approval” and make the changes on the software platform based on availability, it would remove some of the subjectivity and emotionality of the Board, putting the responsibility back on the Superintendent and the rest of the administrative team.
- Mrs. Clark added that the Board would only need to be concerned about the groups requesting, not the dates and times of the usage. If there were concerns with the fees, etc., that would be clarified in the policy and corresponding administrative regulations.
 - Mr. Rasmus asked that the timeline not be completely removed from the policy language because of the personnel burden it creates if the expectation is that requests can be processed immediately.
 - Mrs. Clark answered that yes, the timeline could still be there, but maybe it did not need to be 14 days.
 - Mrs. Myers shared her concern with requesters who have used the facilities in the past who may assume their request will be fulfilled and another requester submits a request for blanket approval, there may be disagreements and overlap of usage.
 - Mrs. Davis then added the concern to the conversation about taking the timeline down to 5 days with requests requiring custodial/cafeteria worker coverage. She explained that finding a support staff member to cover these usage requests could be difficult to do with only 5 days’ notice, adding that there may be more denials for usage with only 5 days to process the requests.
 - Mrs. Clark answered that in those cases, the issue would be on the requester for not allowing enough time to process. She suggested that there could even be language put in about this issue.
 - Mr. Rasmus explained that the language of 14 days was put in to match the timeframe of Board meetings, sharing that the PSBA recommendation was 10 days previously.

- Proposed 707 AR-1 Rules for Usage of District Facilities
 - Mr. Rasmus then reviewed the language in 707 AR-1 about having a custodial staff member present at all events. He shared that Mr. McWilliams brought up a concern if there is usage on the weekend when a maintenance worker was not present and there was a spill or food product left to spoil. Therefore, there was a rule about having a staff member present at all events in the language of the Administrative Regulation 707 AR-1.
 - Going further, Mr. Rasmus read and highlighted some other rules in the AR document. Some language explained about requesters changing or cancelling events on a short notice. In those cases, Mr. Rasmus explained that additional personnel costs may be applied because work was already done to set up the space, line the field, etc.
 - To this, Mr. Hemsarh then asked as an example about groups like Blue Quake who have rescheduling of games if the group would incur those fees or submit a new usage.
 - Mr. Rasmus answered that in the new Master Library platform, he believed there would be limits and prompts in the system to match the constraints put forth by the policy, so he did not believe that the same usage request would “roll” over to the new date. He believed that a new usage request would have to be filled out because it would have to go through the approval process internally again to be moved on the calendar. However, Mr. Rasmus explained that the request would not necessarily need to come back to the Board, but another request for the new date would need to be submitted to go through the internal approval process again.
 - Ms. Rosenberger then added that for example that recently First Columbia Bank had submitted another request for the same purpose already approved by the Board with a changed date. She shared that they resubmitted a new form, and the date change went through the approval process internally.
 - Mr. Rasmus then explained the language in the AR document stating that a district employee must be present at all times during an event. He opened the discussion about district employees who are members or requesters for outside organizations maintaining the responsibility for the usage for the outside organization. The concern was brought up to this by Mr. McWilliams about custodial needs during the facility’s use.
 - Mrs. Myers shared the concern that the process of allowing employees, other than custodians, be the designated person at the event, there may be concerns with the Support Staff Union because it would be like the district denying bargaining unit work.
 - Mrs. Clark then asked if no custodian was available to work during the facility’s use, would it still be an issue with the union.
 - Mr. Rasmus answered that he believed it necessary to still put out the request for custodial staff work to the custodians first. Then, if no worker was found, then the district could look for another person.
 - Mrs. Myers added that perhaps certain district employees as the coach of an outside organization or otherwise may not want to clean up at the conclusion of the event.
 - Mr. Hemsarh answered that the employee would need to be asked and have it be understood that they would be assuming the responsibility, including clean up, lock up, etc.
 - Mr. Rasmus then shared a potential example with the Elementary Secretary who is a parent of a student in an outside organization using the facilities and perhaps decided to be the designee for the group’s usage. He explained that she herself would be responsible for every usage by the group, no other person would be able to go in her place.
 - Mrs. Jistine Myers then added that staff members would not have keys to the custodial closet for supplies, so some consideration or a key would have to be

