Greene County

GA · score 26/100 · full report · Model Policy Manual

Press release

Greene County, GA. EarthPilot's Alignment Audit has scored the written policy of the Greene County school district at 26 out of 100. The audit read 85 sections of district policy and checked them against the research record in 57 domains. 0 of the 57 domains fully meet the evidence. 4 domains meet it in part, 4 conflict with it, and 49 domains are silent.

Among the conflicts, the section titled The following penalties may be assessed answers chronic absence with penalties, while no rigorous US study shows that fines, prosecution or court referral improve attendance, and controlled studies find that supportive, family-facing responses reduce chronic absence at modest cost. The section Types of Actions (part 3) conflicts with the evidence on tiered positive behavior supports and restorative practices, the discipline framework with the strongest research record. The section Penalties for Weapons (part 2) conflicts with the constitutional standards for student searches and due process set out in Goss v. Lopez, New Jersey v. T.L.O. and Safford v. Redding.

The silences matter as much. The policy says nothing about early literacy instruction and K-3 reading screening, nothing about corporal punishment, and nothing about dual enrollment and early college, each a domain where randomized trials point to clear outcomes.

The full report, with every receipt tied to the policy text and the research behind it, and a recommended clause for each gap, is public at /d/greene-ga. The scoring method is described at /manual. The district was scored on 2026-11-03.

Contact: EarthPilot, Alignment Audit. Report: /d/greene-ga.

Memorandum to the Board

To the Board of School Directors, Greene County, GA

I am writing as a resident to share the results of the EarthPilot Alignment Audit of our district's policy manual, scored on 2026-11-03. The audit read 85 sections and checked them against 57 research-backed domains. Our district scored 26 out of 100. No domain meets the evidence, 4 partly meet it, 4 conflict with it, and 49 are silent. The full report is at /d/greene-ga.

Three sections deserve first attention. First, "The following penalties may be assessed," which governs chronic absence. Controlled studies show that supportive, family-facing responses cut chronic absence by roughly 8 to 23 percent, while no rigorous US study shows that fines, prosecution or court referral improve attendance. Second, "Types of Actions (part 3)," since school-wide PBIS has the strongest evidence of any discipline framework, and the five-year Maryland RCT found children in PBIS schools 33 percent less likely to receive an office referral. Third, "Penalties for Weapons (part 2)," because student searches and discipline due process are governed by constitutional standards, including Goss v. Lopez and New Jersey v. T.L.O., and our language should track them.

I ask that the Board place the attached proposed clauses on a future agenda for first reading. Thank you for your service to our students.

Proposed motions (37)

Each motion amends the named section or adds a new policy, in the district's own format. Numbers in rewritten clauses were checked against the model clause and the existing section.

Motion 1. Chronic absence response: Amend The following penalties may be assessed

Current language. *Students who are 13-15 years of age who have exceeded the allowable number of absences will have juvenile charges filed against them through the Department of Juvenile Justice.*

Why. Missing 10 percent or more of school days lowers achievement and engagement from kindergarten on, and the share of students chronically absent nearly doubled after the pandemic. Controlled studies show that early, supportive, family-facing responses (mailed and texted attendance information, caseworkers who remove material barriers, structured adult mentoring) cut chronic absence by roughly 8 to 23 percent at modest cost, while no rigorous US study shows that fines, prosecution or court referral improve attendance.

> Board Policy, Student Attendance: Chronic Absence Identification and Support Chronic absence shall mean missing 10 percent or more of enrolled school days, excused or unexcused. Each principal shall review attendance at least monthly and identify every student at 10 percent or more, or absent three or more days in any 20-day period. Within 10 school days the school shall make a documented two-way contact with the family, in its preferred language, stating days missed, asking what makes attendance hard and offering help, supportive and without threat of penalty. A student still at or above 10 percent shall receive a written attendance plan developed with the family within 20 school days, naming a staff member for weekly follow-up. A student missing 20 percent or more, or not improving under a plan, shall be assigned a case manager to assess transportation, health, housing, food, safety and school-climate barriers and connect the family with services. No student shall be referred to truancy court, cited, fined, suspended, excluded from activities or denied credit for absence until that contact, plan and assessment are documented in the student information system. The Superintendent shall report to the Board quarterly, by school, grade and subgroup, the chronic absence rate, the share of identified students contacted within 10 school days, plans opened and truancy referrals filed, and shall post them on the district website within 30 days.

How the Board will know it worked. Percent of enrolled students missing 10 percent or more of enrolled days (the state chronic absence measure in the EDFacts or state report card file), by school, grade and subgroup; the share of identified students who received a documented two-way family contact within 10 school days; and the number of truancy referrals filed, each tracked monthly and reported quarterly. Target: Within 1 year every school reports the share of identified students contacted within 10 school days rising each quarter, with zero truancy referrals filed without a documented contact, plan and barrier assessment; within 1 to 3 years the chronic absence rate falls below the baseline in every school and subgroup, with a reduction in the range of 8 to

15 percent of the baseline rate consistent with the family-contact and caseworker studies. The Superintendent reports to the Board each quarter and publishes the figures on the district website within 30 days of each report; the Board reviews the annual chronic absence rate against the baseline at the end of each school year.

Eklund K, Burns MK, Oyen K, DeMarchena S, McCollom EM (2022). Addressing chronic absenteeism in schools: a meta-analysis of evidence-based interventions. School Psychology Review 51(1):95-111. doi · Li D, Singh S, Jeldi N, Chang S, Zhu M, Dailey K, Karabukayeva A, Cai C (2026). What works to keep students in school? A meta-analysis of interventions to reduce school absenteeism. Behavioral Sciences 16(5):697. doi · Rogers T, Feller A (2018). Reducing student absences at scale by targeting parents' misbeliefs. Nature Human Behaviour 2(5):335-342. doi

Motion 2. Early literacy instruction and K-3 reading screening: New policy (academics and access)

Current language. None; the manual is silent.

Why. Systematic, explicit phonics instruction in K-1 raises word reading, spelling and comprehension by a moderate amount (about 0.4 SD) and is the only reading-disability treatment whose efficacy is confirmed in randomized trials; curriculum-based screening in K-2 predicts later reading well enough to find at-risk readers early. State 'science of reading' laws raise high-stakes elementary reading scores by a small amount so far, mainly where the policy is comprehensive, and the gains on low-stakes NAEP are not yet statistically clear.

> Policy No. [to be assigned] Early Reading Instruction and Screening, Kindergarten Through Grade 3 Core reading instruction in kindergarten through grade 3 in the District shall be explicit and systematic in phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. Instructional materials that direct students to identify words primarily from pictures, context or syntax (three-cueing) shall not be adopted as core or intervention materials. The Superintendent shall administer a universal reading screener with published classification accuracy to every student in kindergarten through grade 3 within the first 30 school days of the school year and again in the winter and spring windows. Any student identified as at risk shall begin a documented, evidence-based intervention within 15 school days of the screening, and the student's parent or guardian shall be notified in writing within the same period. All K-3 teachers of reading and all elementary principals shall complete a Board-approved structured-literacy training within two years of hire. The Director of Curriculum shall report to the Board each November and each June the screening participation rate, the share of students at risk by school and subgroup, the share of at-risk students receiving intervention within 15 school days, and third-grade state ELA results.

