



## **BOARD CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES MONDAY, APRIL 19, 2010**

Members of the Board Curriculum Committee met on Monday, April 19, 2010, in the Dining Room at the Education Center. The following Board Members were in attendance: Rosario Amato, William Burkhardt, Michele Cann, Judith Dexter, Michael Faccinnetto, Irene Follweiler, Loretta Leeson, Eugene McKeon, and Aurea Ortiz. Also in attendance were Dr. Thomas Persing, interim superintendent; Dr. Margaret K. Barilla, educational consultant as assistant superintendent for curriculum and instruction; Thomas Washington, assistant superintendent for human resources; Richard Agretto, director of special education; Iris Cintrón, supervisor of minority affairs, governmental programs and grants; Dr. Dean Donaher, student services; principals, teachers, and representatives of the press.

Mrs. Dexter called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

### **COURTESY OF THE FLOOR**

1. Rocky Bayer, 1118 Russell Avenue, Bethlehem, referred to the Ilick's Mill Project listed as Item 7 on the agenda. He noted that he was president of the Ilick's Mill Board of Directors and a long time supporter of the efforts of Ilick's Mill. He added that he had worked in education at Penn State University, Temple University, Muhlenberg College, Northampton Community College, and was a secondary school teacher. He said he was involved with the National Occupational Competency Testing Institute in the area of curriculum development and his background was formed by education but a part of his education was at Ilick's Mill when it was at first a youth center. He stated that he learned about community involvement and the impact youth could have in a positive way in their community. Mr. Bayer announced that last week they learned that the Ilick's Mill Partnership had won the highest honor awarded by the Environmental Protection Agency, which was the President's Environmental Youth Award. He said he was concerned about any movement by the board in the area of curriculum which would affect the outcome of the project as it moved forward. He felt it would be an invaluable asset to the district in terms of science and other curricular advantages afforded to the district at no real cost to the district. He explained that the building belonged to the city and the fundraising by the students more than paid for the efforts of the organization. He said they needed support and a full four blocks of Ilick's Mill activities, especially with having a science teacher on board, in addition to Karen Dolan, whose efforts had been exemplary for the last ten years and accorded well-deserved national respect.

2. Karen Dolan, 55 Bridle Path Road, Bethlehem, expressed that yesterday the mayor presented a certificate of appreciation that announced the highest honor that an organization of young people could have in the United States of America. She added that she took the time to write a brand new standards aligned curriculum for the Ilick's Mill Project. She said that she was not paid anything for it but it was a great experience to write it because everything in it was what they were doing. She concluded that she would be glad to answer questions during the agenda portion of the meeting.

Director Dexter congratulated Mrs. Dolan on the great honor for the district in addition to her and the students.

### **STEM PRESENTATION - Dr. Al Bodzin, Lehigh University**

Dr. Bodzin, of the Teaching, Learning, and Technology Program at the Lehigh University Environmental Initiative presented an overview of the science education project associated with Broughal Middle School. He said the goal was to redesign the science curriculum and also work with the science supervisor with the hope that the district would come on board and it would become the new innovative curriculum for the district. He explained that the Toyota Foundation provided generous funding to support the building and design of the program. He revealed some of the content area of the curriculum including Energy, Environmental Issues, Land Use Change, with a Climate Change unit currently in development. He noted that everything was aligned to the national standards along with Pennsylvania standards. They had performed pilot and field-testing with all levels of abilities in the school district. He pointed out that they included educator curriculum materials, which were designed from a teacher learning of science content, in addition to pedagogical support in content. He explained that a given curriculum might not work for every learner so the teachers took the materials and tweaked it for student diversity.

Dr. Bodzin revealed an example of the instructional design model and activities through his PowerPoint presentation. He also brought attention to the area of sustainable energy. He said the students looked at land footprints made by solar power plants made on the environment utilizing Google Earth, which enables multiple perspectives of viewing. He stated the curriculum also involved a unit that dealt with wind farms and the impact on land use with regard to environmental concerns. Another area of education was hydroelectric dams utilizing Google Earth in addition to geothermal energy where the students must decide on the best location for a geothermal power plant. The culminating activity required the students to create an energy policy that contained the best way to use a mix of renewable and sustainable energies and in some cases, nonsustainable energies to maximize the renewable energy resources and minimize the impact on the environment.