- given if a staff member chose to serve as the designee for the outside organization.
- Mr. Hemsarth then asked for outdoor facility use if a custodial worker would be needed if the out-of-district requester has a portable restroom. He also added that there may be a concern with bodily fluids needing to be cleaned up on the field.
 - Mr. Rasmus answered that this may bring up the concern about opening the stadium for bathroom usage.
 - Mr. Rasmus then moved onto the language about a custodial staff member always opening and locking the doors at the conclusion of the event as well as doing a check of the facilities for order.
 - Mrs. Sue Myers raised the concern of putting that check of the order on custodial staff.
 - Mr. Rasmus answered that the language could be removed if deemed inappropriate.
 - Mrs. Davis added that oftentimes when the usage is on the weekends, the children are unruly and loud. She said that at times, she has gone to the children and managed some situations, explaining that sometimes the outside groups do not share the expectation of the district to control the people/members of their groups using the facilities.
 - Mrs. Myers added that the expectations would need to be shared with the requesters.
 - Mr. Hemsarth agreed that the rules outlined here would need to be articulated to the requesters.
 - Mrs. Clark then added that when issues arise, those concerns need to come back to the Board for future consideration of usage.
 - Mrs. Davis commented that oftentimes the usage of groups include food or the teams are eating dinner and food product is left behind, attracting animals.
 - Mr. Rasmus raised the final concern that any food left can cause issues and perhaps, there needs to be a custodian.
 - Mr. McWilliams answered that the events, dependent on how they are situated, could fall outside of the custodial hours on the weekend. He did not believe it was fair to ask custodians to work more than a shift on the weekend.
 - Mr. Rasmus then asked if there could be the potential to input this information into Master Library somehow so that if the usage request was outside of the custodial work time, it would be included on the platform at the time of the request.
 - Ms. Rosenberger then asked if Mr. McWilliams could be in the approval process and check the availability of custodial staff before giving his approval.
 - Mr. Rasmus added that the necessity of Mr. McWilliams in the approval process could be even pertaining to the usability of certain venues, such as the fields after rain.
 - Moving on, Mr. Rasmus reviewed a few other items on the AR document. He shared that no person may have a firearm on school property, unless functioning as the School Resource Officer, or therefore, as law enforcement, even if they have the right to carry.
 - Mr. Hemsarth asked about having food and/or drinks available or not available for outside facility use.
 - Mr. Rasmus shared his concerns about an incident where outside usage created an issue wherein the requesters did not dispose of bodily fluids.
 - Mr. McWilliams added that the custodian on duty on the weekends has to clean their section, so they have other responsibilities other than just to manage the event happening on that day.
 - Mr. Hemsarth added a suggestion that perhaps the district should require a refundable deposit to cover any potential damages.

- Mrs. Sue Myers like the idea but was concerned about handling this at the Business Office.
- Mrs. Clark answered that the check could simply be held and not cashed so that should not be an issue.
- Mrs. Jistine Myers then added that previously, when she was involved with Boy Scouts, that is what they had to do. The check was held until all usage was signed off and the check returned to the group.
- Mrs. Clark answered that this practice could help with some groups to encourage them to clean up after themselves and that it should be done across the board for outside groups, regardless of whether or not they are incurring other fees per the Fee Schedule.
- Mr. Rasmus asked if this would be a one-time deposit for all dates the same group uses the facilities or would they have to pay the deposit for every date of use.
- Mr. Hemsarth clarified that the group would pay the deposit and if no issues arise after the first use, the deposit would remain until the last use. If there is damage, the group would forfeit their deposit and have to issue another for continued use.
- Mrs. Davis then asked how long the timeframe would be for the return of the deposit.
- Mr. Rasmus answered that a 30-day period would be fair, if the check is not cashed and it is void.
- Proposed 707 AR-3 District Facilities Fee Schedule
 - Mr. Rasmus reviewed the Administrative Regulation for the Fee Schedule dependent on the types of groups.
 - Mrs. Sue Myers questioned the Group B requesters who are not charging admission but are raising money for a fundraiser.
 - Mr. Rasmus answered that the discussion earlier with the Administrative team was about adding “non-profit” or “for profit” instead of the admission language.
 - Mr. Noah Adams then added his concern that some “for profit” organizations would perhaps not charge admission and was unsure where they fall on the schedule.
 - Mr. Rasmus explained the reasoning but agreed that the admission language may be too confusing.
 - Mr. Adams replied that if the admissions language is removed, that may remove “Group D” as a classification.
 - Mr. Rasmus clarified what he meant by the classification of “for profit” in Group D.
 - After the discussion about the types of groups, Mr. Rasmus asked the group to allow him more time to consider, and he would bring an updated document to the group. As this was an Administrative Regulation, it did not need to be approved by the board and could be updated more regularly.

