

ROCHESTER BOARD OF EDUCATION
Policy Committee Meeting
September 18, 2012

Attending: Commissioner Cruz (Chair) – arrived at 6:10PM; Commissioners Powell, Adams, White and Campos (arrived at 6:00PM). District staff: Ed Lopez-Soto, Chief Counsel; Charles Johnson, Attorney with the Law Department; Bethany Centrone, Chief of HCI; Lori Baldwin, Director of Safety and Security; Jerome Underwood, Senior Director of Operations; Vicky Ramos, Director of Student Placement. Board staff: Debra Flanagan.

Noting that the other Committee members were delayed, Commissioner Powell convened the meeting at 5:55PM without a quorum.

I. Discuss Proposed Revision to Drug-Free Workplace Policy (9320)

Bethany Centrone reported that the Auditor General recommended pre-employment drug testing for all employees, noting that only those with a commercial driver's license are currently tested. She stated that while this practice could be implemented without a change in the existing policy, it is important to ensure that current and prospective employees are aware of these expectations. Ms. Centrone stated that pre-employment drug testing has been suggested previously by a number of HCI directors.

II. Discuss Impact of Cell Phones and Electronic Devices in the Classroom and with regard to School Safety and Security

Chuck Johnson noted that the proposed revision to the Code of Conduct is in response to recent changes made by the NYS Education Department (SED). He explained that the existing policy has allowed each individual school to make a judgment about the availability of cell phones and other devices in the building, but SED has decided that these devices are not to be permitted during NYS assessments unless otherwise specified in the student's Individual Education Plan (IEP), 504 Plan, or by medical order.

Mr. Johnson stated that the original draft language would have prohibited use of electronic devices for all assessments conducted in the District. However, he reported that school principals wanted greater flexibility to allow each administrator to make this determination.

Mr. Johnson pointed out that the proposed revision to the Code of Conduct contains a section regarding storage and management of property taken from students. He reported that 18 claims were made in the past year of schools losing student property that had been confiscated. For this reason, the policy provides guidelines regarding storage, identification, and retrieval of property taken from students. Mr. Johnson stated that the proposed policy would also require schools to compensate students for any lost property that had been confiscated.

Commissioner Powell noted that the proposed revisions do not address the basic problem of the distractions caused by having cell phones in the classroom, but at least comply with NYS requirements. Mr. Johnson replied that different schools have different perspectives on the use

of cell phones and other devices in the classroom, and this is the reason that the proposed policy allows school administrators to make this decision.

Commissioner Campos inquired whether school staff are provided coaching or training regarding taking possession of students' property. Lori Baldwin stated that coaching has been provided to staff in the schools for which claims were filed of lost student property to enable better tracking, identification, and storage. She stated that one school was responsible for 11 of the 18 claims, and was "bagging and tagging" items without keeping a record of the owner of each item. Consequently, any student could come to the office and claim a cell phone that did not belong to them. Ms. Baldwin emphasized the importance of having rigorous and consistent practices in place, noting that the possibility of using scanners to identify items is currently being explored. She stated that she is working currently with schools that want to remove these devices from the classroom.

Commissioner Campos commented that she supports each school deciding the best practice regarding allowing cell phones in the classroom based on their school climate and environment.

Commissioner Powell pointed out that some schools would like to remove cell phones from the classroom, but do not have the staff to implement this practice because of reductions in sentry positions.

Ms. Baldwin stated that schools have to make a determination about allowing cell phones in the classroom at the beginning of the school year because mid-year changes are ineffective.

Motion by Commissioner Campos to approve the proposed revisions to the Code of Conduct.
Adopted 2-0.

III. Recommendations for Managing Zone Boundaries and Cross-Zone Transportation

Commissioner Cruz invited Jerome Underwood to present his perspective on this issue.

