

BETHLEHEM AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT  
BOARD OF SCHOOL DIRECTORS  
REGULAR MEETING

The Regular Meeting of the Board of School Directors of the Bethlehem Area School District was held on Monday, July 27, 2009, at 7:12 p.m. in the Auditorium of East Hills Middle School, 2005 Chester Road, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.

The Board Secretary called the roll:

Members present: Directors Amato, Cann, Dexter, Follweiler, Haytmanek, McKeon, Tenaglia, and Leeson – 8

Members absent – Director Koch - 1

At this point in the meeting, the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

President Leeson requested a moment of silent meditation.

President Leeson proceeded with Courtesy of the Floor. Public comment in the first session is limited to 30 minutes. Speakers are asked to stay within the limit of three minutes. It is asked that speakers refrain from personal attacks toward a specific individual.

1. Elizabeth Simmons & Ricky Gower, President of Saucon Rotary Club.

Ms. Simmons stated that this past year they worked with Karen Gomez from Marvine Elementary School to hold an Adopt a School program. She said that they had approached Dean Donaher asking for help to select a school that was showing a need for the teachers. The program is meant to help teachers who subsidize their classroom instruction with extra materials with money from their own pocket. They originally looked at a small number of classes and then after conversations, decided to adopt the whole school. The adoption program consists of finding sponsors at \$100 per class to help offset those expenses. They were fortunate to have all 17 classes adopted at Marvine Elementary School. She presented the check to Karen Gomez in the amount of \$1,700 and also presented her with a Certificate of Appreciation thanking her for allowing them to fund the program with Marvine. It is the first time they have done this and hope to adopt another school this coming school year.

Ms. Gomez thanked Saucon Rotary Club for herself and the teachers at Marvine for the generous gift and said it was an extraordinary way to start the new school year.

President Leeson thanked Saucon Rotary Club on behalf of the Board and the Administration for their generous contribution. She also stated that in these difficult financial times they appreciate that many teachers are digging into their pockets for more than just incidental expenses.

Dr. Lewis thanked Ms. Simmons for following through with this program. He stated that he realized that they were a small Rotary with a real force. He added his personal thanks and that the teachers would appreciate it.

2. Dr. Frank DeAngelo – Assistant Professor, Bloomsburg University

He stated that this is the 4<sup>th</sup> year that the Bethlehem Area School District has partnered with Bloomsburg University. This past year the district provided 41 Bloomsburg students with a field experience that was labeled “the urban practicum.” The program allows their students to immerse themselves in the elementary schools for a two week period and in the community so they can see how the student population of a large urban district, such as Bethlehem, operates. He stated that it is an outstanding experience for their students and thanked the school district for allowing them to come into the district. He noted that Dr. Molly Marnella, who co-facilitated the practicum and Dr. Karen Terwilliger, the Associate Dean from the College of Education at Bloomsburg University were also present to show their appreciation.

Jessica Reilly – Bloomsburg University

Ms. Reilly worked with a 5<sup>th</sup> grade teacher, Pamela Kalamar at Donegan Elementary. She enjoyed her time and said that Ms. Kalamar was open with what she had to say and showed how her classroom works. She was thankful for the opportunity and was hopeful that the program would expand.

Erin Keeny – Bloomsburg University

Ms. Keeny also observed at Donegan Elementary with a first grade teacher, Mrs. Donnatelli-Medei. She was thankful for the opportunity and personally it was an awesome experience. She learned to love the urban setting. She would love to have the opportunity again.

Dr. DeAngelo stated that it was Dr. Lewis along with Mr. Tony Villani’s foresight which allowed them to do this. He stated that this was his last opportunity to publicly thank Dr. Lewis for what he has done; letting the doors open for them to come in that first year and helping the program grow. He wished Dr. Lewis success. Dr. DeAngelo stated that if it wasn’t for Mrs. Katona’s vision and her leadership the program would not be where it is today.

3. Pastor Bill Lentz – 173 Hamilton Avenue, Bethlehem

Pastor Lentz stated that he was appearing for the alliance called the All Faiths Reconciliation Alliance. He is joined by other members of the steering committee, Greg Cook, Gene Johnson and Marylou Hatcher. It is their hope to build on the positive relationship they have had with the present administration on matters related to racial equality and cultural competency and all issues related to race and fairness in the Bethlehem Area School District. He acknowledged the very large task for picking a new school superintendent in the future. The alliance, along with the organization For America Bethlehem and the Coalition for Quality Education have some impressions so far of the conduct of the board related to the search for a new superintendent. They have

noticed a late notification of important public meetings relating to the search process itself. They have noticed that the announcement of the process and timetable for choosing interim superintendent may not have been exactly as publicly announced. They have an impression of lack of disclosure of the identity of the “community”, or the members consulted on subjects having to do with the superintendent search. They also noted a failure to consider or respond to a presentation made by the alliance weeks ago on behalf of all three organizations to look at some guidelines that they proposed for the search. It is their sense that the community has, even with faith based citizens, very smart and intelligent people who can help develop a process that is both open and transparent. Their concerns are very pointed: Racial reconciliation, racial inclusion, cultural competency among administration, faculty, staff and employees. They had some suggestions about the process. Pastor Lentz stated that all public meetings should be announced 10 days prior to the meeting itself. The date should be made public in all of the available papers in the area and prominently displayed on the district home page and a district superintendent search page. They believe that a formal list of guidelines related to the superintendent of schools’ position ought to be properly and fully disclosed on the same web sites. Their rationale in engaging the advice of private individuals and representative community groups ought to be fully disclosed as well on the school website. Frequently updated and comprehensive information about the superintendent search should be maintained weekly on the websites as community members are sometimes unable to come to meetings like this one and they ought to be kept fully informed. Pastor Lentz went on to say that they believe that the use of the so-called personnel clause as a means of carrying out the selection process without public input or witness should be ruled out of the search process itself. They would like an opportunity to explain their thoughts, impressions and concerns and their hopes for the future. On behalf of the organization as well as the organization for America Bethlehem and the Bethlehem Coalition for Quality Education they would like to have a meeting with the board. The board can be determined by the board, the whole board, officers, the appointment committee, the personnel committee or any configuration they may choose for a brief and congenial meeting to assess the process and perhaps find ways in a mutually respecting way that they may be able to assist in the very important process. Pastor Lentz stated that they hoped to hear from the board by the 3<sup>rd</sup> of August so that the meeting could be scheduled as soon as possible.