Dr. Bodzin noted that the teachers who used the program at the middle schools would share that the students loved the activities and were engaged in the learning. He also said that the graduate students collected data on the students saw the same results. He concluded by sharing a website that provided the curriculum which was available to the public. He expressed that Toyota Foundation wanted them to disseminate their findings.

Director Dexter asked Dr. Bodzin where the curriculum was currently being utilized.

Dr. Bodzin responded that it was being taught at Broughal and Nitschmann Middle Schools.

Director Dexter asked if his proposal was to have it used at all middle schools.

Dr. Bodzin said there was discussion about a plan to work with the constraints of professional development. He noted that on April 29, a professional development day was planned at Lehigh University with regard to the land use change unit. They were also looking at the early fall for three professional development days with regard to the energy unit.

Director Dexter questioned if the program was still at the pilot stage and asked for an explanation of a field test and the pilot.

Dr. Bodzin explained the involvement of five classrooms and all three track levels with revisions made based upon student data and observations. He added that the material from prototype to pilot was very different. The field test was started about two months after the pilot to give enough time to do additional revisions.

Director Dexter asked if they were at the pilot yet.

Dr. Bodzin replied that they were past the pilot and were into the field test.

Director Leeson questioned the grade levels involved in the program.

Dr. Bodzin replied that it involved eighth grade students and the program would possibly expand to an additional eighth grade unit and one seventh grade unit dependent on funding. He said they would find out in June if the funding is approved.

Director Leeson questioned Dr. Barilla if the program was in line with the middle school science curriculum and consistent across all four middle schools.

Dr. Barilla stated that the three units would be consistent in classrooms across the four schools. They would be meeting at the end of the month with the intent to have the curriculum approved in June. She added that the three units were in line with the standards. She was going to review it to see if there was a possibility to refine it for middle school science curriculum.

Director Follweiler questioned if the Toyota Foundation Grant had expired.

Dr. Bodzin explained that there was one more year remaining on the grant funding. He added that the funding provided teacher support in consideration that geo-spatial tools was not very easy and there was need for support. He said there was a grad students supported by the grant who worked with the teachers with regard to laboratory support.

Director Dexter questioned if the program was initially approved. She stressed that all pilots brought to the district had to be approved by board policy. She expressed appreciation of the program in addition to the incorporation of technology to earth sciences.

Dr. Barilla commented that she thought the teachers appreciated the availability of the grad students with regard to the technology.

Dr. Bodzin pointed out that they tweaked the program involving the input of the teachers who worked with the program. He said that when the topic of homework was brought up; they addressed the program and incorporated it.

Director Leeson also commented about homework at all schools involved because the students fed into a common high school and needed preparation.

### **LRE PRESENTATION - Richard Agretto**

Mr. Agretto expressed that every year more identified students were being incorporated into the regular classroom. He explained the detail of the provided informational sheet. He noted that the least restricted environment information was required to be reported to the government. Mr. Agretto reviewed that the Gaskin settlement had established criteria that must be followed and reported to the state on a yearly basis. He also reviewed the yearly changes in the increased percentage of identified students being included in the regular classroom. He said he was very proud of the district's progress in the attempt to close the achievement gap. Mr. Agretto referred to the current percentage of special education students being incorporated into regular education for the current school year, which was 66.2 percent as compared to 42.3 percent in the 2005-2006 school year. He provided a data report detailing a historic perspective explaining the percentage of special education students involved a regular classroom setting. He commented that within a large school district, it was a result of a lot of hard work done by many people including the curriculum and instruction office, the principals, and specifically the teachers where it happened in the grass-roots programs within the classrooms. He also thought the dramatic increases were a result of a change in culture that had taken place when the summer academy was brought forward in 2007. He also thought that more staff development in the area of inclusive practices and co-teaching, and differentiated instruction had paid off. He thought the exposure to the students within the regular education classroom was critically important as they tried to close the achievement gap. Mr. Agretto noted that work was needed in the area of students that are placed in regular education for less than 40 percent of their day. He also noted there were many students in the district at the low end of the spectrum, which has proven to be a great challenge to the professional staff. He added that the autism population was growing dramatically with many students at the low end of the autism spectrum utilizing the Intermediate Unit for services.