Mr. Underwood emphasized that student placement and transportation are inextricably linked to the geographic distribution of quality schools and programs, and the exceptions requested by parents reflect their desire to find the best option for their children. He asserted that the recommendations will not have an impact on transportation costs until there are quality schools in every zone. He contended that the District can only require students to be placed in schools within their zone when there is an equitable distribution of educational quality.

Commissioner Powell stated that she had reviewed the presentation and recommendations developed by Ms. Flanagan, and agreed that a phase-in approach would be inadequate in terms of generating cost savings or reapportioning these funds to transport additional students who reside within 1-1/2 miles from school.

Commissioner Powell reviewed the presentation, discussing data indicating that:

- 29% of RCSD elementary students cross zones to school
- 49% of buses to elementary schools cross zones
- Cross-zone buses are slightly more than half full because only have 45 minutes to travel longer distances and cannot pick up as many students as the other buses
- 25% of students are transported across zones because of child care arrangements

She stated that the existing Transportation policy allows transportation to a child care provider if the student is already eligible to receive transportation services (i.e. lives 1.5 miles or more from school) and if the child care provider is located more than 1.5 miles from the student's school. Commissioner Powell pointed out that current practice does not follow this policy, so that bus service is provided to all students whose child care provider is located 1.5 miles or more from their school – even if the child lives next door to the school.

Commissioner Powell stated that there are no criteria or mechanisms for determining whether cross-zone transportation for child care is necessary. She stated that the District has not been encouraging families to use child care within their zone, and the result has been increased transportation costs.

Commissioner Powell acknowledged that there is high mobility among District families, but previous studies conducted in developing zone boundaries indicate that the vast majority of families move within a 10-block radius. She asserted that the Placement Office can counsel families at the outset of the kindergarten lottery and at the beginning of each school year that relocating outside of their current zone will result in their child having to change schools. She stated that enforcement of policies has been lax when families move out of their zone.

Commissioner Powell contended that the provision to give preference in placing a student in the same school as their sibling has been exploited to enable additional siblings to attend a school outside of their zone.

Commissioner Powell reported that the zone boundaries were equitable when managed choice was first developed, with an equal distribution of high-performing schools, capacity, and special programs such as ELL and MAP. She noted that each zone had a similar socioeconomic balance and adequate capacity to accommodate resident students. She stated that schools with special offerings became City-wide schools to allow equal opportunity for students to attend, regardless of where they live. Commissioner Powell stated that the District has increased the number of City-wide schools over the years, rather than replicating successful models in each of the zones. She cited the example of three inquiry-based schools: #8, #10, and #58, arguing that each of these schools could simply be assigned to a zone and eliminated as a City-wide draw school.

Commissioner Powell emphasized that many underlying problems arise from granting numerous exceptions to Transportation policy (8400) and/or to the Managed Choice policy (5153). She stated that each time an exception is granted, it becomes more difficult to deny the next parent that requests an exception.

Mr. Underwood requested assistance from Committee/Board members with granting exceptions and explaining to parents that Transportation staff are busy at the beginning of the school year ensuring that all eligible students receive transportation, so that requests for exceptions can only be addressed after that time. He reported that Board members themselves have advocated for parents in obtaining exceptions to Transportation policy, referring to a recent email sent by Commissioner White.

Commissioner White clarified that his email simply requested Mr. Underwood to look into the issue, and did not include a request for an exception to be made. He stated that his expectation was that Mr. Underwood would explain current policy and protocol to the family, and emphasized that he does not make promises to parents that contact him about these issues. Commissioner White stated that he refers these parents to District staff because of their expertise and more detailed knowledge of the process involved. Mr. Underwood acknowledged that the Board members have contacted him to look into parents' concerns, rather than directing that a particular action be taken.

Mr. Underwood agreed that it is the responsibility of District staff to implement Board policies, which is difficult with transportation because it is a very emotional issue for parents and most requests for exceptions are quite reasonable in terms of concern for their child's safety. He noted that it is also the responsibility of District staff to notify Board members about operational issues that arise from implementing the policy.