#### 4. Peter Crownfield - 569 Brighton Street, Bethlehem

Mr. Crownfield stated that he wanted to speak on two issues; Broughal and the Code of Conduct. He stated that he was aware that the school board members and administration have put in a lot of hours on the Broughal issue. He stated that it seems to him that a lot of energy has been put into avoiding dealing with the real question. How will we provide the south side students and families with the first rate fields that they deserve. He stated that the fields that they are getting now do not meet that standard. He thinks that that is the goal that the board and the administration need to set and if it is approached in a determined way it can be accomplished. There is a lot of misinformation out in the community and some of it has even been at meetings. He stated some facts regarding the issue. First, the district’s current plans call for fields that do not meet PIAA published specifications and have numerous hazards. Real games will not be played there. They

will not be first grade, full size fields that were promised and that the residents deserve. Secondly, the district's current plans are shockingly inferior to those planned for Northeast Middle School, which will get two complete fields, each of which is larger than the one planned for Broughal. They won't have part of the field 12 feet below ground or storm drains or concrete walls next to the field like Broughal. Thirdly, Mr. Crownfield stated that he believed the only way to get the first rate schools the south side deserves is to preserve the old building. He stated that despite the penalties which have been claimed to be 90 percent of the contract amount, they are much less than the total contract amount. It is a reduction of savings, not a new out of pocket cost. He stated that canceling the contracts make a substantial reduction in cost and will keep an asset that is worth at least \$1,000,000 even in today's market. He believes there is still time for the school district to live up to commitments that board members, administrators and others made to people of the south side which was to provide first class fields where games would be played.

Mr. Crownfield commented on the K-12 Code of Conduct. He referred to the statement that students learn responsible behavior when it is modeled by faculty, staff and everybody involved. He suggested that the district model such behavior by bringing the Code of Conduct into compliance with the state school's code and that it is not at present. Mr. Crownfield referred to Good Discipline. What is it. It enumerates various student responsibilities, but the schools are required to also publish the statement of student rights. This is not published in that document. He stated that it would not be fair to give rights without responsibilities and also not fair to give the responsibilities without pointing out the rights. Mr. Crownfield then referred to the policy on locker searches. He stated that the code of conduct reads that lockers and other in school storage spaces may be searched without prior warning to the student and without the student's presence. Mr. Crownfield stated that that is a direct violation of the state school code which states that students must be given the opportunity to be present. The code also states that the district may use search dogs which would in itself constitute a search and require the students to be allowed to be present. Mr. Crownfield stated that he believed Mr. Spry would be able to advise the district what would be necessary to bring the code into compliance but believes it clearly is not as written.

##### 5. Phil Richardson – 2231 Easton Avenue, Bethlehem

Mr. Richardson stated that he wanted to put on the record that he was provided information, based on coach's figures, where four camps where school district facilities were used. The total earnings for those four camps total was \$35,000. Of that amount, the coaches and instructors paid themselves over \$20,000. The school district received \$1,900 for the 19 days the facilities were used. The coaches also spent between \$1,200 - \$1,500 to purchase lunch for themselves with that \$35,000. Mr. Richardson went on to say that the four booster clubs received a total of a little over \$3,000. He said that three of the booster clubs at Liberty, checks that were written were signed by the coaches. Secondly, Mr. Richardson stated that recently there was a Ray Guy Football Kicking Camp held at Bethlehem School District stadium on a Sunday and Monday. He stated that this organization is from Tennessee and has nothing to do with the school district. He stated that they teach kicking and punting to high school and college kids for \$425 per

person. A total of \$1,500 was collected for two days. He stated that the policy stated the fee is \$1,500 per day.

6. Leo McKenna – student at Broughal

Liam McKenna wanted to thank Dr. Lewis and his principal for telling them that they would be getting a full size field and that it would be safe. He stated that he trusted them on that. He also thanked the school board for agreeing with them.

7. Sonia Morales – 510 Polk Street, Bethlehem

Ms. Morales thanked the school board for their decision at last Monday's board meeting on the demolition of Broughal and listening and taking into consideration their students and community. She thanked the board on behalf of the students and parents for providing them with a safe, outdoor green space for the practice of sports, games, band practice, fire drills, emergency evacuations and field days.

8. Stephen Antalics – 737 Ridge Street, Bethlehem

Mr. Antalics read an article from the local newspaper.

*“After attending the Bethlehem City Council meeting Tuesday I am still confused about the Broughal situation. The reality, that I implore a Bethlehem school official to correct me, is that the new field will not be game condition. Parents will still have to travel to places like Northeast Middle School to watch their children's home games. The new fields will only be for practice. No one from the school district, even with the Superintendent Joe Lewis in attendance, argued this point. This practice field would cost about \$6,000,000. Along with that price tag the field will be unsafe without large buffer zones between the field and retaining walls. If this field will only be practice, it hardly makes sense to destroy Broughal. Use the money saved to secure a field close to Broughal. (easier for parents and students to travel to a field on the south side than to Northeast). Counting the money lost from demolition contracts, the district will save at least \$4,000,000. Remove the newer addition to the old Broughal and a 50 yard practice field can be constructed for scrimmages, practice, band and so forth. Old Broughal can be put on the tax rolls. Without any solicitation, the developer offered \$800,000. The district could collect about \$80,000 a year in taxes. It would be crazy to turn down tax dollars that could go toward programs for students. This would be a win, win for everybody. The district could work with the city and the \$4,000,000. to find a safe, close, state of the art playing field to host games.”*

Mr. Antalics stated that this article was written by Jason Slipp. Mr. Antalics stated that he appreciated Mr. Slipp's confusion. Mr. Antalics' recommendation is that it be put upon the superintendent to write a “white paper” to state precisely what PIAA says, which is a private corporation, what Pennsylvania school authority says, in terms of extra curricular, and the realty of the Broughal field. This white paper should lay out precisely what the final analysis is and to include investigation as to what the long term gain would be if the building would be put on tax rolls.

Dr. Lewis acknowledged that there is much misinformation and asked to go on public record that it is a regulation football field. He stated that the constant spread of inaccuracies has caused this consternation. Director Dexter, Director Follweiler and Dr. Lewis attended city counsel. He provided a white paper of sorts to all counsel members because he chose not to get into an argumentative state with the number of people on both sides. Dr. Lewis stated again that it is a regulation field as determined by the National Federation of High School Athletics which sets standards for fields and the PIAA uses their standards. The decision to play games on that field or not to, will rest with the administration. Dr. Lewis quoted the PIAA. "We have fields that host district championship games on the state level in the western part of this state that do not have the run off areas that you have on this field. We do not find this field to be at all unsafe." Dr. Lewis stated that they received a complete set of plans and indicated that they would not prohibit competition should the district choose to compete on that field. The decision to play middle school games on Saturday mornings at the stadium is one that children look forward to. Playing at the stadium is not a decision by the board, administration, or middle school principals, that they decided that their fields are inferior. If the middle school principals came to the administration and said we would like to schedule games on their home field, that would probably be respected. Broughal's field could be used. Dr. Lewis stated that he was tired of hearing that it is an inferior field. He referred to the young man who spoke earlier that they have a substantial, adequate green space in which to compete. It is a full length field where marching bands could perform. A full size soccer field is overlaid on it. He further stated that the misconception that they were building three fields befuddles his imagination. He stated that there was a physical model. There were drawing provided to the board. The board clearly knew that it was a single area that had three overlays on it to accommodate softball, soccer and football. Dr. Lewis stated that he believed that the ultimate motive of the misinformation is to save the old building. Ultimately, the athletic directors have acknowledged to Dr. Lewis and others that they have no objections. Dr. Lewis stated that the board spent countless hours reviewing the plans and made the determination to build on the Southside site because the community wanted the school there. Dr. Lewis respected that decision in spite of the fact that they could have had fields like Northeast had they gone elsewhere. Dr. Lewis believes it was the right decision and thanks the board for their decision to keep it in the community. He stated that people have commented that they were happy that there would be a community school there with a fully appointed family center. Dr. Lewis stated that the principal has focused his entire career on this initiative.