Director Cann inquired if the statistics covered the K-12 student population.

Mr. Agretto stated that it covered the full spectrum.

Director McKeon commended Mr. Agretto for the progress achieved noting that he had a child involved in the program in 1992-1993 and he has seen a dramatic change in the entire process with regard to inclusion. He thought it was beneficial and educational to both types of students; the regular education student and IEP student.

Director Dexter inquired about the special education teaching staff added since 2005.

Mr. Agretto replied that in 2005-2006 the teaching staff total was 105.6. The projected amount of staff for 2011 was 110.5. He noted that the increase was only 4.9 teachers with students increasing by 135. He said there were some teacher-aides provided with one-on-one aides in certain situations.

Director Dexter asked if the one-on-one aides were hired through the Intermediate Unit or hired directly by the district.

Mr. Agretto responded that they have gone through both routes depending on the student and the necessary training attached to their needs.

Director Ortiz commented that she believed that the BASD had the best special education department in the area. She noted that her son had many challenges and had made amazing progress. She recalled that people had said he would not be able to talk and now he was in college.

Director Burkhardt inquired about future discussion about the impact of incorporating the identified students in the regular classroom and the overall impact on the regular education students. He thought the students at the high school level were historically stereotypical.

Mr. Agretto agreed to obtain and provide the data in the future.

### **ELEMENTARY TECHNOLOGY CURRICULUM UPDATE – Frank Arbushites**

Academic Integration Curriculum – Mr. Arbushites introduced the program and noted that the students needed to develop the proper technology skills and be prepared for college or other future challenges such as the work force or the military. He added that they welcomed the incorporation of other areas of curriculum into the program. Mr. Arbushites brought attention to the ISTE Standards, which were the national technology standards that focused on topics such as creativity and innovation, collaboration and communication, research and information fluency, and technology operations and concepts, which was the actual building of skills. He stated that the developed curriculum was aligned with the Pennsylvania Standards for Technology. He further explained that the curriculum did not operate in isolation, with the encouragement of collaboration and connection with other disciplines across the curriculum. Technology benchmarks developed a few years ago identified specific skills necessary at age grade level as they moved through the system.

Mr. Arbushites introduced Mr. Tom Braun from Fountain Hill Elementary, an academic integration teacher. Mr. Braun explained that the students received academic integration (grades 1- 5) every week. He noted that the basics were taught in first grade with a focus on internet safety. He added that many parents had concern in the area of internet safety and responsible social networking. He said that they also focused on research and introduced safe search connections for the students. They also address multimedia skills such as various methods to deliver a message. Mr. Braun provided examples of student projects which involved graph use and summaries. He also brought attention to the use of music programs in classroom activity involving student creativity.

The students also created “podcasts” in the school which could be viewed at home by using a student password. Mr. Braun pointed out the most adults were technology immigrants with the students presently be referred to as the natives.

Director Amato inquired if the available technology would eventually replace hard copy reference material such as school textbooks. He predicted that someday students would be inquiring about what it was like to use a book. He thought the resources were unlimited for the students to gain knowledge.

Director Leeson asked if there was integration of the other curriculum into the technology such as history.

Mr. Braun stated that at times they are approached by a teacher about a particular topic being covered.

Director Leeson inquired about keyboarding instruction.

Mr. Braun stated that it began at the first grade level but he did not grade the skill.

Director Cann asked if learning how to type was still considered an important component of the program. She thought it would make a difference if the students learned to type at an early stage.

Mr. Arbushites stated that it was still a warm up activity in most classes but was not specifically tested. He thought other skills had taken a higher priority but the teachers reinforced good typing skills. He referred to it as passive reinforcement.