FIELD TRIPS

- Proposed Policy 121: Field Trips
 - Mr. Rasmus reviewed the “local” language to the updated Field Trips policy. He wanted to clarify the three types of trips taken by students. First, the traditional type is a field trip where students go out into the world for a new experience. The second type is a Community Based instruction trip that is predominantly found in the Special Education department as part of students’ Individualized Education plans and Transitions services. Finally, Mr. Rasmus explained that the third type would be curricular excursions where students are gaining

- required real-world experience based on their curriculum needs, predominantly used in the Career and Technical programs. These definitions would need to be supplanted into the Field Trips policy before final approval from the Board.
- Mr. Rasmus then reviewed the required documentation found in this policy for chaperones planning to go on field trips.
 - Mr. Hemsarth then noted that perhaps the language should say to have clearances to the district office two “school days” before the proposed trip instead of 48 hours in cases where they are submitted on a Friday or late in the week.
 - Going on, Mr. Rasmus reviewed the language in the policy about not advertising, collecting money, or moving forward in the field trip preparation without first garnering approval from the Board.
 - Mr. Hemsarth asked if a teacher could talk about a proposed trip before it is approved.
 - Mr. Rasmus said that provided a teacher makes it clear in all language of the tentative nature of the plans, that would be permissible. They could be planning in anticipation of the Board’s approval, but no money should be collected prior to the approval.
 - Mrs. Clark then asked what would be the expectation or the timeline for teachers to wait before the approval.
 - Mr. Rasmus answered that the timeline for submitting requests should be no less than a month before the scheduled trip date for the Board’s approval.
 - Mrs. Jistine Myers added that it is important to delineate which type of trip you are discussing to come up with a timeline. If the trip is a curricular excursion, it can be quickly planned and executed. However, a grade level field trip would require more planning, and therefore time before the approval and actual trip date. Additionally, she asked if a quick curricular excursion would need to go before the Board.
 - Mr. Rasmus answered that the policy does delineate that both field trips and curricular excursions are to be approved by the Board. However, he explained that the Community Based instruction trips do not need to be approved by the Board due to the nature of those trips. In those cases, a member of the administrative team would approve the trip.
 - Mrs. Davis added that sometimes extracurricular groups need a van to deliver goods or supplies to a local organization and those do not come before the Board.
 - Mr. Rasmus summated this discussion by stating we cannot come up with every scenario, however, this gives the teachers and staff members the ability to budget and know about the parameters for field trip approvals.
 - Moving forward, Mr. Rasmus highlighted some other aspects, including the fact that all trips should outline standards, adding that the district has to be more consistent in this practice. Additionally, he explained another point in the policy whereby teachers must explain when requesting field trips where the funding will come from as well as how the “overage” costs will be paid if the trip is more than the district’s subsidized allotment.
 - Mr. Hemsarth questioned the policy language delineating how the district subsidized money could be used.
 - Mr. Rasmus explained that he wanted the language to be clear that the money from the district towards field trips would need to be used towards transportation cost and student registration fees.
 - Mrs. Clark then asked if the grade level trips were inexpensive enough, would they be able to go on two field trips.
 - Mrs. Jennifer Bodnar asked for clarification on the trips that are subsidized by outside grants and whether or not they would be included in this amount allotted by the district.