Dr. Lewis further stated that it is a regulation field for the children of the Southside. It will be safe. Athletics is a dangerous event on any playing field or basketball court. Someone could get hurt on this field, but no more so than on any other field in the school district. He stated that the field does have a drop off with adequate fencing as does the tennis courts at Liberty, the stairwell at Donegan and the playground at Fountain Hill. There are examples across the city with their own premises where there are abutments, drops, railing and fences. There is a certain amount of expectation to guarantee safety wherever possible. Dr. Lewis believes the board and the administration are providing that. They physically walked the area with Director Cann and other board members so they could see what the elevations look like. Dr. Lewis stated that he knew that some of

city council went inside the old Broughal. They wanted to find out, independent of the district, and they found the same things. Dr. Lewis wanted to assure the public that it is a regulation field and a safe field that meets, with the exception of one corner, and that corner is in the run off area, the National Federation Standards that are used by the PIAA. The PIAA has received the plans and has commented that it is usable for competitive events.

A motion was made by Directors McKeon and Follweiler to approve the minutes from the March 11, 2009 Special Board Meeting and the March 11, 2009 Public Budget Hearing. The motion was passed by unanimous voice vote.

A motion was made by Director Follweiler and seconded by Director Dexter to approve the following Committee Minutes:

February 2, 2009 – Board Finance Committee Meeting

April 6, 2009 – Board Finance Committee Meeting

June 15, 2009 – Board Curriculum Committee Meeting

July 13, 2009 – Board Human Resources Committee Meeting

July 13, 2009 – Board Facilities Committee Meeting

July 20, 2009 – Board Curriculum Committee Meeting

The motion was passed by unanimous voice vote.

Director Haytmanek made a motion to accept the Financial Report and Payment of the Bills. Director McKeon seconded the motion.

Director Dexter questioned why the bills and financial report were delayed.

Mr. Majewski responded that they were using new software and there was a problem with the “print” function and were unable to get a report. The issue has been resolved.

Director Dexter asked if there are two systems running.

Mr. Majewski replied that one system is running active and the second system is not active. Two systems are capable of running, one through June 30 of last year and one as of July 1 of this year.

Director Dexter asked what was involved in getting the second system up in terms of district personnel, time and etc.

Mr. Majewski replied that it takes about 5 minutes of time to activate the system and allow them to enter it.

Director Dexter questioned that if there was a problem with the new system again, could the old system be activated so the board could receive the financial report timely in their packet, prior to the agenda.

Mr. Majewski replied that that would not be possible because the transactions stored in the new system are those from July and not contained in the old system.

Director Follweiler questioned since they just received the information that evening, if they agreed to allow payments could they resolve questions that may be asked after further review.

Mr. Majewski responded that there are a number of payments that could likely be delayed after discussions with vendors. He did request that they could schedule a special board meeting for Monday to allow for the approval of all of the bills. He also asked if a handful of bills could be released and that he would report to the board what was released. He referred to bills with penalties and the agreement with Northampton Community College which was already approved by the board.

Director Dexter questioned a payment on Fund 42 in the amount of \$1,800 to George White. What services did he provide to the district and what budget line did that come from?

Mrs. Katona replied that Dr. White has been assisting the high schools with their teaming; getting the teams under way, the structure of them, and having the teachers understand how to function as teams, getting their ideas together and how they will all work together. He has provided services on site and in a workshop setting with the teachers and has agreed to help in different ways. It is scheduled to come out of Project 720.

Dr. Lewis stated that the bill is paid out of grant money. He stated it was offered to both high schools.

Director Dexter questioned the four payments on Fund 15 in the amount of \$2,887.50 to Jeanne Kipp. She had questioned this line earlier and was told she was providing special guidance services and PBIS at Northeast. Now it is summer and she wanted to know what she did this past month.

Mr. Majewski stated that he would have to get confirmation but that this payment may not have been for the summer but may be a delayed billing.

Mr. RaHS stated that the bill is for work during the school year and that those monies are from the school improvement that Northeast has received as part of AYP. He further stated that her services will be missed if they are not able to seek the grants that they have looked to in order to continue her work. She provides the organization for various groups and support for our students in conjunction with our PBIS efforts and various teams. She works upward of three days a week. The payments are a culmination of her work.

Director Tenaglia asked if the new reporting system can name the fund rather than just providing the fund number.



Mr. Majewski responded that he would work on refining it with the company and believed that could be done.

President Leeson questioned at least two payments to the Pennsylvania Shakespeare Festival; one in the amount of \$297.00 and another in the amount of \$1,044.00.

Mrs. Katona suspected that that was something from ASPIRE for summer programs.

Mr. Majewski stated that they would have to research what the time frame was.

President Leeson also questioned a rental of the Boys and Girls Club.

Dr. Lewis responded that that was through the grant for the extension of the SPARK program. A monthly rental was covered 100 percent by the pre-k grant.

Mr. Majewski believed that the grant began August of last year. It was a 12 month grant that will continue at least through July of this year.

President Leeson questioned where this program was.

Dr. Lewis clarified that it is a SPARK program in the Marvine project area that was approved by the board. The grant was accepted a year ago with the condition that it was 100 percent funded.

President Leeson requested a roll call vote on items 24 and 25. The question was called with roll call as follows: Yea, Directors McKeon, Tenaglia, Amato, Cann, Dexter, Follweiler, Haytmanek, Leeson (abstaining to reimbursement for dual enrollment for her daughter). - 8

The motion passed 8 – 0 on all items excepting reimbursement for President Leeson's daughter where President Leeson abstained.

President Leeson stated that there was an executive session held prior to the meeting where student discipline and contract negotiation were discussed. There was also an update on litigation.

Attorney Spry stated that litigation items discussed were regarding labor arbitration, a federal court matter involving special education and tax assessment appeal.