Commissioner Powell contended that the underlying issue results from competing needs: to realize significant reductions in transportation costs, and to minimize disruption to families resulting from changes in transportation practices. She discussed a number of ways to mitigate between these competing needs:

- Allowing sibling preference only for placement in schools within the family's current zone
- Aligning practice with policy by providing transportation for child care only if the student is already eligible for transportation services
- Establishing a process for granting exceptions to Managed Choice policy and to Transportation policy:
 - Ensure that Placement Office is involved whenever exceptions are requested
 - Counsel parents on implications of their choices: have their child walk to school, obtain transportation to a school within their zone, or transfer their child to a different school if they relocate to a different zone.

Vicky Ramos stated that the Placement Office has been allowing sibling preference only within the family's current zone. She reported that some families choose to transfer the sibling to a school within their current zone, and other families choose to have their children attend different schools. Ms. Ramos emphasized the importance of educational stability and not requiring students to change schools too frequently. She stated that school principals have been instructed to contact the Placement Office first whenever a transportation issue arises, and there has been collaboration with the Transportation Department. Ms. Ramos contended that a lot of issues

stem from parents wanting their child to be placed in a particular school and space is not available, especially since the District is filled to capacity in the primary grades.

Commissioner Powell argued that the elementary school buildings are not filled to capacity, but the capacity issue is affected by staffing decisions and the number of teachers available at each grade level. Given the fact that numerous exceptions have been granted to Board policies, Commissioner Powell contended that a formalized exception process is needed. She stated that parents have had the ability to make choices between the neighborhood school and a zone school more than 1.5 miles from their home so that they could obtain transportation. She asserted that parents need to be clearly informed of the implications of their choices and held accountable for them; the District should not later protect them from the consequences of their own decisions. Commissioner Powell asserted that a formal exception process would provide some accountability for the choices made by parents in weighing priorities between schools and transportation services.

Ms. Ramos reported that the Placement Office continued to offer choices to parents through the beginning of the summer because space was still available in zone schools for kindergarteners. She discussed the counseling provided by School Specialists regarding parents' interests and priorities, as well as the consequences of their choices.

Commissioner Cruz inquired whether a representative from the Placement Office is included on the committee that reviews requests for transportation exceptions. Mr. Underwood replied that staff from the Placement Office have not served on this committee because of a timing issue. He stated that staff in the Transportation Department are focused for the first three weeks of the school year on ensuring that all eligible students receive transportation, and exceptions are not considered until after this has been settled.

Commissioner Adams pointed out that the District is advocating for a change in NYS transportation eligibility based on safety considerations, and she requested data as to the number of elementary students residing within the 1.5-mile distance limit in high-crime areas. She cited an instance in which an 8-year-old girl attends School No. 25 and lives within 1.3 miles of the school. Commissioner Adams reported that the girl's mother does not want her to walk to school because of the high level of crime in the area. She stated that by the time the school will allow students to be dropped off, her mother will be late for work. As a result of this situation, Commissioner Adams stated that the only remaining option is for this young girl to transfer to a different school, even though she likes School No. 25 and has been doing well there. Mr. Underwood responded that crime data was examined last year to present a case to the NYS Education Department (SED) about the need for additional transportation for students in high-crime areas. He reported that SED declined to provide reimbursement for these additional transportation costs. Mr. Underwood asserted that the basic conundrum lies in balancing educational stability with the requirement that students attend schools in their zone and the need to reduce transportation costs. He emphasized the importance of having quality education in schools in each zone, and of examining these issues holistically in terms of student placement, safety, and education.

Commissioner Powell suggested bringing in the experts that performed the initial evaluation of the zones to determine whether there have been fundamental programmatic changes since the original zone boundaries were drawn. She stated that the entire structure of school choice, student placement and transportation is based on having equity across the zones in terms of the quality of programs and schools. Commissioner Powell stated that certain zones (i.e. South zone) are more popular because of a few schools (i.e. #12 and #23) that are in high demand, while other schools in the zone have had empty seats and were filled by assignment.