- Mr. Rasmus asked for clarification on this topic if the “free” trips which only incur transportation costs would be included in the grade level allotment per the Administrative Regulation 121-1. He asked the Committee if these additional trips would need to be considered separately outside of the Board’s consideration.
- Mrs. Clark answered that if the trips were a low cost and collectively fell underneath the allotment by the Board for a grade level, she felt the trips should be approved.
- Mrs. Davis added that we need to delineate the type of trips because trips like “Agriculture Day” should not be in the same consideration as the rest of our field trips because they should actually fall under the curricular excursion distinction. She shared that there is not a way to prepare for trips of that nature because the invitation or the plan may not come until well into the school year.
- Mr. Rasmus answered that from a pragmatic standpoint, the district needs to have money to cover the curricular excursions. He asked if perhaps there should be some money set aside in the budget for these types of trips outside of the grade level allotment.
- Mrs. Myers then added to the discussion that the district would be absorbing the cost of the nurse and/or medical professionals required to go on many grade level trips, which has been added to the language in this updated policy.
- Mrs. Davis explained that there needs to be a process in place for trips that are curricular in nature to be covered that come up later in the year and would most likely not be budgeted.
- Mr. Rasmus answered that this process was discussed and the tentative plan was to put an amount in the budget, consistent with past expenditures for trips like these that would be utilized. His concern was that at some point, that money set aside would be depleted and wanted the teachers and staff to have the knowledge of that limitation.
- Mrs. Clark then commented that the options were to set a limit to the amount of money set aside, set no limit at all, or do nothing, which she did not believe was permissible for our school budget concerns. She added that the first few years of this being put into practice, there may need to be some grace given and allowances for trips past the proposed threshold.
- Mr. Rasmus agreed that consideration would need to be taken as to the past expenditures for trips of this nature as well as current pricing with the transportation contractors to come up with an appropriate fund allotment by the district for curricular excursions. After a year of the threshold being in place, the Board would need to reconsider the allotment if the amount was over by a small amount or by a considerable percentage. At that point, the Administrative Regulation may need to be updated to reflect current costs per the budget.
- Before moving on from this topic, Mr. Rasmus asked for agreement on the removal of the language stating the district would subsidize “one field trip per grade level” because depending on the cost of the trip, the grade may be able to take more than one trip before meeting the proposed threshold.
- Mrs. Clark answered that as long as the trips are appropriately termed so that the cost is attributed to field trips as opposed to curricular excursions and community based outings, she was fine with the removal of the language.
- Mr. Rasmus then highlighted the updated policy language stating that when submitting a field trip request, staff members would need to include how the trip would be funded, if by the district, outside organization, grant, etc. He explained that the teacher would need to reach out to find how the trip would be paid for if it was over the proposed threshold for the year per grade level.

- Mr. Hemsarth then asked if the district had reviewed the fundraising policy and if teachers could use fundraised monies to cover some of the costs.
 - Mrs. Myers added that there was a discussion on fundraisers previously, but to her knowledge, there was no update or change to the policy.
 - Mr. Rasmus commented that this discussion was raised in relation to athletics because the fundraising market seemed to be oversaturated at the time. If the teachers were to use fundraising to cover the cost of trips, they would need to submit the application to their building principal and go through that process.
 - Mrs. Sue Myers then asked for clarification if a grade level did not use all of their allotted money for the year, would they be able to roll the additional money to another grade to use towards their trip.
 - Mr. Hemsarth answered that this practice would be far too subjective and not fair for all grade levels. Mrs. Clark agreed that this would be too difficult to do in a manner that is fair to all parties.
 - Mr. Rasmus agreed with the discussion, adding that he also did not believe the money could be carried over from one fiscal year to the next because of the difficulty in accounting for that money in the budget.
 - Mrs. Clark then asked about the proposed allotment of \$1500 in the Administrative Regulation document put up for consideration, wondering how the amount was decided. She remembered that previously Mrs. Holloway had shared a spreadsheet with the Board including all grade level field trip costs.
 - Mr. Rasmus answered that the allotment was proposed for the purposes of discussion.
 - Mr. Hemsarth asked if Mrs. Holloway could present the Board with a five-year average for transportation costs so that they could choose an appropriate allotment.
 - Mrs. Sue Myers then commented that other school districts do not pay for field trips, just for the curricular excursions.
 - Mr. Rasmus concluded this discussion by stating he would confer with Mrs. Holloway to present information to the board on past field trip expenditures in order to propose an appropriate district subsidy per grade level.
- Proposed Administrative Regulation 121-1 Field Trips
 - Mr. Rasmus quickly reviewed the items in this Administrative Regulation as the previous discussion was on many of the items in this document.
 - Ms. Rosenberger proposed that the definitions of the types of trips be supplanted instead in the policy language as previously mentioned.
 - Mr. Rasmus agreed and summarized some of the proposed changes. He explained that he would confer with Mrs. Holloway to come up with the information for the Board to make an informed decision on an appropriate subsidy amount. Additionally, he understood that the Committee wanted to remove the language stating the district would only allow “one field trip per grade level” because the teachers would instead be asked to stay within the district’s established threshold. Also, he reviewed that teachers would need to indicate in their field trip request how the trip would be paid for, whether the district or another funding source.
 - Mrs. Sue Myers highlighted the language in the AR stating that the district would not allow for more than one field trip a day.
 - Mr. Rasmus agreed and explained that the district must subsidize the cost of the nurse, as outlined in the AR as well so it would not be fiscally feasible to allow more than one trip a day.
 - Mrs. Davis shared that last school year, there was a time when a grade level went to the circus, then some special education classes also went but on a different day. She explained that staff were told to not allow this to happen again because of the lack of