Dr. Lewis noted that they did receive a request for information with some suggestions from Mr. Laverty and his group and a response was prepared. The board has received a copy of this. The questions addressed and audit findings are included. The group's participation in the task force is welcomed. The board is interested in establishing a task force and will determine the membership and what comprises that. They are interested in any and all ideas as to assist the district in dealing with what is probably the poorest economic time seen in their professional history. Copies of the report were available.

Mr. Majewski stated that he spoke with Mr. Lavery prior to the meeting and upon Mr. Lavery's request; the response will be e-mailed to Mr. Lavery tomorrow.

Dr. Lewis requested the solicitor to respond to the issue brought by courtesy to the floor regarding the code of conduct and student searches.

Attorney Spry responded regarding the issue raised specifically concerning student lockers. Bethlehem has chosen to put students on notice that the district owns the lockers and this is in the student handbook. As a result of its ownership it has the right to search those lockers. It is constitutionally permissible and has been ruled that way by the Supreme Court. Attorney Spry stated that the whole purpose of putting it in the handbook is to give notice to the students that if they are going to bring something in and put it in their lockers, it is subject to a search. The search is deemed reasonable as a result of that notice.

Dr. Lewis made additional announcements. There are agenda changes due to late documents received by his office. The first is available at the public point of disbursement of the agendas. Pages 17 and 20 have been replaced. The employee, last 4 digits 7839 on the termination page, has submitted his resignation. The solicitor reviewed it and determined that there is no need for termination as a resignation was submitted to Dr. Lewis late that afternoon. The employee has been moved from the termination page to the resignation page. Dr. Lewis also discussed the settlement agreement brought to executive session relative to a construction issue which has been put on the agenda for this evening. It was worked on with three different parties; the general contractor, the manufacturer/supplier of building tiles, and the BASD. He discussed the issue regarding the agreement. The agreement was drafted by the solicitor and it has been reviewed by the administration and facilities people. The Agreement was added to the agenda as item number 26, on the appended table of contents page.

Dr. Lewis noted that they would be pulling item number 22 on page 43, the Monocacy Building Sale Resolution. Mr. Majewski and Attorney Fall determined that it is not a tight enough agreement at this time. There will be a bona fide resolution presented to the entire board at the August 3, 2009 Finance Committee Meeting. On page 33, the 8<sup>th</sup> item down, head softball coach for East Hills Middle School, is being pulled. That individual has been transferred to an elementary schedule.

Dr. Lewis commented regarding a federal programs update. He noted that the district was notified by the US Department of Education that the Readiness and Emergency Management Grant that Mrs. Cintron and Mr. Gilliland have sought in the amount of \$250,000 over an 18 month period has been awarded. It was a competitive grant to improve readiness and emergency management for all the schools by training personnel and students in emergency proceedings, communicating with parents about emergency procedures and coordinating with local law enforcement, public safety, public health and mental health agencies. He also noted that they were notified by the Pennsylvania Office of Child Development and Early Learning that the 2009-2010 Pre-K Counts grant has been renewed for the third year. The grant pays for the cost of 5 early childhood classes

as SPARK. It was noted that continuation and payments may be contingent upon the 2009-2010 fiscal year state budget which is still in deliberation in Harrisburg. Dr. Lewis also responded to Mr. Richardson's statements. Dr. Lewis stated that he would ask the board for their direction, noting that the board needs to make a decision relative to their involvement in 501c3 in non profit organizations use of the school facilities and whether or not they are going to get involved in establishing parameters relative to salaries, uses of equipment, etc. in their policy. Dr. Lewis stated that Mr. Richardson's concerns highlight the need to take a look at that. Dr. Lewis assured that Mr. Gilliland does not cut deals and follows the policy rigorously. The class 3 designation of the groups calls for certain rentals at certain levels. He stated that there were acknowledged oversights of some of those leases in terms of times and access to the building along with misconceptions. The inquiry was responded to in detail. Mr. Gilliland met with the A.D.s and Dr. Donahaer and developed a future recommendation should the board wish to proceed in that direction.

Dr. Lewis stated that the district was notified that the Bethlehem Area School District did meet AYP this year as a district. Dr. Lewis publicly commended the principals, teachers and support personnel, his cabinet and staff, Mrs. Katona and her curriculum office.

President Leeson stated the board adds their congratulations to all of the teachers, principals and administrators involved in making AYP for the district.

Dr. Lewis stated that they would like to present their information regarding the direction requested above at a committee meeting. He stated that there is an opportunity at the finance meeting on August 3.

Director Follweiler stated that she would not be in attendance that night and stated that she would e-mail her concerns and opinions to Dr. Lewis to be shared that evening. She stated that the role of the board was to make sure that the policy is enforced correctly. She stated that some of the issues that Mr. Richardson brought up were very concerning to her.

Director Dexter stated that she has concerns about the same issues that Mr. Richardson brought up and thanked him for the time and effort to bring them to the board's attention.

President Leeson stated that the Liberty High School rededication will be Sunday, September 13, but noted that Broughal Middle School will be changed to Sunday, November 1 at 4:00 p.m.

Director McKeon stated that last month there was a vote on the Liberty High School girls' basketball coach. He had a negative vote. Since that time there have been discussions and there was a response from the administrators. Director McKeon discussed a memo regarding Mr. Seneca and that Mr. Seneca's name was floated in the public with a deal that he would step down as A.D. and a new A.D. be appointed. Mr. Seneca would then be appointed the girls' coach. Director McKeon stated that he had doubts regarding the memo. At least two of the rejection letters Director McKeon has

seen were stamped by Mr. Seneca. Director McKeon stated that by Mr. Sennecca assuming the coaching responsibilities will cost the school district more money as his replacement for game days. He believes it will cost them a few thousand dollars.

President Leeson stated that there was a response late that afternoon that there are three assistant A.D.s. She stated that she was under the impression that the assistant A.D. positions were cut in some of the budget.

Dr. Lewis stated that there are site managers. There are no longer assistant A.D.s. He said there is always someone managing a game. They have eliminated the stipend assistant A.D.s. What they now have are persons who may have served in those positions before who are now willing to serve on Tuesday night to manage an event as a site manager. The savings is in the stipend for the assistant A.D.s. The A.D.s have assumed the responsibilities for the feeder programs. He stated that there was one assistant A.D. each season.

President Leeson questioned if the site management was being paid hourly.

Dr. Donaher stated that the way the budget was calculated was based on a 4 hour night. This allowed the A.D.s more flexibility to pick the nights for the person to be there rather than for a specific period of time. The budget was reduced dramatically in the amount of hours and the amount of money paid out to "game managers." It is on an individual night basis and not as in the past, being assigned for a season.

President Leeson stated that she believes that Director McKeon's contention is true that having an A.D. as a coach means that there would be a need for more game coverage and cost the district to have coverage at the other events.

Dr. Donaher responded that would not happen if that person would use the game manager for when they are not there. He stated that previously the assistant A.D. could have been there when the A.D. was there and there could have been two people there.