How the Board will know it worked. Share of K-3 students screened within the first 30 school days; share of flagged students beginning a documented intervention within 15 school days; percent of K-3 reading teachers and principals with completed structured-literacy training; third-grade state ELA proficiency rate and subgroup gaps. Target: Within 1 year, every K-3 student is screened within the first 30 school days and every flagged student begins a documented intervention with written parent notice within 15 school days; within 2

years of hire, every K-3 reading teacher and elementary principal completes the structured-literacy training; third-grade state ELA proficiency rises and subgroup gaps narrow over 1 to 3 years. Director of Curriculum reports to the Board each November and each June, by school and subgroup, with the third-grade state ELA results included in the June report.

Ehri LC, Nunes SR, Stahl SA, Willows DM (2001). Systematic phonics instruction helps students learn to read: Evidence from the National Reading Panel's meta-analysis. Review of Educational Research 71(3):393-447. doi · National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (2000). Report of the National Reading Panel: Teaching Children to Read. NIH Publication 00-4769. link · Galuschka K, Ise E, Krick K, Schulte-Korne G (2014). Effectiveness of treatment approaches for children and adolescents with reading disabilities: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. PLoS ONE 9(2):e89900. doi

Motion 3. Bullying prevention: Amend School Sponsored Clubs (part 8)

Current language. *Bullying - A pattern of behavior, which may include written, verbal, physical acts, or through a computer, computer system, computer network, or other electronic technology occurring on school property (cyber-bullying), on school vehicles, at designated school bus stops, or at school related functions that is so severe, persistent, or pervasive so as to have the effect of substantially interfering*

Why. Whole-school anti-bullying programs reduce bullying perpetration by about 19 to 20 percent and victimization by about 15 to 16 percent on average across roughly 100 evaluations, with RCT-only estimates smaller (d about 0.15) but still showing mental-health gains. Written policies matter too: students in states whose anti-bullying laws contain the core US Department of Education components had 24 percent lower odds of being bullied and 20 percent lower odds of cyberbullying, and enumerated policies that name sexual orientation and gender identity are associated with lower suicide-attempt risk among LGB youth.

> The district shall implement the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program, an evidence-based whole-school program with published controlled evaluations, in every school. Implementation shall include this written policy, posted classroom rules against bullying, parent information and support for targeted students. Bullying, including cyberbullying, on the basis of actual or perceived race, color, national origin, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, disability, or any other characteristic is prohibited. Each principal shall publish the reporting channel, including an anonymous option, in the student handbook and on the school website, shall begin an investigation within two school days of a report, and shall document the outcome within ten school days. The Superintendent shall administer the Olweus Bullying Questionnaire, containing a fixed bullying-victimization item, to all students in grades 3 through 12 each spring and shall report to the Board by October 1 of each year the prevalence by school, grade and demographic group, the number of reports received, the number investigated within the deadlines stated in this policy, the number substantiated, and the three-year trend.

How the Board will know it worked. Annual student-reported bullying victimization prevalence on the fixed Olweus Bullying Questionnaire item, by school, grade and demographic group, plus number of reports

received, number investigated within the two-school-day and ten-school-day deadlines, number substantiated, and share of students who say they would report. Target: Within 3 years of the baseline administration, district-wide student-reported victimization prevalence falls by at least 15 percent from baseline, consistent with the 15 to 16 percent victimization reduction in program meta-analyses, and in every year 100 percent of logged reports show an investigation begun within two school days and an outcome documented within ten school days, with the share of students who say they would report rising each year. The Superintendent's annual written report to the Board by October 1, presenting prevalence by school, grade and demographic group, reports received, reports investigated within deadline, reports substantiated, and the three-year trend, with the Board recording whether the target was met in its minutes.

Gaffney H, Ttofi MM, Farrington DP (2019). Evaluating the effectiveness of school-bullying prevention programs: An updated meta-analytical review. Aggression and Violent Behavior 45:111-133. doi · Gaffney H, Farrington DP, Ttofi MM (2019). Examining the effectiveness of school-bullying intervention programs globally: a meta-analysis. International Journal of Bullying Prevention 1(1):14-31. doi · Gaffney H, Ttofi MM, Farrington DP (2021). What works in anti-bullying programs? Analysis of effective intervention components. Journal of School Psychology 85:37-56. doi

Motion 4. Corporal punishment: New policy (discipline and climate)

Current language. None; the manual is silent.

Why. The meta-analysis specific to school corporal punishment (Visser et al. 2022) finds it associated with more externalizing behavior (r = 0.27, 21 studies, 67,400 children), more internalizing problems (r = 0.16) and lower school performance (r = -0.11, 977,367 children); a propensity-matched sample of young adults from the 19 states where it was legal shows lower high school GPA and more depressive symptoms; the 75-study meta-analysis of physical punishment finds 13 of 17 outcomes significantly worse and none better. No study has found that corporal punishment improves behavior or learning, and no study has found that ending it increases misbehavior.

> Greene County School District Board Policy, Number to Be Assigned: Prohibition of Corporal Punishment No employee, volunteer or contractor of the Greene County School District shall administer corporal punishment to any student. Corporal punishment means the deliberate infliction of physical pain as a disciplinary measure, including striking with a hand or object, slapping, pinching, shaking, forced exercise and the withholding of food, water or restroom access. This prohibition shall apply in every district school, program, vehicle and sponsored activity and shall not be waived by parental consent. Physical force shall be used only as permitted by the district's restraint and seclusion policy to prevent imminent physical harm. The Superintendent shall publish this prohibition in the student handbook and the staff handbook each August and shall report to the Board by September 30 of each year the number of substantiated allegations of corporal punishment in the prior school year, the action taken on each, and the figure submitted to the Civil Rights Data Collection. Any employee who administers corporal punishment shall be subject to discipline up to and

> including termination, and the Superintendent shall report the incident to the state child protection agency where state law requires.

How the Board will know it worked. Number of instances of corporal punishment in the district, counted as substantiated allegations in the Superintendent's annual report and as the figure submitted to the Civil Rights Data Collection, reconciled to building discipline logs; plus presence of the written prohibition in both handbooks. Target: Zero instances of corporal punishment reported in the first full school year after adoption and every year after, with the reconciled count and the CRDC submission both at zero, and the prohibition published in both handbooks each August. The Superintendent's written report to the Board by September 30 each year, stating substantiated allegations, action taken on each, the CRDC figure and the reconciliation to building logs, with the handbook publication dates attached.

Visser LN, van der Put CE, Assink M (2022). The association between school corporal punishment and child developmental outcomes: a meta-analytic review. Children 9(3):383. doi · Gershoff ET, Grogan-Kaylor A (2016). Spanking and child outcomes: old controversies and new meta-analyses. Journal of Family Psychology 30(4):453-469. doi · Gershoff ET, Sattler KMP, Holden GW (2019). School corporal punishment and its associations with achievement and adjustment. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology 63:1-8. doi

Motion 5. Dual enrollment and early college: New policy (academics and access)

Current language. None; the manual is silent.