Director Ortiz inquired about accelerated reading associated with the technology program. She noted that the student’s progress is tracked via the computer.

Ms. Moran commented that it was part of the Read 180 Program which provided the students with immediate feedback. She noted that most of the schools had the program.

Director Amato inquired why keyboarding wasn’t included as part of the curriculum. He thought that if they did not have the basics of typing, they would have difficulty taking computer based tests and being successful with research projects.

Mr. Arbushites noted that it was a developmental process and if it was started at the lower grades, as they did, the students would learn proper hand position and develop coordination skills. He said the students only receive approximately 45 minutes of technology instruction during the week so it would be difficult to incorporate the typing instruction.

Director Dexter asked Director Amato if he would like to see more typing skills taught to the students.

Director Amato commented that he wanted to see what needed to be taught to utilize the technology; whether it was typing or reading.

Director Faccinetto thought the students acquired the keyboarding skills naturally by frequent exposure to technology.

Mr. Arbushites gave an example of writing and using a pen as a tool. He said that he wanted to think about what he was writing rather than focus on the pen and compared it to typing.

Director Dexter commented that with her personal experience is that over time, accuracy and speed was essential. She thought that the proper technique was important. She added that many lawyers were now drafting their own documents by typing and if one was not fast and accurate, they will not be able to be productive. It was her view that typing needed to be taught to the students.

Director Cann pointed out that her son was presently in college and was having difficulty producing documents with ease. She thought it was important that the students were taught the proper technique.

Director Leeson commented that although the content was important in the technology classes but a foundation would help the students move forward. She also noted that some of the students seemed to be struggling with IMovies. She asked if the time involved with learning to make the IMovies was consistent across the entire curriculum. She stated that the process was time consuming.

Mr. Arbushites replied that a two-minute video could possibly take hours to create and pointed out that the students improved with more exposure.

Director Amato stated that they need to be aware that many students were not born into having technology in their home, which needed to be a consideration.

### **TECHNOLOGY AUDIT – Mr. Arbushites**

It was noted that the technology audit was the next subject and would involve considerable time to address.

Director Leeson stated that she thought it was an issue that would need to be addressed but the discussion could take place at a future date.

Director Cann thought there was a need to give time to the subject and they should consider addressing the item at a future date.

It was agreed to postpone the technology audit discussion for a future meeting.

Mr. Arbushites suggested that questions regarding the provided documents be communicated to him before they meet for future discussion. He also brought attention to a document regarding Academic Integration for fifth grade curriculum and would have the entire document finished for next month's meeting.

## **SCIENCE TEXTBOOKS – Dr. Margaret Barilla**

Eric Baltz (Freedom High School Science Department Chairperson) stated that he and Beth Guarriello (Liberty High School Science Department Chairperson) worked together with Dr. Barilla to determine the choices of new books to be utilized in various areas of scientific study. It was noted that the spreadsheet provided to the board described the different courses and textbooks which were needed either as new courses or to update their current courses.

Mrs. Guarriello announced that there were two new physics courses with one being honors physics. There were two different books with one book used for Advanced Placement Physics-C, which included electromagnetic content for engineering and science majors. She noted that the course would replace AP Physics-B.

Director Amato questioned the various AP science courses and the reasoning behind certain course offerings associated with calculus and algebra. He asked if there was an organization used for reference to assist in choosing the books.

Mrs. Guarriello noted that the College Board, which was a national organization, preferred the calculus-based book in order to give college credits. She added that in order for an AP to be offered, it had to be approved by the College Board, including the syllabus and textbook.

Director Amato asked why they looked at the algebra based physics book when the colleges preferred the calculus-based book.

Mrs. Guarriello replied that not all students would be taking the AP Physics-C course because one had to finish algebra-based honors physics first. She added that a specific course could not be taken until a student completed a previously required course. She also introduced a third physics book which would be utilized for a new conceptual level course. It involved more hands-on projects and the building of more practical applications. The reading level was somewhat lower and not as math intensive. She reviewed that Honors Physics, AP Physics-C, and Conceptual Physics were all new courses.