Director Amato questioned if there is normally an administrator appointed to attend an event.

Director Amato responded that as in most districts you assign an administrator to attend events at the facility. Every athletic director he knows and every district that he deals with, that is how it is set up. He stated that there is no way that an athletic director can be there every night of the week. He stated that everyone has gone to either a full time assistant A.D. so that the two can share the responsibilities for the fall, winter and spring seasons. It won't cost the district more money because you need to have an administrator at these events. The assistant A.D. and seasonal A.D. were added 6-8 years ago because the athletic directors were going crazy. One person can not cover 5 events at once. He stated that they have done away with the more costly seasonal assistant A.D. and have gone to a site manager category where you are now going to be spending half or one quarter of the expenses. The person he replaced at the school he is at was the A.D. and

baseball coach. In the spring when baseball was played, the assistant A.D. ran the spring events because the baseball coach was involved in coaching. His assistant is the basketball coach. He believes using the site manager category constructively will save a lot of money.

Director McKeon stated that he hasn't heard what a normal footprint would be for a home game night. He has seen multiple assistant athletic directors at Freedom on a basketball night. He assumes that their game management was supported by the A.D. who is there.

Director Amato stated that 6 or 7 years ago when this proposal took affect, he attended events at Liberty and Freedom and the assistant, or seasonal A.D., and the A.D. were both there. That was a waste of money. The complaint was that the A.D. could not be there 6 days out of 7. There ended up being two people in attendance rather than one. The way it is now the process is started around 4:30 – 5:00. If they are receiving \$50 for 4 hours that it a good deal. We are saving money. It was costing much more with a seasonal A.D.

Director Follweiler asked for a comparison from Dr. Donaher of a typical basketball week with the A.D. being the coach and without to see what the actual numbers are.

Director Amato stated that the worst scenario would be using them twice a week.

President Leeson stated that they have looked at putting all of the non-core department heads back into the classroom. She questioned why the A.D.s are not being put back into the classroom. If the A.D.s are put into one class for each term that would cover the cost of the core department heads. If they are willing to put their academics at risk by putting the core department heads into the classroom and not athletics, then they are sending a message that they value athletics far more than academics. The core department heads are carrying a far greater burden than they have ever carried at any other time in the history of the Bethlehem Area School District. They are educational leaders in our high school. President Leeson stated that the district just made AYP. It happened because there was a lot of hard work done in the high schools and particularly with the department chairs. She believes that they could solve the problem by putting the A.D.s in the classroom for one period and the core level department chairs would be free to do the work that needs to be done right now.

Director Amato stated that he does not agree. He doesn't believe that the department heads will go back into the classroom without negotiation with the BEA. He stated that 10-15 years ago the district did not have these positions. He does believe there is a value to it. He stated that the athletic director is an administrator. Between the hours of 8 and 4 in the afternoon there are a lot of things that go on. He explained the duties involved and stated that it may be a stress to get them into the classroom.

Dr. Donaher asked that the board keep in mind that this year the position of middle school supervisor for intramurals and athletics was eliminated. Those responsibilities

have now fallen upon the two high school A.D.s. When there is rescheduling due to rain the high school A.D.s must also handle the middle school rescheduling.

President Leeson stated that she understands their responsibilities but felt that as everyone was considered, that athletics should be considered as well. She also stated that the department heads have great responsibilities; they oversee normally about 20 people, conduct interviews, scheduling, and changes in course offerings. Some departments had problems retaining teachers and that is another responsibility of the department chair to cover. They must meet with other educational leaders through project 720, the student achievement task force and review academics during the school day.

Director Follweiler stated that she felt this was an excellent suggestion that didn't come up during the budget process. She wanted to ask the administration to do more research on this and find out what the options are and have the results brought to a committee meeting for discussion.

Director Cann stated that she thought the board had voted several times that they do not want to increase chairpersons for core subject classroom time.

Dr. Lewis stated that the board received a memo on May 26, 2009 that outlined in detail what one of the budget reduction areas was. It was all department chairs reduced by one period. That meant cores went from teaching 4 to teaching 5 out of 6. Non-cores went from teaching 5 of 6 to 6 of 6. Dr. Lewis stated that in a recent memo Mr. Washington highlighted what adjusting only the non-cores would mean from a budget prospective. It is roughly \$106,000 in savings. If you adjusted everybody it was \$176,000 in savings. The budget amount previously submitted by human resources was incorrect. It noted \$141,000 in savings for a reduction of one across the board. He further stated that the board knew from the May 26 agenda what the reduction was.

Dr. Lewis stated that if the board chooses to reduce the non-core by one, they need to find roughly \$35,000. That keeps the cores in place for two periods, one each semester, the non-core return to the classroom, they still get their stipend but do their work. The areas of focus are the cores; Social Studies, Science, Mathematics and ELA. That is the focus from high stakes testing, SATs to AP instruction. Dr. Lewis asked for the board's direction so they could adjust the budget accordingly. Dr. Lewis stated that the board never gave them direction to just adjust the non-cores.

President Leeson stated that her interpretation of the May 26 memo spoke to both areas on the color-coded sheet; one being the non-core at the top and the other being the core at the bottom. The \$141,000 never coordinated with both of them. She didn't believe it was clear to the board members and that they did not anticipate that they were cutting the core at that time.

President Leeson stated that they should move forward at this point and determine where they are now and what they want to do. She suggested that by putting the A.D.s back in

the classroom for one period that they would cover the \$35,000 gap between the non-core and the \$141,000 that was reduced.

Director Dexter stated that she supports putting the core department heads back to where they were in the past year. She also agreed that having the A.D.s teaching one course per semester is a good idea. She discussed where she believed the interpretation came from regarding the May 26 memo and stated that the issue should be corrected if the board wanted to put the department heads where they were in the 08-09 school year. Director Dexter stated that she believed the department heads were needed for the development of their departments. They are educational leaders in the high schools. She stated that she believes meeting AYP was partially a result of their efforts.

Director Dexter stated that the average salary of the A.D.s is \$75,000. If each one would teach one course per semester, 4 courses per year, the equivalent of one full time teacher, she felt that could be done without significantly impacting education or their A.D. responsibilities. She believed it could be done.

Dr. Lewis stated for clarification that a full time teacher is 6 sections. He agreed that this can be done. He stated that it has already been discussed with the BEA, the high school principals and at cabinet. Dr. Lewis stated that the administration does not agree to put the A.D.s back in the classrooms and that their responsibilities have been increased.

President Leeson stated that they could put a motion on the agenda and take a vote. With 6 people agreeing to put it on the agenda there would then be public comment prior to voting on it.

Director Dexter made a motion to add to the agenda to restore in the current budget the assignments of the core department heads, specifically science, social studies, mathematics and English, to the schedule that was in place for the 2008-2009 school year. The motion was seconded by Director Cann.