Why. Two independent lottery-based randomized studies of early college high schools (North Carolina, followed 17 years, and the AIR national study, followed six years past graduation) find higher high school graduation, college enrollment, and degree completion, with very large effects on associate degrees and bachelor's gains for low-income and first-generation students. A Tennessee RCT of a dual-credit math course shifted students from remedial to precalculus and AP math and from two-year to four-year colleges, though it did not raise overall college enrollment. The What Works Clearinghouse rates dual enrollment as having positive effects on degree attainment, credit accumulation, and completing school.

> Greene County Board of Education Policy: Dual Enrollment and Early College Pathways The Greene County School District shall maintain a written agreement with at least one accredited public college under which every high school offers dual-credit courses, on the high school campus or online, in general education subjects that transfer to the state's public universities. Tuition, fees, textbooks, and transportation for dual-credit courses shall be paid by the district or the partner college, and no student shall be charged. Any student who meets the partner college's placement standard or the state standard on the high school assessment shall be eligible, and principals shall notify eligible students and their parents or guardians in writing by March 1 for the following year. The district shall operate, or partner with, at least one early college pathway in which students can earn an associate degree or 60 transferable credits by the end of grade 12 or 13, with enrollment by lottery when oversubscribed. The Director of College and Career Readiness shall report to the Board by November 1 each year: dual-credit participation, courses passed, credits earned and credits

> transferred, and early college enrollment and completion, disaggregated by school, race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status, together with postsecondary enrollment of the prior graduating class from the National Student Clearinghouse.

How the Board will know it worked. Share of graduates who earned at least one transferable college credit in high school and share who earned 12 or more, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status, plus dual-credit pass rates, share of credits that transferred, early college enrollment and completion, and postsecondary enrollment of participants versus non-participants from the National Student Clearinghouse. Target: Within 1 year every high school offers no-cost dual-credit courses and all eligible students receive written notice by March 1; within 3 years the share of graduates earning at least one transferable credit and the share earning 12 or more rise each year in every student group, gaps for low-income, first-generation, English learner, and disability-status students narrow, and postsecondary enrollment of dual enrollment participants exceeds that of non-participants. Director of College and Career Readiness to the Board by November 1 each year, posted publicly with the state report card and National Student Clearinghouse data, with the Board reviewing progress against the baseline at that meeting.

Edmunds JA, Unlu F, Phillips V, Glennie E, Mulhern C (2024). The Impact of Early Colleges on Postsecondary Performance and Completion. AERA Open 10. doi · Edmunds JA, Unlu F, Furey J, Glennie E, Arshavsky N (2020). What Happens When You Combine High School and College? The Impact of the Early College Model on Postsecondary Performance and Completion. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 42(2):257-278. doi · Edmunds JA, Unlu F, Glennie E, Bernstein L, Fesler L, Furey J, Arshavsky N (2017). Smoothing the Transition to Postsecondary Education: The Impact of the Early College Model. Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness 10(2):297-325. doi

Motion 6. High-dosage tutoring: New policy (academics and access)

Current language. None; the manual is silent.

Why. Across 96 randomized trials, tutoring raises achievement by about 0.29 SD, with the largest effects when teachers or paraprofessionals tutor, sessions run at least three days a week, and tutoring happens during the school day. Post-pandemic programs run at district scale have produced much smaller gains (0.04 to 0.09 SD in reading and no math effect in Nashville), and a 263-trial reanalysis puts the realistic effect of large, test-targeted programs at 0.16 to 0.22 SD.

> GREENE COUNTY SCHOOLS BOARD POLICY NO. ____: TUTORING FOR STUDENTS BELOW BENCHMARK Any student who scores below the district benchmark on the fall or winter interim assessment in reading or mathematics shall be enrolled in tutoring in a group of no more than four students, for no fewer than three sessions per week of at least thirty minutes each. Tutoring shall be delivered during the regular school day by a consistent tutor who has completed district training and who uses district-approved materials aligned to the core curriculum. Tutoring shall not be offered solely on an opt-in, on-demand, or outside-school-hours basis. The principal of each school shall record the sessions scheduled and the sessions delivered for each tutored student. The Superintendent shall report to the Board by

> December 15 and by June 15 of each year the number and share of eligible students tutored, the average sessions delivered per week, tutor consistency, and the assessment growth of tutored students compared with similar students who were not tutored. Each report shall be disaggregated by school, race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status.

How the Board will know it worked. Share of students below benchmark on the interim assessment who received tutoring at least three sessions a week for at least ten weeks during the school day, by school and student group; sessions delivered versus scheduled; share of sessions with the student's assigned tutor; interim assessment growth of tutored students compared with matched non-tutored students. Target: Within one year, every student identified below benchmark is enrolled and the share receiving at least three sessions a week for at least ten weeks during the school day rises each reporting period, with no student group lagging the district rate; within 1 to 3 years, tutored students show growth on the interim assessment greater than matched non-tutored students in both reading and mathematics. Superintendent reports to the Board by December 15 and June 15 each year, disaggregated by school, race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status, with any school below the dosage standard named and its corrective schedule attached.

Nickow A, Oreopoulos P, Quan V (2024). The Promise of Tutoring for PreK-12 Learning: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of the Experimental Evidence. American Educational Research Journal 61(1):74-107. doi · Nickow A, Oreopoulos P, Quan V (2020). The Impressive Effects of Tutoring on PreK-12 Learning: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of the Experimental Evidence. NBER Working Paper 27476. doi · Kraft MA, Schueler BE, Falken G (2026). What Impacts Should We Expect From Tutoring at Scale? Exploring Meta-Analytic Generalizability. Review of Educational Research. doi

Motion 7. Tiered positive behavior supports and restorative practices: Amend Types of Actions (part 3)

Current language. *Teachers must utilize and document a minimum of three research-based interventions prior to writing and submitting a discipline referral on a classroom-managed behavior.*

Why. School-wide PBIS has the strongest evidence of any discipline framework: a meta-analysis of 29 group studies including seven RCTs finds small-to-medium reductions in discipline referrals and gains in achievement, and the five-year Maryland RCT found children in PBIS schools 33 percent less likely to receive an office referral with fewer suspensions. Restorative practices are promising but mixed: the Pittsburgh RCT cut days lost to suspension 36 percent against 18 percent in controls and narrowed racial gaps, but did not improve achievement and worsened it in grades 6 to 8, while the Maine middle school RCT found no significant intent-to-treat effects.

> Types of Actions (part 3). Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. The District shall operate Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), a school-wide tiered behavior support system, in every school. Each Principal shall maintain a leadership team meeting at least monthly to review discipline data, shall ensure school-wide behavioral expectations are taught to all students each semester, and shall maintain functioning Tier 2 and Tier 3 teams providing interventions, including function-based behavior intervention plans, for students

> not responding to Tier 1 supports. Every school shall use restorative practices, including conferences and circles, as a complement to, not a substitute for, the tiered system. Each school shall complete the Tiered Fidelity Inventory or another Board-approved fidelity instrument by May 1 each year. The Superintendent shall coach any school scoring below 70 percent at Tier 1 and shall budget at least two years of external coaching for any school newly adopting the system. By September 30 each year the Superintendent shall report to the Board and post on the District website, for the prior school year by school, race, disability status and sex, office discipline referrals, out-of-school suspensions and other exclusions per 100 students, fidelity scores, and the use and outcomes of restorative practices, and shall present a corrective plan for any school whose referral risk ratio for Black students or students with disabilities exceeds 2.0.