Commissioner White asked about the number and percentage of students who chose School No. 23 and live in that neighborhood. He suggested that returning to neighborhood schools may be a way to resolve the concerns about cross-zone student placement and transportation.

Commissioner Powell reported that there has not been one school that has exceeded the number of seats set aside for students residing in the neighborhood in the entire history of school choice. She explained that 40% of the seats available in each school are set aside for students residing in the neighborhood. She stated that if the demand for neighborhood schools was greater, schools would be exceeding the number of seats set aside for resident students.

Commissioner White contended that the reason that School No. 23 is successful is because of parents who are actively engaged in their child's education. He stated that requiring students to attend their neighborhood school would lead to having a certain number of involved parents in each school to promote its success. He declared that the District has chosen to allow parents to escape their neighborhood by offering options for school choice in other parts of the District.

Commissioner Powell acknowledged that the "proximity preference" set aside was designed initially to prevent middle-class flight to the suburbs. She described the example of School No. 46, which was highly chosen within their neighborhood – primarily due to the efforts of Concerned Citizens for City Living (CCCL). Commissioner Powell stated that CCCL went door to door in the neighborhood, encouraging all families with kindergarten-aged children to sign up for School No. 46. She stated that even with these efforts, the school did not exceed the number of seats set aside for students from the neighborhood – partially because some chose to go to a private or parochial school. She noted that School No. 46 is not a highly chosen school today because of changes in leadership, and neighborhood parents are not choosing to send their children to the school.

Commissioner Powell asserted that the primary reason for school choice is that schools are no longer located where students live. She stated that returning to neighborhood schools would result in some schools requiring twice their current capacity to accommodate all of the students in their area, while others would remain empty.

Commissioner White emphasized the inequities in the distribution of quality schools amongst the zones in the District, leading parents to look outside their neighborhood if given the option. He contended that the District has created the problem by failing to replicate successful schools and allowing parents to choose a school outside their neighborhood. He pointed out that the District has successful school models, but has failed to replicate them across the zones. He stated that

these practices have led to a concentration of academic quality and actively engaged parents in a few schools in the District, to the detriment of the majority of schools and students.

Commissioner Adams suggested identifying a core of schools in high-crime areas and conducting a comprehensive examination of the costs and benefits of providing transportation to all students in these schools, including the impact on attendance and academic achievement. She proposed that this process be expanded to additional schools in the District, at least to remove the disincentive for parents to choose their neighborhood school. She asked about schools in high-crime areas for which the cost of providing transportation to all students would not be too prohibitive.

Commissioner White maintained that the District has to begin building schools based on successful models and then require students to attend the school in their neighborhood.

Commissioner Powell noted that one of the concepts built into school choice is for the principal to be the salesperson for their school and to recruit children from the neighborhood. She stated that the District has instead created more City-wide schools outside of neighborhoods and granted exceptions to staying within the zone. Commissioner Powell urged examining every assumption upon which the original school choice model was based to determine if these assumptions are still valid and where changes may be needed.

Commissioner Powell stated that there is a lot of anecdotal reporting, but little objective data regarding the primary reasons for parents' requests for exceptions to staying within their zone. She maintained that a process is necessary to remove pressure from Transportation Department staff, involve the Placement Office to counsel parents, and require final approval by a Zone Chief to ensure that there is a genuine need for an exception. She stated that data must be examined regarding the reasons for requesting exceptions, and the basis for granting or denying these requests. Commissioner Powell emphasized that these factors necessitate incorporating an exception process into the policy.

Commissioner Powell asserted that improved data collection through a formalized exception process would enable better policies to be developed and safety issues to be addressed. She stated that the safety issues are being pursued through advocacy by the New York State School Boards Association to change the law to enable child safety zones to be established in urban districts, as already authorized in other districts.