Mrs. Guarriello described the chemistry book considerations. She explained that some science course offerings did not incorporate as much math, which still covered the concepts, was standards aligned and would also be able to be utilized by the identified students. She pointed out that chemistry was one of the four required science courses.

Mrs. Guarriello moved on to the Earth and Space book and explained that the newest version was from 1998 with a back-up version from 1989. She said the books stayed at the school because there were not enough to distribute to all students. In addition, there was a need for new astronomy and geology books. She also requested some supplemental books for the current chemistry book being used at Liberty and Freedom High Schools because there were no available extra copies.

Director Follweiler questioned the areas on the document provided which were not completed.

Mrs. Guarriello stated that the astronomy curriculum was completed and AP Physics-C would not start until the 2011-2012 school year with the syllabus approved by the College Board but the curriculum still needed to be written.

Director Follweiler questioned the total cost for all science books. She asked that before it was listed as an agenda item, the total cost needed to be listed.

Mrs. Guarriello agreed to follow-up with the curriculum office and stated they received the updated information today.

Director Follweiler questioned the shipping costs.

Mrs. Guarriello explained that the costs listed were for the shipping fees from Prentice Hall, the publisher for the majority of the books and Key Curriculum Press represented another book. It was noted that Prentice Hall was offering a better price on shipping because they purchased many books.

Director Follweiler recommended renegotiating the shipping costs.

Director Follweiler thought that physics should be a core course and was as important as chemistry and other science courses.

Director Ortiz inquired about accompanying software.

Mrs. Guarriello said that many additional resources were offered through the book purchases but many students did not have home computer access.

Mr. Baltz pointed out that Prentice Hall stated that teacher training and online resources were provided at no additional cost.

Director Leeson thanked the teachers for their time and effort regarding their work on the science curriculum. She reviewed the sequencing for college preparatory students such as biology, environmental science, and chemistry. She asked about the various available choices for the students.

Director Leeson questioned the environmental science course and the pattern of increased study. She mentioned the rigor associated with the courses. She asked if there was a way to incorporate the environmental science course into chemistry and biology courses.

Mr. Baltz explained that environmental science had its own four point standards. He noted that the course was full of the provided standards. He commented that it was going to be a good hands-on course without the incorporated math for inclusion or struggling students.

Director Leeson asked how they determined the course selection for the students.

Mr. Baltz said there was collaboration between the current science teacher, the math teacher, and the student's reading level. Also the career goals of the student were considered.

Director Burkhardt asked why they were proceeding without further review.

Mr. Baltz stated that the course details involved so much information in order for students to have success in the PSSA testing.

Director Dexter asked if they were endorsing the sequence or were they endorsing the concept that it needed to be readdressed.

Mrs. Guarriello said that she was not comfortable answering for the entire department.

Mr. Baltz expressed that he was endorsing the current course as written in consideration that he would be teaching the course. He thought it could be readdressed at a later date because they were at the point where they needed to move forward.

Director Leeson requested that Dr. Barilla review the one aspect of the curriculum.

Director Amato addressed purchasing an electronic version wherever possible for cost containment. He expressed that the district was going to be faced with a huge budget challenge.

Dr. Barilla stated that every student did not have laptop computer access in the buildings.

Director Follweiler commented that she had concern about the cost but also thought that in the future the companies would negotiate price based on purchasing the software alone.

Director Amato commented that even if it was a requirement to purchase the hard copy in order to obtain the electronic version, it could be negotiated if they want to make the sale.

Dr. Barilla explained that every student had an ID number to use which required every student to have a hard copy.

Director Leeson inquired about AP Chemistry.

Mrs. Guarriello noted that both schools would be starting AP Chemistry with enrollment at both Freedom and Liberty High Schools. They also planned on starting AP Biology and AP Environmental Science with teachers being trained this summer at the College Board Institutes.

Director Leeson reviewed that the courses needed to be board approved before course initiation.

Dr. Persing congratulated the board on their concern about the course structure along with the endeavors of the department heads.