How the Board will know it worked. Office discipline referrals and out-of-school suspensions per 100 students by building and student group; annual Tier 1 fidelity score on the Tiered Fidelity Inventory; share of buildings with functioning Tier 2 and Tier 3 teams; referral risk ratios for Black students and students with disabilities; student and teacher climate survey results. Target: Within 1 year, every building completes a fidelity assessment and has functioning Tier 2 and Tier 3 teams; within 3 years, every building scores 70 percent or higher at Tier 1, office referrals and out-of-school suspensions per 100 students decline from baseline in every building, and no building has a referral risk ratio above 2.0 for Black students or students with disabilities. Superintendent reports to the Board and publishes on the district website by September 30 each year, for the prior school year, by building and by race, disability status and sex, including fidelity scores, restorative practice use and outcomes, and a corrective plan for any building over the 2.0 risk ratio threshold.

Lee A, Gage NA (2020). Updating and expanding systematic reviews and meta-analyses on the effects of school-wide positive behavior interventions and supports. Psychology in the Schools 57(5):783-804. doi · Bradshaw CP, Mitchell MM, Leaf PJ (2010). Examining the effects of schoolwide positive behavioral interventions and supports on student outcomes: results from a randomized controlled effectiveness trial in elementary schools. Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions 12(3):133-148. doi · Bradshaw CP, Waasdorp TE, Leaf PJ (2012). Effects of school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports on child behavior problems. Pediatrics 130(5):e1136-e1145. doi

Motion 8. School-based mental health, counseling and suicide prevention: New policy (health and wellbeing)

Current language. None; the manual is silent.

Why. Mental health services delivered in school by school staff reduce student mental health problems (Hedges g = 0.39 across 43 controlled trials with 49,941 elementary students; g = 0.76 for targeted services), and placing licensed clinicians in schools raised treatment use 8 percent and cut self-reported suicide attempts about 15 percent across 263 Minnesota schools. Counselors have causal effects: an additional counselor reduces disciplinary incidents and raises achievement (Carrell and Hoekstra), individual counselors move graduation and college attendance as much as teachers do (Mulhern), and one more high school counselor raises four-year college enrollment by up to 10 points in a regression-discontinuity design. Universal suicide prevention

programs that teach help-seeking (YAM in the SEYLE trial, SOS) roughly halve new suicide attempts, but the largest Sources of Strength trial found no overall reduction and harm where fidelity was poor.

> Policy No. ____ Student Mental Health and Suicide Prevention The Superintendent shall staff each school at or below 250 students per counselor, 500 per psychologist and 250 per social worker, and present to the Board by March 1 annually a funded plan to reach the ratio within three years at any school above it. Every school shall have a licensed mental health clinician, district-employed or contracted through a community provider, on site at least one day weekly; a referred student shall be offered an initial appointment within 10 school days. Each secondary school shall offer annual universal depression and suicide risk screening with a validated instrument and parental consent, deliver an evidence-based suicide prevention program listed by a recognized registry, and maintain a written postvention protocol, approved by the Director of Student Services, governing response to a suicide death or attempt. Students at elevated risk shall receive same-day follow-up by a licensed professional, and students found to need services shall be referred to school or community services that week. The Director of Student Services shall document program adherence each semester, suspend any component not delivered as designed, and report to the Board by November 1 annually staffing ratios by building, number and share of students served by an on-site licensed clinician, share screened, share referred who began services, time to first appointment, suspension rates and fidelity findings.

How the Board will know it worked. Students per school counselor, school psychologist and school social worker by building; share of students screened and share of referred students who begin services within 30 days; time to first appointment; number and share of students served by an on-site licensed clinician; student survey items on depression, suicidal ideation and attempts; suspension rate; suicide prevention fidelity checks. Target: Every building at or below 250 students per counselor, 500 per school psychologist and 250 per school social worker within three years of the first March 1 plan; every school with a licensed clinician on site weekly by the end of year one; every referred student offered an initial appointment within 10 school days; share of referred students beginning services within 30 days rising each year; self-reported suicide attempts and suspension rates declining over 1 to 3 years with every program component passing fidelity checks. Director of Student Services to the Board by November 1 each year, with the funded staffing plan from the Superintendent by March 1 each year; the ratio, clinician access, screening and referral figures are broken out by building and the survey and suspension items are compared with the baseline year.

Sanchez AL, Cornacchio D, Poznanski B, Golik AM, Chou T, Comer JS (2018). The effectiveness of school-based mental health services for elementary-aged children: A meta-analysis. Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry 57(3):153-165. doi · Golberstein E, Zainullina I, Sojourner A, Sander MA (2024). Effects of school-based mental health services on youth outcomes. Journal of Human Resources 59(S):S256-S281. doi · Carrell SE, Hoekstra M (2014). Are school counselors an effective education input? Economics Letters 125(1):66-69. doi

Motion 9. School resource officers and school policing: New policy (safety)

Current language. None; the manual is silent.

Why. The strongest causal studies agree that placing police in schools increases suspensions, expulsions, police referrals and arrests, with the largest increases for Black students, male students and students with disabilities; a Texas quasi-experiment ties federal school-police grants to a 6 percent rise in middle school discipline, a 2.5 percent drop in high school graduation and a 4 percent drop in college enrollment. Safety effects are mixed: a national regression discontinuity finds SROs reduce some violence but not gun incidents, while a matched COPS-grant study finds no safety gain and more recorded drug and weapon offenses.

> Greene County Board of Education Policy [Number to be assigned]: Law Enforcement Officers in Schools No law enforcement officer shall be assigned to a school of the Greene County School District except under a written memorandum of understanding approved by the Greene County Board of Education and the law enforcement agency and reviewed annually. The memorandum shall provide that officers shall not participate in enforcing the student code of conduct, shall not be called for behavior that would be handled by school staff in the officer's absence, and shall not question a student about a school matter without an administrator present and parent notification, except in an imminent safety emergency. Each officer shall complete training in adolescent development, de-escalation, disability awareness and implicit bias before assignment and annually thereafter, and the Director of Safety shall document this training. The Superintendent shall report to the Board by October 15 of each year, and shall publish on the district website, the number of arrests, citations, law enforcement referrals and uses of force in each school for the prior school year, disaggregated by race, disability status and gender, with the share arising from non-criminal conduct. The Board shall review this report before renewing any officer assignment.

How the Board will know it worked. Annual counts and rates per 1,000 students of school-based arrests, citations, law-enforcement referrals and uses of force, by school and by race, disability status and gender; share of referrals arising from non-criminal code-of-conduct matters; out-of-school suspension rate by school; perceived-safety items on the climate survey; complaints against officers. Target: Within 1 year of adoption, the share of law-enforcement referrals arising from non-criminal code-of-conduct matters falls from baseline and continues to fall each year; within 3 years, arrest and referral rates per 1,000 students decline from baseline overall and for Black students, male students and students with disabilities, with the gap between those groups and the district rate narrowing each year, while perceived-safety items do not decline. The Superintendent reports to the Board by October 15 each year and publishes the report on the district website; the Board reviews it in a public meeting before voting on renewal of any officer assignment or memorandum of understanding.

