

**EAST STROUDSBURG AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT
BOARD OF EDUCATION
POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING
FEBRUARY 22, 2021
MEETING HELD VIA ZOOM DUE TO COVID-19 SCHOOL CLOSURE—4:30 P.M.
MINUTES**

- I. Meeting was called to order at 4:33 p.m. by Sharone Glasco.
- II. **Policy Committee Members Present were:** George Andrews, Sharone Glasco, Debbie Kulick and Wayne Rohner.
- III. **Board Members Present were:** Rebecca Bear, Richard Schlameuss
- IV. **School Personnel Present were:** Brian Baddick, Brian Borosh, Dr. William Riker, William Vitulli, Debra Wisotsky and Stephen Zall
- V. **Members of the Public Present were:** Eleni Angelopoulos, Terrence Bomar, and Nadia Worobij

VI. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE: Motion was made by Debbie Kulick to approve this agenda for February 22, 2021 (page 1), with members of the Committee reserving the right to add to the agenda and take further action as the Committee deems appropriate. Motion was seconded by George Andrews and carried unanimously, 4-0.

VII. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE: Motion was made by George Andrews to approve the minutes for for January 25, 2021 (pages 1-3). Motion was seconded by Wayne Rohner and carried unanimously, 4-0.

POLICIES FOR DISCUSSION:

Policies presented by Administration-

- a. Policy 301 - Creating a Position (REPEAL 401 & 501) – These policies are being consolidated into the 300 section covering all employees. Mr. Andrews expressed a concern under Authority, where it states, “based on the recommendation of the Superintendent and supporting documentation”. Mr. Andrews suggested, shouldn’t it also say the Board does not have to accept that recommendation, perhaps language should be included that states the final determination on a candidate for a position is made by the Board. Ms. Glasco pointed out the preceding paragraph states, “The need for creating positions shall be determined by the Board, based on the recommendation of the Superintendent. The Board reserves for itself the final determination of the number and type of positions deemed necessary for effective management of the district.” Mr. Rohner agreed that the policy indeed states that the Board has the final determination. Mr. Andrews wanted to be sure that it is clear. Ms. Glasco added, the salary or salary range is also determined by the Board. All agreed that the Board makes the final decision. Ms. Glasco asked is it the Superintendent that maintains a comprehensive and up-to-date position description or is it the Director of Human Resources. Dr. Riker replied that most district policies state “Superintendent or designee” which covers us here. Mr. Rohner asked if a position description is the same as a job description. Dr. Riker replied, yes.

- b. Policy 304 - Employment of Professional Employees (REPEAL 404) – Policy 404 is being renumbered to 304. This policy refers to the hiring of teachers. Under Guidelines, Mr. Andrews asked who is responsible to notify the candidate upon a failed approval of the candidate. Mr. Zall stated that he would notify the candidate. Ms. Kulick asked if there is a procedure in place either where a letter goes out, yes or no, you were not approved, thank you for applying. Mr. Zall stated on the occasions where candidates are approved, our office is following up to finalize with the onboarding paperwork for that candidate. If it is an individual that the Board should not accept the recommendation, then he is reaching out, communicating by phone call. Ms. Glasco suggested, just as a formal process, always put it in writing, even if it is sorry, we have identified a more suitable candidate for our needs. Mr. Zall stated we can add it into the process but I don't know if that point in time that the Board has a recommended candidate because that section in the policy states if the candidate is rejected, we are then reposting the position. So we don't have another candidate to offer right there. Ms. Glasco added we recently had a situation where a subset of employees applied for a position, none of those employees in the original posting made the cut, so the position was reposted. None of those employees were informed that they didn't make the first cut. It was just reposted and they had the ability to reapply without any change to the job description. What I am trying to instill is that once the first wave of the interview/employment process is concluded and the person is not going to be granted an offer by the Board, we should send something in writing. If we did that type of practice, it would avoid us from being in the position where we just had the same people reapply for the same job with no change. Mr. Zall added we can certainly add that as another step when an employee has been rejected. Dr. Riker asked for clarification. This policy is speaking to an employee who appears on a Board agenda and has already gone through the interview process, they have been selected as the recommended candidate for the position and the Board has elected not to hire them. This policy is not the interview process, but the hiring process. Mr. Andrews added the interviewee needs to be made aware that they are not hired until Board-approved and I think that is where we had the issue or misconception before and got ourselves into hot water. Dr. Riker shared he agrees with that. I just want to clarify that this is not that piece of the hiring process, this is where administration recommends a candidate and it's been placed on the agenda for the Board and the Board has rejected that candidate as the person to employ. Mr. Andrews stated that person has to realize they are not officially hired until the Board approves. Mr. Zall added all the candidates I speak with in a follow-up interview that they have been recommended by Human Resources, my communication to them verbally at that time is that they would be the recommended candidate to the School Board, pending final approval. The other step would be, when the candidate is rejected, obviously I will notify them but like Ms. Glasco stated it will now be followed up in writing as well. Dr. Riker agreed and stated we will add additional language to reposting the position to read, "and the rejected candidates will be notified in writing".
- c. Policy 304.1 - Employment of Classified Support Employees (REPEAL 504)—Ms. Kulick asked that the same language added to Policy 304 be added to this policy as well with regard to rejected candidates being notified in writing. Mr. Zall stated this policy aligns specifically to the current classified support staff CBA. Cafeteria cooks are added alongside the workers, we no longer have the study hall monitor position and we have the adjustment in the IT and business office personnel as well. Mr. Andrews asked if we have Secretaries I, II, III or just one level of Secretary. Mr. Zall replied we have only one level for secretary assignments in the CBA; however, we also have Confidential/Administrative Assistants that have their own separate agreement with the Board. Mr. Andrews asked why are they not part of this list. Mr. Zall stated the Administrative Assistants are not part of this list or the support bargaining agreement. So where would they be under professionals/teachers? Mr. Zall stated they would probably be included with the administrative or the professional. Mr. Andrews stated we need to put them someplace; should the Administrative Assistants have their own separate policy. Dr. Riker felt the professional policy would cover them, if you notice there is no list of everyone that falls under that policy which includes all professional employees including Administration, so I don't think we need a separate policy for Administrative Assistants. Mr. Andrews replied