## **CURRICULUM AUDIT – 2010-2011 HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAM OF STUDIES**

Dr. Barilla explained that she compiled a CD, which contained the current status of high school courses which did and did not meet PDE requirements. She explained that she would be asking for board approval in May after their review. She also provided a copy of a letter she had written to Dr. Persing which contained her recommendations in the area of curriculum, professional development, and instruction. She also was including a copy of a quality review performed by the distinguished educators when they first came into the district. She noted that she updated it every six months and forwarded her report to Dr. Persing.

Director Leeson asked if the curriculum was aligned with the standards.

Dr. Barilla noted that the sections in red were not aligned. She added that if the area was shaded yellow, the curriculum was written this year and it would be brought forth for approval at the next meeting. She said the light blue areas were recommended to be completed for next year as soon as possible. She explained that by Pennsylvania Code and board policy, the curriculum had to be board approved. She asked that the board review the provided CD to view the curriculum documents and then give blanket approval so they could be posted on the district website.

Director Dexter asked when Dr. Barilla would be asking for approval.

Dr. Barilla replied that she would ask for approval on May 10.

Director Dexter stated that the audit indicated at the top of most pages that the assumption was made that all of the curriculum posted on the website was board approved. She asked if that curriculum was also listed on the disc.

Dr. Barilla referred to the BASD website and she assumed the curriculum was board approved. She referred to the disc and said that anything listed on it was written since 2007 but never came before the board for approval.

Director Dexter replied that Dr. Barilla's assumption was incorrect regarding content dated 2005 and after that period because she knew the board did not approve some of the programs.

Dr. Persing commented that the courses had been selected by the students and were taught in the past three or four years regardless if they had been board approved.

Director Dexter suggested the possibility of board review of what was posted on the website and then have it on the agenda for approval in order to correct the issue.

Dr. Barilla said that there was a 30-day time frame for the public to review books and then she will return to the board to request approval. She said she was still in the process of a textbook inventory.

Director Leeson said that it was always the standard in the district for having one curriculum for the entire grade level and now she is aware that some schools in the district were doing something different.

Dr. Barilla noted that many courses were recently reviewed with teachers collaborating on the content. She added that the courses at different schools needed to be titled the same but noted there had been inconsistencies. They should technically be looking at a course name on the course document, the course name in the program of studies, and the course name on the selection sheet for registration as one and the same.

Director Leeson emphasized the need for all courses to be approved by the board before allowing student enrollment.

Dr. Persing commented that if anyone finds a course that is not aligned or was not acceptable he asked that it not be approved until they were corrected. He added that in the following year, if they were not corrected, then they could not be offered.

Dr. Barilla pointed out that the board could offer conditional approval for students that were already enrolled in a course but it could go under review to be revised and aligned with the standards for the following year. She also recommended that a course be ready by October 31 or it could not be offered for the following year.

Director Cann asked if they would be approving the courses as revised or as presented.

Dr. Barilla explained that they would be approved as presented with the contingency that they would be revised and aligned with standards by next October. She added the new SAS site was very helpful in the development of courses. She also recommended a common format to be used for all course descriptions.

Director Ortiz said she was concerned about the inconsistencies in the curriculum. She asked how they could determine which curriculum was the most successful.

Dr. Barilla replied that they needed to replicate the process they did with the high schools across the board with the remaining schools and follow-up with professional development.

Director Follweiler asked Dr. Barilla about her recommendation for the schedule of curriculum audits.

Dr. Barilla recommended a 5-year cycle. She said it evolved every single year so it never is placed on a shelf.

Director Follweiler expressed that she did not want it to fall through the cracks so they did not have curriculum taught without approval.

## **ILLICK'S MILL CURRICULUM – Mrs. Dolan**

Mrs. Karen Dolan stated a request was made by Dr. Barilla for her to provide an updated curriculum for the Illick's Mill Project. She explained that the project had historically been four blocks which included Community Project English, two blocks of the elective, and Community Project History. She reviewed that Dr. Barilla's email communication requested that she needed to align the elective. She said she had recently aligned the two block elective with the standards and enjoyed the process.