Sorensen LC, Avila-Acosta M, Engberg JB, Bushway SD (2023). The thin blue line in schools: new evidence on school-based policing across the U.S. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management 42(4):941-970. doi · Gottfredson DC, Crosse S, Tang Z, Bauer EL, Harmon MA, Hagen CA, Greene AD (2020). Effects of school resource officers on school crime and responses to school crime. Criminology and Public Policy 19(3):905-940. doi · Weisburst EK (2019). Patrolling public schools: the impact of funding for school police on student discipline and long-term education outcomes. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management 38(2):338-365. doi

Motion 10. High-quality instructional materials and adoption: New policy (academics and access)

Current language. None; the manual is silent.

Why. Which textbook a district adopts can move achievement as much as many costlier reforms: in California the best-performing elementary math series outscored its rivals by 0.05 to 0.08 SD at near-zero marginal cost, a randomized IES trial found differences of 4 to 7 percentile points between first and second grade math curricula, and a field experiment giving teachers high-quality off-the-shelf lessons raised math achievement by 0.06 SD at about 6 dollars per student. Effects depend on the specific materials and their use with aligned professional development; districts' formal adoption processes rarely examine evidence of effectiveness.

> Policy No. ___ Core Instructional Materials The Superintendent shall maintain and post on the district website an inventory of the core instructional materials in use in every subject and grade, showing the adoption year and the independent quality rating of each program. Core materials shall be adopted only through a process that includes an independent standards-alignment and quality review, such as EdReports or the state review; a written summary of available effectiveness evidence for each finalist; a pilot of at least one semester in at least two schools with teacher and student feedback; and a curriculum-specific professional development plan providing at least 20 hours of training to every teacher using the materials in the first year. Core materials shall be reviewed at least every six years. Teachers shall use the adopted core program as the primary instructional resource and may supplement it. Supplemental materials used for more than 20 percent of instructional time in a course shall be reported to the principal. The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum shall report to the Board by August 31 of each year the inventory, the share of classrooms using the adopted core program as primary as shown by the annual teacher survey and walkthroughs, curriculum professional development hours delivered, and achievement and growth in each subject for three years following each adoption.

How the Board will know it worked. Share of core programs on the public inventory that have an independent quality rating and were adopted through the published process, share of classrooms using the adopted core program as primary, curriculum-specific professional development hours per teacher in adoption year, and achievement and growth in each subject for three years after each adoption. Target: Within 1 year, the full inventory is posted and every new adoption follows the published process with a semester pilot in at least two schools and at least 20 hours of professional development per teacher in the first year; within 3 years of each adoption, the share of classrooms using the core program as primary rises from baseline and achievement and growth in that subject improve relative to the pre-adoption year. Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum reports to the Board by August 31 each year, with the inventory posted on the district website.

Koedel, C., Li, D., Polikoff, M. S., Hardaway, T., & Wrabel, S. L. (2017). Mathematics Curriculum Effects on Student Achievement in California. AERA Open 3(1). doi · Koedel, C., & Polikoff, M. (2017). Big bang for just a few bucks: The impact of math textbooks in California. Evidence Speaks Reports 2(5). Washington, DC: Brookings

Institution. link · Jackson, C. K., & Makarin, A. (2018). Can Online Off-the-Shelf Lessons Improve Student Outcomes? Evidence from a Field Experiment. American Economic Journal: Economic Policy 10(3):226-254. doi

Motion 11. Multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS / RtI): New policy (academics and access)

Current language. None; the manual is silent.

Why. The components of a tiered system work when they are done well: K-3 supplemental reading interventions average about 0.4 SD across dozens of rigorous studies, early K-2 screeners predict later reading, and a randomized trial shows that starting intervention immediately after screening beats waiting a semester (d = 0.36). The one large evaluation of RtI as schools actually ran it (Balu et al. 2015, 146 schools in 13 states) found that first graders just below the cutoff who were pulled into Tier 2 or 3 scored lower in spring than peers just above it, with no effect in grades 2 and 3.

> Policy [Number]: Multi-Tiered System of Support Every school shall operate a multi-tiered system of support in reading, mathematics and behavior, using [name of screener], with published classification accuracy, as each area's universal screener. The Superintendent shall screen every K-8 student within the first 30 school days and in winter and spring windows published before each year. An at-risk student shall begin Tier 2 intervention, logged by the school, within 15 school days of screening. Tier 2 shall deliver at least three 30-minute small-group sessions weekly and Tier 3 at least five 30-minute sessions weekly in groups of three or fewer, both added to, never replacing, core instruction. Tier 2 and 3 students shall be progress-monitored at least every two weeks. The student support team shall review each student's data at least every six weeks and record its decision: at the screener's grade-level benchmark, exit to the lower tier; on track to meet it by the next window, continue; below it, intensify. A student not responding after two cycles shall be referred for special education evaluation; no school shall require tiered intervention before a parent-requested evaluation proceeds. Each December and June the Director of Student Services shall report to the Board screening participation per window, share identified at risk, share of at-risk students with intervention logged within 15 school days, progress-monitoring frequency per Tier 2 and 3 student, share of Tier 2 students exiting to Tier 1 within a semester, and special education referral and identification rates by school and race.

How the Board will know it worked. Share of at-risk students with Tier 2 or Tier 3 intervention logged within 15 school days of screening, share of Tier 2 students exiting to Tier 1 within a semester, screening participation each window, progress-monitoring frequency, and special education referral and identification rates by school and race. Target: By the June report of year one, every school screens all K-8 students within the first 30 school days of each window, every at-risk student has intervention logged within 15 school days, every Tier 2 and Tier 3 student is progress-monitored at least every two weeks, and the share of Tier 2 students exiting to Tier 1 within a semester rises each year over the first 3 years with no school showing referral or identification rates by race that diverge from its share of enrollment without a documented review. Director of Student Services

reports to the Board each December and June, by school and race, with the June report comparing spring outcomes of students placed in Tier 2 or Tier 3 against students just above the cutoff to check for the negative grade 1 pattern found in the national evaluation.

Balu R, Zhu P, Doolittle F, Schiller E, Jenkins J, Gersten R (2015). Evaluation of Response to Intervention Practices for Elementary School Reading. NCEE 2016-4000. National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, US Department of Education. link · Gersten R, Jayanthi M, Dimino J (2017). Too much, too soon? Unanswered questions from national Response to Intervention evaluation. Exceptional Children 83(3):244-254. doi · Fuchs D, Fuchs LS (2017). Critique of the national evaluation of Response to Intervention: A case for simpler frameworks. Exceptional Children 83(3):255-268. doi

Motion 12. Behavioral threat assessment: New policy (safety)

Current language. None; the manual is silent.

Why. Schools that use the Comprehensive School Threat Assessment Guidelines (CSTAG, formerly the Virginia guidelines) resolve student threats with far less exclusion: in a randomized trial, threatened students in CSTAG schools were about one third as likely to receive a long-term suspension (OR 0.35) and four times as likely to receive counseling, and statewide Virginia comparisons show lower odds of suspension (OR 0.59) and law-enforcement action (OR 0.47) than under generic threat procedures, with almost no threats carried out and no racial disparity in outcomes among assessed students.