he believes the Administrative Assistants need to be added to the list because they are not regular secretaries, they are confidential employees. Ms. Glasco added the Admin Assistants do not fall under Classified Support Employees as they are not part of that CBA, so as Dr. Riker stated they would fall under the previous policy. Mr. Andrews said to keep confusion down for future Boards we need to state that in writing then in that policy. Ms. Glasco added we really aren't naming any titles in the previous policy. Mr. Andrews stated we had problems in the past with people in Pupil Services. We need to place them somewhere in policy by title. Ms. Wisotsky pointed out our 1st Level Supervisors also have a separate contract. Ms. Glasco inquired whether the contracts reference these policies at all. Ms. Kulick stated I don't think they would fall under the professional; Admin Assistants may not fall under 304 as they have a hybrid contract from both administrative and the professional agreements. Perhaps we should take a better look and bring this back to the committee next month. Ms. Glasco asked if they can get a list of all classifications and which policy each fall under so we know which policy to reference as it is not crystal clear. Mr. Zall added we can take a look at each of their current agreements and make a determination where we could put language in the actual agreements as to which policy they would be identified as. Ms. Glasco agreed that would be helpful. Dr. Vitulli asked what would actually change under the proposed 304 as I'm not convinced the parts of that particular policy really would change depending on whether someone is a confidential administrative assistant or not. Ms. Glasco replied, no change but just give it a home for us. Dr. Riker agreed we can put a list together to include a list of other classifications that fall under 304. These policies do not reference the CBA. The CBA isn't really driving the policy, so the idea of having a list on Policy 304 clarifies it for everyone. We can use same language as the subsequent Classified Support Employees and list all the classifications. CBA doesn't really speak to employment of. We can bring Policy 304 back to you again.

- d. Policy 306 - Employment of Summer School Staff (REPEAL 406) – There were no concerns with the language or renumbering of this policy.
- e. Policy 307 - Student Teachers/Interns/Student Observers (REPEAL 407) – There were no concerns with the language or renumbering of this policy.

Public Participation: None

VIII. ADVISORY RECOMMENDATIONS

ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE: Motion was made by George Andrews to authorize and direct the administration to post the following item(s) with noted revisions for PUBLIC REVIEW during the month of February and subsequent Board action in March: Policies 301, 304.1, 306, 307 and the REPEAL of 401, 406, 407, 501, 504. Motion was seconded by Debra Kulick and carried unanimously, 4-0.

IX. **ADJOURNMENT:** 5:07 p.m.

ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE: Motion to adjourn was made by George Andrews. Motion was seconded by Wayne Rohner and carried unanimously, 4-0.

Next meeting: March 15, 2021 at 4:30 p.m., location TBD.

Respectively submitted by,
Debra Wisotsky