



A meeting of the board's Policy Committee meeting came to order at 4:03 pm at the call of Committee Chair Rita Moore. This meeting was held virtually and live streamed at <http://www.youtube.com/user/ppscomms/live>.

There were present:

Committee Members

Rita Moore - Chair

Julia Brim-Edwards

Eilidh Lowery

Staff and Other Attendees

Kara Bradshaw - Executive Assistant, Board of Education

Shanice Clarke – Director of Community Engagement, Strategic Partnerships

Jonathan Garcia – Chief Engagement Officer

Mary Kane - Legal Council

Maxine Latterell – Student Representative

Liz Large - Interim General Council

Dani Ledezma – Senior Advisor, Racial Equity and Social Justice

Brenda Martinek – Chief of Student Support Services

Parker Myrus – District Student Council Representative

Dr. Esther Omogbehin – Regional Superintendent

Juniper Painton-Straub – Project Manager, Student Support Services

Rosanne Powell - Senior Board Manager

Stephanie Soden-Back - Chief of Staff

John Stellwagon – Senior Legal Council

Public Comment

none

Student Conduct and Discipline Policy 4.30.010-P

Director Moore noted that the committee would be looking specifically at the new language that was added since through the Racial Equity and Social Justice (RESJ) work. Mary Kane provided an overview of the revised policy, noting that Maxine Latterell and Dani Ledezma worked on community engagement and added revised language based on the engagement. The committee went through the changes in the policy, noting each change/addition, and Board Directors asked questions if there were any. There was a question regarding what was meant by “promising and evidence based”. Dani Ledezma responded that evidenced based often has built in bias and could contain exclusive language, and does not represent small groups of students and so while the district believes in research, there is room for the difference in sample sizes that is accounted for in promising practices. Director Moore added that it takes many years for practices to become evidenced based, and that it is pretty common for promising practices to be included. There was discussion regarding making sure that terms were defined that the terms were consistent throughout the policy and other policies. There was discussion regarding duplication of content in section I, sub-section C numbers 4 and 5, it was decided that staff would work on revising each statement to more explicitly state the difference of intended meaning of each, including linking number five to impact of disciplinary actions on educational outcomes. There was a question regarding what is meant by “all adults”, whether it includes only Portland Public Schools (PPS) staff, or whether it also includes contractors, parents, and other adults who are part of the school community. It was decided that it should include the larger school community and that the currently language does not need to be changed, but with the suggestion to include a link to the adult conduct policy that was completed earlier in the year or in an Administrative Directive.

There was discussion regarding whether students under the age of 18 are able to access their disciplinary records. It was noted that according to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) a student needs to be at least 18 years old or emancipated to view their discipline records. It was clarified that a student could view their discipline records with a parent prior to that, but that the student record laws are to the parent. It was decided to add language that reflects that a student of any age can look at their records, as long as FERPA rules allow for it. There was discussion regarding the referenced RESJ report, noting that it's an annual report that includes a summary of discipline data. It was requested to also provide a report to the board with targeted discipline data that includes the "reason" for suspensions. There is already a discipline report by school on the System Planning and Performance website, make sure it's the correct data in the existing report and align the names. There was discussion regarding delayed suspension and access to instruction, noting that it is challenging for a student to miss a month of school. It was noted that we be specific where we talk about suspension and add suspension and delayed expulsion, Ms. Martinek will look for language. The last section regarding Policy review will be deleted.

They policy will be revised and brought back to the June 1st meeting.

Search and Seizure Policy 4.30.040-P


Mary Kane shared that the definitions section is completely new, and that it was an addition made in response to the (DA) comments regarding ambiguous language from a legal and law enforcement point of view. It was suggested that the definitions should come at the end of the policy. DSC rep Jackson Weinberg shared that he thought that he thought a reasonable suspicion is important to him as a student and which was seconded by Parker Myrus and Maxine Latterell. It was requested that the definition of reasonable suspicion be stated in less legal language. It was noted that paragraph three was added based on RESJ framework. (there was conversation regarding notification, at 1.5 hr in, look at that). There was a question regarding when a parent will be notified in advance, and it was noted that parents and guardians will be notified before law enforcement could interview a student, but that if a school staff were to interview or search a student (with reasonable suspicion) that the parent will be notified after the fact. The location of the clarification that parents must also consent, except for in specific circumstances, to a police interview. Mary Kane provided an overview of the tracking system.

Workplace Harassment Policy 5.10.060-P

Mary Kane noted that they added language regarding the application process. She added that there was a vandabox (check that) language but that they did not add it because it was not applicable. (at 1.75 hr there was a note about clarifying some language, or that it does not need to be defined in this policy but I missed what they were specifically talking about, go back and reference). There was discussion regarding what is meant by "This includes harassment that occurs in the workplace or off district premises." It was decided that it should say That could be characterized as harassment of another employee on or off district premises. There was a question regarding employee harassment towards a volunteer or contractor, Ms. Kane noted that harassment is prohibited towards those categories of people as well, but it does not belong in this police, that there is general harassment policy it should be addressed in. Director Moore requested that there be a footnote directing to see the other policy for harassment towards non-employees. Director Moore stated that there will be a couple of minor changes. The committee decided to refer the policy committee to the full board. It was noted that the employee complaint line is not in place yet, but that it is being created right now as a result of the legislation. There was a question regarding discrimination and it was noted that it was included because of the Oregon statute (double check this as well)

Committee Chair Rita Moore Adjourned the meeting at 5:56 pm.

Submitted by:


Kara Bradshaw, Executive Assistant
PPS Board of Education