> Greene County Board of Education Policy [Number to be assigned]: Threat Assessment Teams Each school in the Greene County School District shall maintain a threat assessment team composed at minimum of an administrator, a school counselor or school psychologist, and a school resource officer or other law enforcement liaison. The team shall be trained in the Comprehensive School Threat Assessment Guidelines or another model with published controlled evaluation. The team shall classify each threat as transient or substantive and shall develop a written support and supervision plan for every substantive case. No student shall receive out-of-school suspension, expulsion or law enforcement referral solely because a threat assessment was opened. Every team member shall complete initial training before serving on the team and a refresher at least every three years. The Director of Student Services shall keep the training roster. The Superintendent shall report to the Board by September 30 of each year the number of assessments by school, the transient and substantive counts, the disciplinary, law enforcement and counseling outcomes, the referral rate per 1,000 students by race, disability status and gender compared with enrollment, and any threat later carried out.

How the Board will know it worked. Share of assessed students who received out-of-school suspension, expulsion, alternative placement or law-enforcement referral versus the share who received counseling and a support plan, and the referral rate per 1,000 students by race, disability status and gender compared with enrollment. Target: Within 1 to 3 years, the share of assessed students receiving counseling and a support plan rises each year while the share receiving out-of-school suspension, expulsion, alternative placement or law-

enforcement referral falls each year; every substantive case has a written plan; team training completion is 100 percent; the referral rate by race, disability status and gender matches enrollment with no group gap; and assessed threats later carried out stay near the published level of about 1 in 100 or below. Superintendent to the Board by September 30 each year, as the clause requires, with a one-page comparison to the prior year and to the published CSTAG figures.

Cornell DG, Allen K, Fan X (2012). A randomized controlled study of the Virginia Student Threat Assessment Guidelines in kindergarten through grade 12. School Psychology Review 41(1):100-115. doi · Maeng JL, Cornell DG, Huang FL (2020). Student threat assessment as an alternative to exclusionary discipline. Journal of School Violence 19(3):377-388. doi · Cornell D, Maeng JL, Burnette AG, Jia Y, Huang F, Konold T, Datta P, Malone M, Meyer P (2018). Student threat assessment as a standard school safety practice: results from a statewide implementation study. School Psychology Quarterly 33(2):213-222. doi

Motion 13. English learner programs and reclassification: New policy (academics and access)

Current language. None; the manual is silent.

Why. Lottery studies show dual-language immersion raises English reading achievement (Portland: +13 percentile points by grade 5 and +22 by grade 8, with no loss in math or science; Charlotte: +0.04 to 0.05 SD per year in math and reading for English learners and non-learners alike) and raises the share of English learners reclassified by grade 6. Regression-discontinuity studies of reclassification show that the rule matters more than the label: reclassifying students on a single lenient test score harmed later outcomes, while multi-measure criteria that keep supports in place removed the harm, and timely reclassification before the grade 5 and grade 8 transitions improved on-time graduation.

> Policy No. ____ English Learner Programs The Superintendent shall ensure that every English learner receives a language instruction program meeting the standards of Castaneda v. Pickard and that English learners are enrolled in grade-level core academic courses with integrated language support. Placement of a student in a course below grade level solely on the basis of English learner status shall be prohibited. Where at least 20 English learners who share a home language are enrolled at a grade level, the Superintendent shall offer a dual-language or bilingual program at that grade level or shall report to the Board the reason it cannot be offered. Reclassification shall require the state English language proficiency assessment plus at least two additional measures, including classroom academic performance and teacher recommendation, and shall not rest on a single test score. The Director of Multilingual Programs shall monitor every reclassified student for four academic years and shall re-enter supports when a reclassified student falls below grade level. By October 15 of each year the Director of Multilingual Programs shall report to the Board, disaggregated by school, program model, home language and years in program: reclassification rates, the number and share of long-term English learners, achievement and growth of current and former English learners, and English learner enrollment in advanced

> and core courses. Program models, exit criteria and this report shall be posted on the district website.

How the Board will know it worked. Annual reclassification rate by years in program and program model; number and share of long-term English learners (6 or more years); ELA and math achievement of former English learners tracked for four years after reclassification; share of English learners enrolled in grade-level core courses and advanced courses; dual-language seats offered versus applicants. Target: Within 180 days, zero English learners placed in a course below grade level solely on the basis of English learner status and zero reclassifications resting on a single test score; within 1 to 3 years, the share of long-term English learners (6 or more years) declines each year from baseline, the reclassification rate rises from baseline, former English learners show no decline in ELA and math achievement across the four monitored years, and every grade level with 20 or more English learners sharing a home language has a dual-language or bilingual program or a Board-reviewed reason it does not. The Director of Multilingual Programs reports to the Board by October 15 each year, disaggregated by school, program model, home language and years in program, and posts the report with program models and exit criteria on the district website; the Board compares each measure against the baseline year and the prior year.

Steele, J. L., Slater, R. O., Zamarro, G., Miller, T., Li, J., Burkhauser, S., & Bacon, M. (2017). Effects of Dual-Language Immersion Programs on Student Achievement: Evidence From Lottery Data. American Educational Research Journal 54(1_suppl):282S-306S. doi · Bibler, A. (2021). Dual Language Education and Student Achievement. Education Finance and Policy 16(4):634-658. doi · Umansky, I. M., & Reardon, S. F. (2014). Reclassification Patterns Among Latino English Learner Students in Bilingual, Dual Immersion, and English Immersion Classrooms. American Educational Research Journal 51(5):879-912. doi

Motion 14. Family engagement and two-way communication: Amend Communication About Student Learning

Current language. *Some of the ways you can expect us to reach you are: ● Class newsletters to parents ● Parent Portal ● Classroom Dojo ● Parent-Teacher conferences ● Student Agendas ● Emails to parents on student's progress ● Text messaging ● Call outs ● School Website and GCES Facebook page*

Why. Randomized trials show that specific, frequent, two-way teacher-to-family communication about a child's own effort, attendance and missed work raises engagement and achievement: daily teacher messages increased homework completion 40 percent, weekly one-sentence notes cut course failure 41 percent, automated missed-assignment alerts cut course failures 27 percent, and parent-school meetings in France reduced truancy and discipline sanctions by about 0.15 SD. Meta-analyses of family-school partnership programs find small to moderate positive associations with achievement (r about 0.12 for involvement overall; about 0.3 SD for structured programs), strongest for communication about schoolwork and parental expectations rather than attendance at events.

> COMMUNICATION ABOUT STUDENT LEARNING Each school in the Greene County School District shall make at least two documented two-way contacts with the family of every enrolled student each school year, the first by October 31 and the second by March 31, concerning that student's own attendance, progress and missed work. A two-way contact

> shall be a phone call, in-person or video conference, home visit or text exchange in which the family responds. Class newsletters, mass messages, call outs and other automated calls shall not count. Each contact shall be made in the family's preferred language and shall be logged in the student information system with the date, mode, language and topic. The district shall enroll every family by default in weekly progress alerts covering absences, missing assignments and grades below the passing threshold, with the ability to opt out, and shall verify each family's phone number and language preference at enrollment and each August. Each school shall hold at least one scheduled parent-teacher conference per student per year, offered at two or more times including one outside working hours, with interpretation provided on request. The Superintendent shall report to the Board by November 30 each year, by school and subgroup, the share of students whose families received two logged two-way contacts in the prior year, conference participation, alert enrollment and the results of an annual family survey administered in the district's top five home languages, and shall publish the report on the district website.