Commissioner Campos noted that the School Conditions Survey and review of the Strategic Plan will be coming up later in September. She urged her colleagues to consider all of these factors to make more informed and uniform decisions.

Commissioner Cruz reported that one of the recommendations from an earlier meeting was to hold a mini summit with staff from the Transportation Department, Placement Office, the Zone Chiefs, and all involved to hear different perspectives on this issue. He reminded the Committee that the original mission was to provide transportation to every student, but savings have to be found to cover these additional costs. He acknowledged that this issue is quite complex and cannot be resolved with 2-3 recommendations. Commissioner Cruz discussed the importance of

modifying the culture in terms of expectations and entitlement to enable all of these different functions to operate in conjunction. He also underscored the importance of educating families about the purpose for making changes to student placement and/or transportation: to compel schools to improve, at least partially by having a community of involved parents to advocate for their children.

Action Item: Ms. Flanagan will schedule a mini summit to be held within the next few weeks with representatives from the Transportation Department, Placement Office, Zone Chiefs, and members of the Policy Committee to hear from all different perspectives and examine data regarding requests for exceptions to placement or transportation within zone.

Commissioner Powell noted that previous discussions have concerned using savings from eliminating cross-zone busing to pay for transportation for students who reside within the 1.5-mile distance limit from school. She reported that an estimated \$5.65M in cost savings would result from eliminating cross-zone busing, which would provide a significant funding base for additional transportation. She stated that cross-zone student placement is probably the most difficult to untangle because parents have an attachment to a particular school, and want all of their children to attend that school. Commissioner Powell pointed out that even if the zone boundaries were enforced today, savings would not be realized for years because of the large number of students that would continue attending an out-of-zone school until completion of the final grade (i.e. K-6, K-8).

Ms. Ramos expressed concern about the recommendation that a student change schools when District staff have been notified of an out-of-zone address. She cautioned against requiring students to change schools frequently because these transitions are detrimental to academic stability and achievement, particularly in the elementary grades.

Commissioner Powell noted that issues regarding family mobility and educational stability pre-date the Managed Choice policy, and asserted that District staff have to have a candid discussion with parents about the impact of moving outside of their current zone. She pointed out that the District spends \$4500 more per student for transportation outside of their zone, and these funds could be used in the classroom. She stated that these concerns must be balanced and clearly communicated to parents.

IV. School Closure Policy

Chuck Johnson stated that the proposed policy was developed as a result of issues that arose with closing School No. 6 and the discussions regarding School No. 16. He stated that Commissioner White put forth a resolution on this issue, and the proposed policy incorporates the criteria contained in that resolution.

Mr. Johnson described the following elements as essential in developing any school closure plan:

- The academic and social history of the school
- Physical condition and limitations of the building
- Rationale for closure

- Academic and social impact on students and the school community from closing the building
- The building(s) to which students would be reassigned
- Financial impact of closing the school
- Alternatives to closure that are available to students and families

Mr. Johnson stated that these elements would be required in the school closure plan that the Superintendent presents to the Board and to the community for consideration. He stated that the proposed policy would require the Superintendent to present the plan to at least the following five key constituent groups:

- Parent Advisory Council
- Zone Improvement Team
- School-Based Planning Team
- Parents and students from the school
- Board of Education

Under the proposed policy, Mr. Johnson stated that the Superintendent would be required to submit to the Board a summary of the input received from the constituent groups. He stated that the Board would have the authority to approve, reject, or modify the school closure plan.

Mr. Johnson explained that the final aspect of the proposed policy addresses potential emergency situations (e.g. significant unexpected reduction in NYS Foundation Aid). In these situations, he stated that the Board could elect to waive some or all of these requirements.

Commissioner White noted that Board staff also prepared a policy proposal regarding the school closure process, and that the two versions could be reconciled. Ed Lopez-Soto objected to having Board staff draft a separate policy proposal, emphasizing the need for collaboration in the policy development process.

