

**Suffield Board of Education  
Policy Subcommittee Meeting Minutes  
March 10, 2016 – 7:00 a.m.  
Central Office Conference Room**

Attendees: Natalie Semyanko, Susi Keane, Jeanne Gee, Kendra Wiesel, Lori D'Ostuni, Steve Moccio, Ned Sullivan, Dom Casolari, Deb Pierce, and Karen Berasi

- I. Call to Order: 7:01 a.m.
- II. Policies for Review and Discussion:

**Policy/Regulation 6145.51 – National Honor Society**

There was a noted discrepancy between the listed weighted quality points average (QPA) required for National Honor Society (NHS) application invitation in the Regulation and the high school Program of Studies and other materials. Discussion revealed the NHS Faculty Committee determines chapter criteria which they could change annually. With this information, the group felt the regulation should state where a person could locate the specific criteria, but not state specific criteria which could change frequently leading to a future discrepancy. Other discussed items included whether a QPA or GPA should be used and if the current number used was the appropriate number as criteria. NHS Advisors Casolari and Pierce spoke to these items noting our number of NHS members were higher than other districts' inductee numbers. Mr. Moccio will make the revisions discussed, and both policy and regulation changes were recommended to go to first read at the next regular board meeting.

**Policy 6146.1 – Grading/Assessment System (class rank)**

The group looked at information provided by Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Moccio on a large number of high schools in the State on whether they provide class rank and/or announce valedictorian and salutatorian. Overwhelmingly, high schools do not provide class rank, however only a handful of schools do not announce valedictorian and salutatorian. Discussion centered on why class rank exists and any benefits or detriments of the practice of providing class rank to students and on transcripts. Also mentioned was how class rank is determined (using QPA scale) and whether it aligned to other districts' weighted scales. The group was in agreement the issue of class rank needs to be a school community discussion for understanding and receiving input on class rank before any action is taken.

**Discussion of High School Finals/Mid-Terms and Honor Roll**

The group discussed any benefits or detriments associated with our high stakes testing of finals and mid-terms. There was information on other school districts: 1) questions if other mid-terms/finals looked different, weighted different or were given at different times, and 2) notations/questions as to the number of differences on who is, and criteria for being, exempt from finals and questions. Also included in discussions were preparation of students for college testing, stress upon students, timing of these tests and whether they accurately measure all students' understanding and application of courses. Further discussion is needed as no recommendation was reached.

The honor roll discussion centered on the criteria for High Honors (all grades of 90 or better) and Honors (all grades of 80 or better) and if this criteria is appropriate. Information from other districts was used where almost all districts use an average and allow for at least one grade to be lower than the average used. Further discussion is needed as no recommendation was reached.

### III. Upcoming Policies

Next policy agenda items include attorney language review notes on policy and regulation 5145.5 Sex Discrimination and Sexual Harassment (Students); a CAFE sample policy for policy 1316 Conduct on School Property; discussion on 2000 series organization chart changes; and bylaw 9325.2 Order of Business due to board meeting confusion with the separation of discussion items and action items.

In addition, Superintendent Berasi received and will forward the new recommendation by the current state task force looking at policy 6146 Graduation Requirements. Ms. D'Ostuni will research the 9000 series for the next policy meeting, and Bill Hoff will be forwarding transportation policies to the subcommittee after the budget process is complete.

### IV. Policy Review – Process/Timeline

No information was discussed

### V. Adjournment: 9:06 a.m.