How the Board will know it worked. Percent of enrolled students whose family received at least two logged, individualized two-way contacts in the school year (one by October 31, one by March 31), by school and subgroup; plus share of families enrolled in alerts and reachable by verified phone, conference participation rate, and family survey response rate and agreement with 'the school tells me how my child is doing' Target: Every school reaches a majority of students with two logged two-way contacts in year one and raises that share each year through year three, with the gap between the lowest and highest subgroup narrowing each year; all families enrolled in alerts by default with a verified phone on file by the end of each August; survey response rate and agreement with 'the school tells me how my child is doing' rising each year Superintendent's annual report to the Board by November 30, by school and subgroup, published on the district website, with a mid-year check at the March 31 deadline

Kraft MA, Dougherty SM (2013). The effect of teacher-family communication on student engagement: evidence from a randomized field experiment. Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness 6(3):199-222. doi · Kraft MA, Rogers T (2015). The underutilized potential of teacher-to-parent communication: evidence from a field experiment. Economics of Education Review 47:49-63. doi · Bergman P (2021). Parent-child information frictions and human capital investment: evidence from a field experiment. Journal of Political Economy 129(1):286-322. doi

Motion 15. Classroom temperature, ventilation and indoor air: New policy (health and wellbeing)

Current language. None; the manual is silent.

Why. Heat cuts learning: across 10 million PSAT retakers, each 1 degree F hotter school year reduced that year's learning by about 1 percent in schools without air conditioning, and air conditioning offset nearly all of it; hot school days fall hardest on Black and Hispanic students and explain roughly 5 percent of the racial achievement gap. Poor ventilation costs attendance and scores: in 162 California classrooms each additional 1 L/s per person of outdoor air cut illness absence 1.6 percent, a 140-classroom study found math scores rose 0.5 percent per L/s-

person up to the 7.1 L/s-person standard and a further 0.5 percent per degree C cooler within 20 to 25 C, and a double-blind crossover experiment found 3 to 7 percent more correct answers when outdoor air rose from 1.7 to 6.6 L/s-person.

> Greene County Board of Education Policy (number to be assigned): Classroom Temperature, Ventilation and Air Quality The Greene County School District shall maintain every occupied classroom at a temperature between 68 and 78 degrees F during instructional time. When a classroom cannot be held at or below 82 degrees F, the principal shall relocate instruction to a cooled space, and no student shall be taught in a room at or above 88 degrees F. The Director of Facilities shall install a continuous carbon dioxide monitor in every classroom, shall operate ventilation systems to supply at least the outdoor air rate in ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 62.1 using filters rated MERV-13 or higher, and shall investigate and correct any classroom whose CO2 exceeds 1,000 ppm for more than 10 percent of occupied hours in a month. By September 30 of each year the Director of Facilities shall report to the Board the classrooms without mechanical cooling, the number of instructional hours above 78 degrees F by building during the prior year, the monthly CO2 exceedance rate by building, filter replacement records, and a prioritized capital plan to provide cooling and code-rate ventilation in every classroom. The Superintendent shall include that plan in the annual capital budget request.

How the Board will know it worked. Share of classrooms with mechanical cooling, instructional hours above 78 F by building, share of occupied classroom hours with CO2 above 1,000 ppm, measured outdoor air rate per person at commissioning, illness absence by building, and number of heat-related early dismissals Target: Within 1 year every classroom has a continuous CO2 monitor and no building exceeds 1,000 ppm for more than 10 percent of occupied hours in any month; within 3 years the share of classrooms without mechanical cooling and the instructional hours above 78 F fall each year, no student is taught at or above 88 F, and illness absence by building declines Annual report from the Director of Facilities to the Board by September 30, with monthly CO2 exceedance rates by building available to the Board on request

Park RJ, Goodman J, Hurwitz M, Smith J (2020). Heat and learning. American Economic Journal: Economic Policy 12(2):306-339. doi · Park RJ (2022). Hot temperature and high-stakes performance. Journal of Human Resources 57(2):400-434. doi · Park RJ, Behrer AP, Goodman J (2021). Learning is inhibited by heat exposure, both internationally and within the United States. Nature Human Behaviour 5(1):19-27. doi

Motion 16. Secondary school start time: New policy (time and schedule)

Current language. None; the manual is silent.

Why. Adolescent circadian timing shifts later, and middle and high schools that start at or after 8:30 a.m. get measurably more sleep from students; a Seattle district-wide delay of nearly an hour produced 34 more minutes of sleep per night, a 4.5 percent rise in median grades and better attendance, and a Florida time-zone natural experiment found each hour of later start relative to sunrise raised adolescent math scores by 0.08 SD. Meta-

analyses and a Cochrane review agree on the sleep and attendance effects; achievement effects are positive but smaller and less consistent.

> Greene County Board of Education Policy No. ____ Secondary School Start Time The instructional day for students in grades 6 through 12 shall begin no earlier than 8:30 a.m. in every school of the Greene County School District. No school in the district shall require student attendance at a zero period, assembly or mandatory activity before that time. The Superintendent shall present to the Board by March 1 of each year a schedule report listing the first-bell time of every building for the coming school year, the number and percentage of secondary students whose instructional day begins before 8:30 a.m., and the transportation plan and cost needed to comply with this policy. The Superintendent shall include in the annual student wellness report the median school-night sleep hours reported by secondary students on the district climate survey, together with chronic absence and first-period tardy rates by building. Any building unable to comply with this policy shall be named in the schedule report with a dated plan to comply within one school year.

How the Board will know it worked. Percentage of secondary students (grades 6 through 12) whose instructional day begins at or after 8:30 a.m., plus median school-night sleep hours reported by secondary students on the district climate survey and chronic absence and first-period tardy rates by building Target: 100 percent of secondary students begin instruction at or after 8:30 a.m. by the start of the school year following the first March 1 report, with any named noncompliant building in compliance within one school year; median school-night sleep hours rise and chronic absence and first-period tardy rates fall in every converted building by the second annual wellness report The Superintendent reports to the Board by March 1 each year in the schedule report and annually in the student wellness report, with figures broken out by building

Adolescent Sleep Working Group, Committee on Adolescence, Council on School Health, American Academy of Pediatrics (2014). School start times for adolescents. Pediatrics 134(3):642-649. doi · Dunster GP, de la Iglesia L, Ben-Hamo M, Nave C, Fleischer JG, Panda S, de la Iglesia HO (2018). Sleepmore in Seattle: Later school start times are associated with more sleep and better performance in high school students. Science Advances 4(12):eaau6200. doi · Heissel JA, Norris S (2018). Rise and shine: The effect of school start times on academic performance from childhood through puberty. Journal of Human Resources 53(4):957-992. doi

Motion 17. Generative AI use by students and staff: New policy (technology and data)

Current language. None; the manual is silent.

Why. Design determines the effect. In a field RCT with nearly 1,000 high-school math students, unrestricted GPT-4 access raised practice scores (+48%) but cut unaided exam scores by 17% relative to no access; a version with guardrails that withheld answers removed the harm. A college physics RCT found a purpose-built AI tutor produced about double the learning gain of active-learning classes in less time, and an essay-writing RCT found gains persisted a week later only when students used the model as a tutor rather than to write for them. The K-12 evidence base is still one school, one subject and a few weeks.