President Leeson requested a roll call vote to place the item on the agenda. The question was called with roll call as follows: Yea, Directors McKeon, Tenaglia, Cann, Dexter, Follweiler, Haytmanek, Leeson – 7, Nay, Director Amato – 1.

The motion passed 7 – 1.

President Leeson stated that the item would be put on the agenda as item number 27. Prior to the recommendations she would open courtesy of the floor to allow people to speak to this particular item.

Director Dexter made a motion to place an item on the agenda adding to the schedule the assignment of the athletic director of each high school to teach one period of class each semester during the upcoming school year. Director Tenaglia seconded the motion.

President Leeson requested a roll call vote to place the item on the agenda. The question was called with roll call as follows: Yea, Directors McKeon, Tenaglia, Cann, Dexter, Leeson – 5, Nay, Directors Amato, Follweiler, Haytmanek – 3.

The motion failed 5 – 3. 6 votes were required to put the item on the agenda.

Director Follweiler stated that the reason she wanted to delay putting the A.D. issue on the agenda is that she felt it needed to be discussed in committee first. She would like to see it on a future committee agenda for discussion and that the administration give them the options they may or may not have.

Dr. Lewis stated that it could be placed on the human resources agenda for August 10, 2009.

Director Follweiler commented on a previous speaker regarding the search for the superintendent. She stated that they do try to advertise as soon as they know there is an appointment for interviews with superintendent search firms and haven't had another appointment since. She stated that she believes that they intend to publish information as much as requested. She asked Mr. Majewski the policy or law regarding advertising.

Mr. Majewski stated that there is no law in the number of days but that it does need to be in advance and in two papers of general circulation in the area.

Director Follweiler stated that all board meeting announcements are made as soon as they can. All of the search firms they interviewed addressed meeting with community members. The group asked for a response from the board by August 3, but there is no other public meeting until August 3.

President Leeson moved to courtesy of the floor regarding item number 27, to restore the core department heads to the schedule of 2008-2009. No members of the public chose to speak.

President Leeson requested a motion to accept the recommendations of the administration including item number 26 and 27, and excepting item numbers 22, which was pulled, and 24, 25, which have been voted on.

Director Follweiler made the motion which was seconded by Director Tenaglia.

Director Tenaglia asked to pull item number 3.

Director Cann asked to have item number 26 pulled.

Director Dexter asked to have item number 7 and 20 pulled.

President Leeson pulled item numbers 2 and 18.



President Leeson requested a roll call on Recommendations of the Administration item numbers 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 23, 27.

The question was called with roll call as follows: Yea, Directors McKeon, Tenaglia, Amato, Cann, Dexter, Follweiler (excluding item no. 27), Haytmanek, Leeson – 8 (excluding item no. 27), Nay, Director Follweiler to item number 27.

The motion passed (excluding item number 27) 8-0  
Item number 27 passed – 7-1

President Leeson addressed item number 2, the Mandarin Chinese offering. She stated that she would be voting no on the issue. She supports the offering of Mandarin Chinese but feels that the district is not ready at the time to move forward with this offering.

Director Tenaglia addressed item number 3. He has had continued questions arise regarding the audited concession stand report as proposed to what the administration provided. He has multiple questions and would like to move that this item be tabled for further discussion at committee.

Director Tenaglia made a motion that was seconded by Director McKeon to table item number 3.

The question was called with roll call as follows: Yea, Directors McKeon, Tenaglia, Amato, Follweiler – 4, Nay, Director Cann, Dexter, Haytmanek, Leeson – 4.

That motion failed with a vote of 4 – 4.

Dr. Lewis stated that if this item is voted down there will not be an active program in place for the first contest. He stated that they would be willing to address any additional questions.

Director Tenaglia questioned the differences in the administration's report versus the audit report. He questioned distribution to the booster clubs and the difference in the food supplies line item.

Mr. Majewski's reply was that the administration provided a more detailed report than the audit. Under the food supplies line item it included the distribution to both the Freedom and Liberty High School boosters. The information provided is supported by the details as well as the paid invoices.

Director Tenaglia questioned additional funds being paid for athletic items. He stated that it appears that there is a disproportionate distribution to the two schools; an example is repainting the lines at the Freedom High School gym.

Mr. Majewski stated that he doesn't have an answer but would have to go back to the athletic departments who direct the funds that come out of that fund. Mr. Majewski

stated that from the concession stand funds, the athletic directors would make a requisition and it would go through the normal approval process. Mr. Majewski stated that he does not approve every bill in the school district.

Director Tenaglia questioned the accounting controls of the concession stand account.

Mr. Majewski responded that there is a series of approval processes. He stated that there is a series of cabinet people with specific assignments for their areas for their budget responsibilities and they ultimately respond to it. These types of expenditures would be reviewed. The financial statements would be gathered together in a form of a financial statement and Mr. Majewski's office presents them. He further stated that questions regarding the appropriateness of the concession fund needs go back to the administrator directly responsible for those activities.

Dr. Donaher confirmed Director Tenaglia's question of the recommendation of the administration that the booster clubs take control over the revenues and receipts, paying the bills and running the stands and then at the end of that time, either January or the end of the year, cut a check to the district for the amount of money being charged. Right now that amount is \$9,000. Dr. Donaher stated that as past practice of the district, part of that revenue that comes to the district, the A.D.s, in conjunction with each other and the office that he now holds, review those requests and try to do things on an even basis. The expenditures regarding the lines at Freedom was a request made by Mr. Gilliland's office to the athletic office. There wasn't money in athletics and they did support that request. This year a piece of machinery was purchased that will sweep the BASD stadium field to collect remnants of pieces of metal and have made is safer for the student athletes. That request was made to come out of that money. That is reviewed by both the A.D.s and Dr. Donaher and an agreement is made. They don't view it as one school getting more than the other. They get their 30 percent to use as they see fit with their booster club. The other 40 percent that comes to the district is an agreement that the three of them make as to how it will support it. There has never been a quibble about one school getting more than the other.

Mr. Tenaglia stated that in the present case Freedom got an additional \$3,000.

Dr. Donaher agreed and also stated that in years prior or future Liberty may get more money. It is not set in stone as to where the 40 percent will go. It is used as necessary for situations that will benefit both schools or emergencies, like the line painting.

Director Tenaglia continued to question the distribution of monies.

Dr. Donaher further explained the equal distribution to the booster clubs and what the remaining 40 percent is used for. The A.D.s agree on the additional distributions.

Director McKeon asked to be walked through the process.