Discussion involved the details of the Illick's Mill course offering. Mrs. Dolan noted another component of the curriculum, which was the Community Project History, and she was asked by Dr. Barilla to supply it as well, but the curriculum did not exist. She pointed out that there was nobody interested in writing it.

Director Leeson reviewed the course offering. She asked if there was a history program which was aligned to standards and approved for the course offering.

Director Leeson asked if Dr. Barilla would review the curriculum for the elective.

Director Burkhardt stated that the state previously allowed a district to apply for an alternative education exception so that Mrs. Dolan could teach both the English and social studies portion. He asked if it was still allowed.

Dr. Barilla replied that the process was no longer available.

Director Leeson pointed out that the district had financially supported the program for nine years and it was not exclusively funded by other sources.

Mrs. Dolan expressed that she had students involved in the course at the present time.

Director Amato commented that the course came before the board previously because the NCAA was not accepting the course and it did not make sense to offer it. He commented that they went through it last year.

Mrs. Dolan said the course was never submitted to the NCAA but her vision statement may have been submitted.

Director Leeson explained that the course needed to be approved before proceeding. She said the students could not enroll in a course that had a history component.

Mrs. Durante commented that there was not an Illick's Mill Social Studies Course offering in the book.

Director Dexter commented that the issue was administrative and it was her opinion that the course would not be ready for approval by the fall regarding availability for course enrollment.

**APPROVAL OF MIDDLE SCHOOL SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAM  
APPROVAL OF HIGH SCHOOL SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAM**

Dr. Donaher explained that the district-wide program serviced students in need of completing the requirement. He said the middle school program was provided at no cost to the students including transportation.

Dr. Leeson inquired about the success of the summer school program with regard to the remediation received by the students.

Director McKeon addressed accountability and suggested discussion about a fee in the future to support the program.

Director Follweiler thought there could be a nominal fee involved in consideration of the budget. She thought that that it might assist the students who needed a smaller environment to absorb the content.

Director Dexter inquired about the difference in cost between a 15 and 20-day program.

Dr. Donaher replied that it would be an approximate \$2,000 difference.

Director Follweiler noted that everything was on the table because they have not determined the final budget.

Director Dexter inquired about a fee of \$50 for the middle school program with the exception made for students in need of financial support.

Director Cann said that many items were being approved contingent upon the final budget.

Director Leeson asked administration if they supported the additional days for the middle school program.

Dr. Persing recommended that the program be run as long as possible.

A consensus was determined by the board in support of the \$50 fee with the exception made for students in financial need. It was noted that the high school program charged \$200 per full credit course. The students were charged \$100 per half credit course. It was also noted that there were financial waivers available for qualified high school students.

Dr. Donaher commented that the high school summer program was successful last year because they required advance payment and the length of time spent in the classroom motivated the students to do better during the academic year.

Director Follweiler questioned if a student failed Grade 12 English but there were not enough students enrolled to justify a summer school course.

Dr. Donaher stated that they could offer a senior student a research project or independent study.

Director Follweiler recalled that it was a motivating factor regarding the students paying in advance for the course. When they had the discussion last year about not charging for the middle school level, she asked if they should rethink charging the students for full payment similar to the high school students as a motivational influence.

Dr. Donaher thought it would only be fair to announce it at the beginning of the school year.

Director Follweiler recommended it be considered for the next academic year.

The following recommendations of the administration, including the summer school programs, were approved for the April 26, 2010 Regular Board Meeting Agenda:

**APPROVAL OF ACT 80 REQUEST APPLICATION**

**PENNSYLVANIA PRE-K COUNTS**

**FIBER LEASE RENEWAL**

**21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS (CCLCs) – Cohort V**

**21<sup>st</sup> CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS (CCLCs) – Cohort V Middle Schools Grant**

**COURTESY OF THE FLOOR**

No one addressed the board of school directors.

**OPEN FORUM**

There was no commentary offered for Open Forum.

Director Dexter announced an executive session to immediately follow adjournment which would address personnel, secretarial negotiations, and disciplinary actions.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:21 p.m.

Minutes prepared by:

Donna L. Wenz  
Confidential Secretary – Department of Curriculum and Instruction