Commissioner White contended that this meeting presents an opportunity for discussion and collaboration to create the most effective policy by exploring alternatives. Mr. Lopez-Soto maintained that collaboration should occur before the Policy Committee meeting so that one integrated policy proposal is presented for consideration.

Commissioner White pointed out that the two policy proposals contain many similarities, suggesting that a new proposal be developed to include the required elements in the Superintendent's school closure plan, the acceptable rationale for school closure, and the specific criteria under which schools may not be closed. He asked for feedback on the policy proposal drafted by Board staff.

Mr. Lopez-Soto contended that the Board staff version is quite prescriptive and significantly limits the Superintendent's ability to act. He stated that the policy should be more open-ended to allow the Board, Superintendent and District the flexibility to make decisions. He asserted that the Board staff version is so prescriptive that it would never allow a school to be closed.

Mr. Johnson stated that the academic reasons for which a school may be closed under the Board staff proposal are quite limited and would limit the Board's discretion to make choices. He pointed out that the Board staff proposal would not be allow a school to be closed if the principal had been in the school for less than two years, students had been transferred from a closed or consolidated school within the last two years, or if there was no higher performing school in close proximity. Mr. Johnson stated that it would not be advisable to establish a policy restricting the Board's ability to act.

Commissioner White explained that a great deal of the feedback from parents and community members regarding school closures has been that the principal had just arrived at the school and was not given a real opportunity to make positive changes, and the school is the highest performing in the area. He asserted that the Board staff proposal incorporates the voice of parents, and it is not fair to close a school when the principal is just beginning to make progress, some of the students have just been transferred from another school that was closed, or this is the highest performing school in the area. Commissioner White stated that this is the basis for the language in the Board staff proposal and may be the reason it is intended to be prescriptive.

Mr. Johnson acknowledged that these are all important factors to consider before closing a school, but limit the Board's discretion even though the Board could consider these factors in their decision-making. He noted that this proposal would not allow the Board to consider closing a school if any of these factors are present.

Mr. Lopez-Soto pointed out that it might be more advantageous for the policy to state that these factors must be considered and given a great deal of weight in deciding whether to close a school.

Commissioner White stated that a compromise between the two policy proposals would be to require the Superintendent to consider these specific factors and to include them in the school closure plan presented to the community and the Board.

Commissioner Powell provided historic context to clarify the need for considering these specific factors in the school closure process. She cited the example of School No. 2, which was academically quite successful and whose students had very high ELA and Math scores on NYS assessments. She stated that the Administration at that time planned to close School No. 2 due to the need for swing space for the Facilities Modernization Project (FMP), which apparently was given priority over the educational success of the school. She reported that this was the reason for the Board overriding the Administration's plan to close the school and for closely monitoring school closure plans generally.

Commissioner Powell contended that there has been a problem historically with the Administration failing to support principals in recruiting students and in determining adequate staffing levels for schools. She noted that some schools were insufficiently staffed compared to building capacity, leading the Administration to claim that the school is "under-utilized" and propose that it be closed. Commissioner Powell emphasized the importance of considering these factors and responding to these concerns in the policy.

Mr. Lopez-Soto replied that these factors will be incorporated in revising the proposed policy.

Commissioner Adams suggested adding a timeframe for holding a public meeting during the school closure process in emergency situations.

Action Item: Staff in the Law Department will collaborate with Board staff to revise the proposed school closure policy to incorporate the recommendations of the Policy Committee.

V. Review Recommendations regarding Conflict of Interest in the Code of Ethics

Bethany Centrone explained that the proposed changes to the Code of Ethics arose from concerns regarding RCSD employees attempting to contract with the District to provide services. She cited two examples of these situations: 1) consulting contract with the Teaching and Learning Division; 2) response to an RFP for Supplemental Educational Service (SES) providers. Ms. Centrone pointed out that there was no wrongdoing, but these situations simply raised awareness of these issues.