Mr. Majewski stated that regarding the concession stand, there is a person responsible for the overall concession stand operation. They would make sure that the food was purchased, everything is there and the receipts would come in. The receipts are counted and deposited into a school district account and identified as being revenues of the concession fund. Those funds are accumulated throughout the year. By early January costs are reviewed; food, wages, social security and retirement. A net amount is then determined as the gross profit from the concession stand. A report is then provided in January that shows the activity. After it is reviewed and approved distribution is made to both booster clubs. The remaining money for the district resides in the concession stand account. The Directors of Athletics along with Dr. Donaher have that money to determine any repairs to the concession stands or athletic needs. Those funds would then be requisitioned to pay for those items as needed. The present report shows a fund balance in the beginning of the year. Those are monies generated by the concession stand that may not have been spent.

Director Tenaglia stated that it appears that the district, through this fund, is making disbursements and then disbursing the balance according to the ratio.

Mr. Majewski confirmed that.

Director Tenaglia stated that his concern is that if they had not made the disbursements each booster club and the school district would have received a higher amount. He stated that it looks like it took place prior to the booster clubs getting their checks.

Mr. Majewski explained that there are no dates and just a listing of activities. He stated that they started the year off with district funds for the concession. It would have to be identified as to when it occurred and take it off of the fund balance. The intent was not to take the district funds out prior to the distribution to the booster clubs. There is nothing in the report that infers that that is what was done. It is just a listing of activity. In practice, those items will only come out of the district's portion of the funds. It is not netted out so that the booster clubs are getting less than their percentage for the receipts than the cost of foods and related supplies.

Mr. Majewski stated that he believed what they were looking at in the Concession Stand Proposal is addressing who will be responsible for managing the concession funds and for obtaining receipts. Not who distributes the funds or how the money is spent.

Director Tenaglia stated that his concern is that the athletic departments are taking some of the potential district expenses and asking the booster clubs to pay for them. Like padding at Freedom High School, which he believes would be a normal operation of the school district. Repainting the lines in the gym sounds like ordinary maintenance.

Director Follweiler stated that she understands Director Tenaglia's concerns on accountability but stated that what they are voting on is changing the way the concession stands are managed. She stated that the proposal presented is that the booster clubs are

stepping in wanting to run the concession stands by 100 percent volunteers. This will then save the district the salaries that have been paid on the procedure by nearly \$13,000.

Dr. Lewis stated that the proposal would mean that the district would be paid a flat \$9,000 and the pool to the booster clubs would increase. Dr. Lewis stated that it is very common in most districts for A.D.s to go to the booster clubs and state a unique need that is not in the budget and ask them to consider the item.

Director Follweiler stated that the booster clubs choose to spend the money that they have raised by their volunteerism and donate that to the school.

Dr. Lewis confirmed that that is the new proposal.

Director Follweiler stated that she believes it is a wonderful cost savings to the district. She understands Director Tenaglia's concerns regarding accountability. She further stated that if the booster clubs are raising the money and they then determine how to spend the money she doesn't believe it is in their purview to be involved in that.

Director Follweiler clarified that what was being voted on is for the booster clubs to take management of the concession stands.

Director Dexter requested an explanation of what would happen is the concession stand agreement was not passed this evening. She asked if they revert to the old system for the opening of football.

Dr. Lewis stated that he believed that would be in practice. He doesn't believe time wise that they would do it.

Dr. Donaher responded that there would not be enough time before the August agenda. They would have to go back to the person who previously had the position and offer it to them.

Dr. Lewis stated that this proposal came from their executive committees.

President Leeson agreed with Director Follweiler stating that the question is the management of the district concession stands. She did question the disbursement and asked why the lines were painted on the Freedom gym when it is brand new.

Mr. Gilliland stated the periodic maintenance of painting lines is on a case by case basis. Upon resurfacing the gym floor sanding will sometimes take the lines off. The goal is that the district painters retouch the lines.

Director Dexter discussed item number 7. She questioned if the statement of student rights need to be included in the Code of Conduct.

Attorney Spry responded that it should be published somewhere but that it does not have to be in the Code of Conduct.

Director Dexter asked Dr. Lewis if it would be possible to add a page to the Code of Conduct at this time that would include the Student Rights that are listed by law.

Dr. Lewis responded that this could be done by an amendment to tonight's motion to add the student's bill of rights to the code of conduct document.

Director Dexter made a motion to add the amendment to add the Student Bill of Rights that are set forth in State Board of Regulations to the Student Code of Conduct to item number 7. The motion was seconded by Director Follweiler.

The question was called with roll call as follows: Yea, Directors McKeon, Tenaglia, Amato, Cann, Dexter, Follweiler, Haytmanek, Leeson – 8.

That motion passed 8 – 0.

President Leeson stated that she would be abstaining from item number 18 since her daughter, Maureen Leeson, is on the list for nomination for appointment.

Director Dexter discussed item number 20 proposing changes to the punctuation of Policy Number 219. She proposed changes to the Fourth Level, item numbers (1), (2) and (3), that a semicolon be inserted at the end of (1) and (2) and prior to the word "or" in number (3). She proposed that in number (2) "They may" be deleted and start with "Provide" and that a period be added to number (4).

Dr. Lewis also added that there should also be a colon after "The Board may" and the numbered items should be lower case. He stated that the punctuation changes will be made.

Director Cann addressed item number 26, the agreement regarding tile installation at Liberty High School. She stated that she didn't see a timeline as to when the work needed to be completed.

Attorney Spry responded that there is no timeline set forth and that the agreement was drafted based on the exhibit. He stated that they did not put it in because they weren't present at the negotiation between the parties.

Dr. Lewis responded that in item 2 under Discussion in the Exhibit states: *The attachment also lists the tiles to be replaced in the summer of 2009.* He believes that was the intent. The discussions in cabinet focused on the timeliness of getting this approved so that they could get them in and out.

Mr. Gilliland stated that they would like to get started now and believes the provision for replacement tiles is up to three years.

Dr. Lewis stated that it could be approved with the contingency that there be a reasonable completion date added.

Mr. Gilliland responded that he believed it was everyone's intention to get this done as soon as possible prior to students arriving.

Attorney Spry asked if September 1 was a safe date to insert.

Mr. Gilliland stated that he couldn't speak for the contractors. He believes they are anxious to get this resolved as quickly as possible and have been willing to work with them.

Dr. Lewis stated that the Agreement on page 2 item 3., refers to performing the work set forth in Paragraph 4(v) of the July 14, 2009 Meeting Minutes, attached hereto as Exhibit "A". He stated that this is the statement he was referring to earlier, *The attachment also lists the tiles to be replaced in the summer of 2009.* He believes the expectation Mr. Spry is pointing to would be on or about September 1.

Director Cann expressed her concern that they can't be out of compliance if there is not a time period in which they need to adhere to.

Attorney Spry responded that Exhibit "A" is incorporated by reference.

Director McKeon stated that he spoke with the resident A.D. on the board. He stated that fall practice starts August 17<sup>th</sup> which means the locker rooms will be used.

Dr. Lewis stated that certain areas are going to be scheduled because they are in immediate use and some are not until students return.