nurse coverage. Additionally, she shared that the district has worked to find alternative options for nurse coverage when possible.

- Mrs. Sue Myers then made the suggestion that the language be changed from “the district will NOT approve more than one field trip to occur on the same date” to “the district MAY approve more than one field trip on the same date” for situations that necessitate it.
- Mr. Rasmus agreed and made note of the change.

CTE PROGRAMS

▪ Revised Policy 315 Career and Technical Education

- Mr. Rasmus began by reviewing the proposed changes to this policy, highlighting the language regarding the attendance of students from other school districts in Millville’s CTE programs, a notice of our nondiscrimination policy, and the capacity thresholds for our CTE programs based on space. He shared that the spacing requirements need to be reviewed for CTE programs and possibly put into an Administrative Regulation document. Finally, he highlighted the language explaining that Millville district students have preferential consideration over non-district students as well as students who are on track to be “completers” would be afforded prioritized enrollment.
- Mrs. Jistine Myers added that per state guidelines, there needed to be established enrollment procedures for CTE programs.
 - Mr. Rasmus asked if the language should be “first come, first serve” for enrollment.
 - Mrs. Jistine Myers answered that it would be at the Committee’s discretion, but it needed to be included in the language of the policy.
 - Mr. Rasmus raised the concern that if the enrollment is based on the student’s grade point average, then in the next circumstance in the same year, another student may have a higher grade point average and the district already approved the enrollment of the student with a lower grade point average, which would cause an issue.
 - Mrs. Myers answered that it did not matter which direction the district decided to go. The district simply needed to have it articulated in policy, so it could be first come, first serve instead of based on grade point average.

PSBA UPDATED POLICIES

▪ Recommended Policy 805 - Emergency Preparedness and Response (Required for PCCD Grant)

▪ Recommended Policy 805.2 - School Security Personnel (Required for PCCD Grant)

▪ Recommended Policy 236.1 - Threat Assessment (Required for PCCD Grant)

- Mr. Rasmus explained that this Threat Assessment policy was a new policy required by the state and put forth by PSBA for the Committee’s consideration. He shared that this new policy would be discussed and implemented in the district in the upcoming months.
- Mrs. Davis added a comment that this new Threat Assessment policy would be one of many policies previously approved the Board and recommended and/or required by the Pennsylvania Department of Education wherein required training is outlined. She explained that recently there had been discussion about the amount of training days built into the calendar for staff. With all of the requirements by the state and outlined in policy, she felt that the administrative team needed time. Recently, some auditors came and cited the district for not providing staff with the required training.
 - To this, Mr. Hemsarth then asked what the ramifications would be for not meeting those requirements.
 - Mrs. Davis shared that the state could possibly remove funding dollars from the district. She continued to share some documentation listing the required trainings from PSBA which had grown significantly over only 2 years.

- Mr. Rasmus concurred that the federal money most recently given has been dictatorial in nature, so the state has outlined very specifically the ways that the funding can be used. Additionally, the state has been asking for specificity in reporting how the money is expended, even requiring the dates of the training and the attendance sheets.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Rasmus adjourned the meeting at 8:21 pm.

Chelsea Rosenberger
Assistant Board Secretary