Ms. Centrone stated that the current Code of Ethics mirrors the requirements in the law in defining a prohibited conflict of interest if an employee has the authority to approve a contract, invoice or purchase that would result in their personal gain. She stated that the situations just cited raised questions about prohibited conflicts of interest when employees do not have approval authority, but can influence the scope or nature of the services provided under the contract or when the contracted services replicate the services they provide as an employee.

For clarification, Ms. Centrone provided an example of an RCSD employee who was hired by the District to write the math curriculum. She stated that it would be a conflict of interest for that same employee to be paid under contract with District to write the math curriculum. Ms. Centrone stated that this employee could contract with RCSD to provide other services that do not duplicate their job duties. She explained that a teacher can provide tutoring services as an SES provider in the District, but not to the students in the school in which they teach. She stated that this is because as an employee (teacher), they are in a position to influence the services provided and the students that may come to them for tutoring. Ms. Centrone stated that the problem arises from the opportunity for abuse, such as a teacher not performing adequately so that they can recommend that their students receive their tutoring services or pressure students to obtain their tutoring services when this is not necessary.

Commissioner White asked about the impact of these proposed policy changes on SES providers such as Dial-A-Teacher, since RTA officers serve on their Board of Directors. Ms. Centrone replied that compensation for Dial-A-Teacher is not based on the number of students calling in for academic assistance and the services are located off-site so that there is no opportunity for teachers contracted with Dial-A-Teacher to influence students to use this service.

Commissioner White pointed out that the District recently selected nine SES providers to offer tutoring services on-site in the schools, including Dial-A-Teacher. He expressed concern that RTA officers have authority to approve contracts with the District as members of the Board of

Directors for Dial-A-Teacher. Ms. Centrone replied that RTA officers are not RCSD employees and not able to influence or approve the contracted services on behalf of the District – only on behalf of their own business as an SES provider. She stated that anyone who owns a business will have the authority to approve or influence the services provided by their company, but the primary concern is influencing contracts or services on behalf of the District. She clarified that this is the reason that the proposed policy revisions focus on conflicts of interest when an employee approves a contract for the District to do business with their own company.

Mr. Johnson stated that the conflict of interest arises from an individual's status as an employee with a financial interest and an ability to influence the outcome of a contract with their employer. He clarified that this involves a two-step process: 1) determining whether an employee has an interest (i.e. potential personal financial gain); and 2) determining whether this employee is able to influence the outcome of the contract/purchase because of their position as a District employee.

Commissioner Powell pointed out that having Dial-A-Teacher on-site in schools would lead to some prohibited conflicts of interest if teachers are providing tutoring services in the school in which they teach. She stated that this will have to be explicitly articulated in the contracts with SES providers.

Commissioner White expressed concern that these issues are not being considered in the selection and approval process for SES providers. He stated that the discussion regarding approval of SES providers focused on their familiarity with the students to be tutored, without any apparent awareness of these conflicts of interest. Ms. Centrone replied that these proposed changes have not yet been approved in the Code of Ethics policy, but that she can certainly ensure that these potential conflicts of interest are considered by the committee selecting SES providers.

Commissioner Cruz recommended tabling the following agenda items until the October Policy Committee meeting:

- Additional policies required due to recent legislation
- Review of next set of priorities for updating the Policy Manual
- Discuss methods for monitoring implementation of Board policies

VII. Discuss Policy Committee Goals for 2012-13

Commissioner Cruz confirmed that all Committee members received a copy of the proposed goals for the Policy Committee for 2012-13.

Motion by Commissioner Powell to approve proposed Policy Committee goals for 2012-13. Seconded by Commissioner Campos. **Adopted 3-0.**

Motion by Commissioner Powell to adjourn. Seconded by Commissioner Campos. **Adopted 3-0.**

Meeting adjourned at 8:57PM.