President Leeson requested a roll call on Recommendations of the Administration item numbers 2, 3, 7 (with the amendment), 18, 20, 26.

The question was called with roll call as follows: Yea, Directors McKeon, Tenaglia (Nay to item numbers 2, 3), Amato, Cann, Dexter (Nay to item number 3), Follweiler, Haytmanek, Leeson (Nay to item number 2, 7. Abstain from item number 18).

Item number 2 – Yea 6, Nay 2

Item number 3 – Yea 6, Nay 2

Item number 7 – Yea 7, Nay 1

Item number 18 – Yea 7, Nay 0, Abstention – 1

Item numbers 20, 26 – Yea 8 – Nay -0

The motion passed as stated above.

President Leeson stated that there was a Recommendation of the Board regarding an employee hearing.

A motion was made by Director Tenaglia and seconded by Director Follweiler to accept the recommendations of the board.

There was no discussion on this item.

President Leeson requested a roll call vote on Recommendations of the Board. The question was called with roll call as follows: Yea, Directors McKeon, Tenaglia, Amato, Cann, Dexter, Follweiler, Haytmanek, Leeson - 8

The motion passed 8 – 0.

President Leeson stated that there were no Committee meetings this month to report on.

President Leeson moved to Courtesy of the Floor.

1. Greg Cook – All State Retro Conciliation Alliance

Mr. Cook stated that his group was looking for clarification from the board regarding their request for a meeting to discuss the superintendent search. He asked if the board, or a subset of the board, was willing to meet with them and representatives of the Bethlehem Coalition for Quality Education and Organizing for America Bethlehem.

President Leeson stated that normally during courtesy of the floor the issues were not discussed but there would be no other opportunity.

Director Cann responded that when they hire a search firm, that is what they hire them for; to set up such meetings, and set up the progression of how to do things.

Director Haytmanek asked if there was not a time when the board asked for public input into the search for a superintendent.

President Leeson replied that during open meetings there were search firms giving presentations. At that time they were open to the public and public comment.

Director Follweiler stated that the search firms they have met with have all advised that it is a service which they provide; meeting with the community members, and reporting back to the board. She believes that all of the discussion on issues, excluding items that can not be shared for legal reasons, will be in front of the public. She stated that at that time all organizations have an opportunity to come before the board at that or any other public meeting.

President Leeson clarified that at this point the board is listening to search firms. They are presenting to them possible ways of conducting searches. Should they choose to hire a search firm they would then develop the process. It is open to the public to come and

listen to the presentations given to the board. At this point nothing has been determined. She believes they are all including going to the community and speaking with the community and other groups within the Bethlehem Area School District. She also clarified that she does not believe it would be in the best interest of the district to waive a personnel clause. She would imagine that many people would not want to apply under those circumstances.

Ms. Hatcher stated that their intention was to say that several of their group went to the interview sessions with the search firms. She stated that the board is saying they are not sure if they will hire a search firm. They heard the search firms say that the board will have absolute discretion about what they choose to do and whether or not you take their recommendations. She stated that they would like to know in advance what their intentions are about involving the community, who the community is, and how that will work and if they could be involved in some discussion with the board or a subset of the board to hear what their ideas are and to perhaps share information that folks from the community have had in other hire situations or in their experience in working with diverse populations across the district. How will they choose the search firm, how will they set up the process, so that the dialogue is how the process will be set up. Instead of here is the process the board has decided on and here is where you fit in. She stated that one feels like a dialogue working together and the other is coming in at the end of the process.

President Leeson stated that she will share her opinion and that the process is open to everyone. She believes that at the meetings where search companies are invited to present would be a wonderful opportunity to take courtesy of the floor at that time and have a discussion or interaction at that time.

Director Amato wanted to clarify that if a search firm is hired they will set up to get input from the community and from various organizations, but they are not going to sit with every organization that comes forward or they will not be able to hire a superintendent.

Director Dexter stated that the process is open and the board will choose a firm in the public, will discuss it in the public and will discuss the what the process is of the recommended firm adopted or not adopted. She believes the sequence and timeline will be developed in the public eye and welcome the public to come to those meetings.

Ms. Hatcher stated that to summarize, they don't know if the board will hire a national firm or not. They don't know if the board endorses authentic community involvement or not and we don't know when the next search firm is coming. She stated that she was one of three people at the last meeting that was posted, to her knowledge, on the web page that day. She stated that they represent a small group of people with serious and genuine concern for making this school district as good as it can be.

President Leeson stated that she doesn't believe the ideas are formulated yet and that the board at this point is still listening. She stated that they have offered this group an opportunity as well as any community members to come to any of the meetings. They



will be announced as the board knows. Community input at this time is available at the meetings during courtesy of the floor. There are open discussions and dialogues. There have only been 2 meetings to date.

Ms. Hatcher stated that at a previous meeting they were told to provide e-mail addresses to be advised of meetings.

Director Follweiler stated that this was at the June 1 meeting regarding the interim superintendent.

Mr. Majewski stated that he has the group identified with e-mail addresses. He stated that he has not been provided with any information to send out at this time.

Director Follweiler stated that at the discussion that evening with the members present that evening that Mr. Majewski, as board secretary, could send out information in that format. It was her understanding that the information collected would be used to send out information such as dates of meetings or maybe a new posting on the website.

Ms. Hatcher questioned if the site has meeting minutes for either of the three meetings to date.

President Leeson stated that she doesn't know that they are going to be posting minutes on those meetings and that are information gathering sessions from different firms.

Ms. Hatcher stated that one of their concerns is to broaden the public's discourse on this matter. Their letter states that there are many people unable to attend meetings. The district needs to provide information on the website about the process.

## 2. Jolene Vitalis – President of the Bethlehem Education Association

Ms. Vitalis stated that she wanted to address the board regarding the passing of the revisions of the Student Code of Conduct, that it has always been the BEAs position that the Student Code of Conduct is a fine working document. She stated that the problem remains the lack of consistent reinforcement of consequences for students who break the rules. If the administration would consistently apply the consequences as per the code the schools would run more orderly. Student, staff and teachers' safety would be greatly improved. Students would have an uninterrupted safe and high quality education. She stated that if the board was going to think of a full rewriting of the 2010-2011 school year, the BEA will insist on a seat at the discussion table.

## 3. Stephen Antalics – 737 Ridge Street, Bethlehem

Mr. Antalics stated that there is a lot of confusion. He believes that the administration has a responsibility to delineate what is happening at Broughal. He said it should be an op-ed. He wants to see it written down.

4. Peter Crownfield - 569 Brighton Street, Bethlehem

Mr. Crownfield asked Attorney Spry to refer to Title 22, Section 12.14 which stated that "Prior to a locker search students shall be notified and given an opportunity to be present." He feels it is a fair statement.

Directors Amato and Follweiler moved to adjourn the meeting, which carried by voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 10:02 p.m.

Attest,