> Greene County Board of Education Policy No. [to be assigned]: Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools The Superintendent shall maintain and publish a list of generative AI tools approved for student use and for staff use. No tool shall be added to the list until the Chief Academic Officer and the Director of Technology certify in writing that (a) the tool serves a named instructional purpose, (b) for student practice and homework the tool is configured to withhold direct answers and to prompt student reasoning, (c) the vendor contract meets the district's student data privacy policy, including no use of student inputs for model training, and (d) no student below the vendor's stated minimum age uses the tool. Each teacher shall state in the course syllabus, by the tenth instructional day, when and how students may use AI tools for each category of assignment. No student shall be disciplined for AI use on the basis of detection software alone. Any finding shall rest on the teacher's review of drafts, process evidence or an oral check. Staff shall not enter personally identifiable student information into any tool not on the approved list. The Chief Academic Officer shall report to the Board by October 1 each year the approved-tool list, usage by tool, unaided assessment results in courses using each tool against matched courses, and the number of AI-related integrity cases and their outcomes. The Board shall review this policy annually in light of new evidence.

How the Board will know it worked. Unaided assessment results in courses using each approved AI tool versus matched courses, together with the share of approved tools configured to withhold direct answers, the share of courses with a written AI-use expectation on the syllabus, and the number of AI-related integrity cases overturned. Target: Within 1 year, every tool on the approved list has answer-withholding on for student practice use, every course states an AI-use expectation by the tenth instructional day, and unaided assessment results in courses using approved tools are no lower than in matched courses, with no integrity finding resting on detection software alone; sustained in years 2 and 3. Chief Academic Officer reports to the Board by October 1 each year; the Board records whether the no-deficit condition was met for each tool and whether any tool was removed from the list as a result.

Bastani H, Bastani O, Sungu A, Ge H, Kabakci O, Mariman R (2025). Generative AI without guardrails can harm learning: Evidence from high school mathematics. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 122(26):e2422633122. doi · Kestin G, Miller K, Klales A, Milbourne T, Ponti G (2025). AI tutoring outperforms in-class active learning: an RCT introducing a novel research-based design in an authentic educational setting. Scientific Reports 15. doi · Contractor Z, Reyes G (2026). Experimental Evidence on the Learning Impact of Generative AI. arXiv:2607.08849 (also NBER / IZA DP 18792). link

Motion 18. Gifted and advanced learner identification: New policy (academics and access)

Current language. None; the manual is silent.

Why. Replacing teacher or parent referral with universal screening of every student, with no change in the eligibility cutoff, raised gifted identification in Broward County from 3.3 to 5.5 percent of second graders, with

the largest gains for low-income, Black, Hispanic and English learner students who had been systematically under-referred. Black students with the same test scores are referred less often than White students, especially by non-Black teachers, which is why referral-based systems miss them.

> The district shall administer a validated ability or achievement screener to every student in grade 2 and again in grade 6, and to every student new to the district within one semester of enrollment, at no cost to families and without any requirement of teacher, parent, or self nomination. Eligibility shall be determined from multiple measures and shall use school-level or district-level local norms in addition to national norms, with nonverbal measures and native-language accommodations available for English learners. A student who meets the criteria shall be placed in services within one semester unless a parent or guardian declines in writing. The Director of Advanced Academics shall report to the Board by November 1 each year the percentage of each cohort screened, the number and percentage of students identified and served by school, race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status, and the representation index for each group, and the Superintendent shall present a corrective plan for any group whose representation index is below 0.8.

How the Board will know it worked. Percentage of each grade 2 and grade 6 cohort screened, and the representation index (share of identified students in a group divided by that group's share of enrollment) for students by race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status Target: 100 percent of each grade 2 and grade 6 cohort screened in year one, and the representation index for every student group reaches at least 0.8 within 3 years, with the identification rate for low-income, Black, Hispanic, and English learner students rising each year until that threshold is met Annual report by the Director of Advanced Academics to the Board by November 1, disaggregated by school, race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status, with the same counts filed to the state gifted data collection and the federal Civil Rights Data Collection

Card D, Giuliano L (2016). Universal screening increases the representation of low-income and minority students in gifted education. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 113(48):13678-13683. doi · Grissom JA, Redding C (2016). Discretion and Disproportionality: Explaining the Underrepresentation of High-Achieving Students of Color in Gifted Programs. AERA Open 2(1). doi · McBee MT, Peters SJ, Miller EM (2016). The Impact of the Nomination Stage on Gifted Program Identification: A Comprehensive Psychometric Analysis. Gifted Child Quarterly 60(4):258-278. doi

Motion 19. Grade retention and promotion: New policy (academics and access)

Current language. None; the manual is silent.

Why. Regression discontinuity studies of test-based third-grade retention paired with intensive reading intervention (Florida, Indiana, Mississippi) show large short-run reading gains, with Indiana and Mississippi gains persisting into middle school. Long-run evidence is split: Florida retainees reached high school with higher GPAs and less remediation and no graduation penalty, while a 2026 Texas study finds retained third

graders were 9 points less likely to graduate and earned 19 percent less at 26, and retention in later grades (Chicago grade 8, Louisiana grade 8) raises dropout and juvenile crime.

> Policy IHE: Promotion and Retention The Greene County Board of Education directs that no student shall be retained in grade solely on the basis of a single test score, and no student shall be retained more than once in grades K-3. Before any student in grades K-3 is retained, the principal shall document that the student received at least one semester of evidence-based intervention beyond core instruction, that the parent or guardian was notified in writing of the risk of retention at least 90 school days before the end of the school year, and that a good-cause exemption review was completed for students with disabilities, English learners with fewer than two years of instruction, and students already retained. Every retained student shall receive a written individual reading plan, prepared by the principal and the reading specialist before the first day of the repeated year, that assigns a different core program or a highly rated teacher, at least 90 minutes of daily reading instruction, and progress monitoring every two weeks. Students in grades 6 through 8 shall not be retained on the basis of test scores. The Superintendent shall report to the Board each September the number of students retained in the prior year by grade, school, race, disability and English learner status, the share with a completed intervention record, and the reading proficiency and attendance of students retained two years earlier.

How the Board will know it worked. Share of retained K-3 students whose retention record shows a completed intervention plan, written parent notice at least 90 school days before year end, a good-cause exemption review where required and an individual reading plan dated before the first day of the repeated year; number of students retained in grades 6 through 8 on the basis of test scores; reading proficiency and attendance of retained students one and three years after retention compared with barely promoted peers; discipline incidents of retained students. Target: By the end of year one, every retained K-3 student has a complete intervention record, parent notice, exemption review and individual reading plan, zero students in grades 6 through 8 are retained on test scores alone, and no student is retained more than once in K-3; within 1 to 3 years, retained students' reading proficiency rises relative to barely promoted peers and their attendance and discipline do not worsen relative to those peers. The Superintendent presents the retention report to the Board each September, with the compliance measures for the prior year's retentions and the reading proficiency and attendance of students retained two years earlier, disaggregated by grade, school, race, disability and EL status, and the Board reviews any school with incomplete records or a subgroup retention share above its enrollment share at that meeting.

Schwerdt G, West MR, Winters MA (2017). The effects of test-based retention on student outcomes over time: Regression discontinuity evidence from Florida. Journal of Public Economics 152:154-169. doi · Hwang NY, Koedel C (2023). Helping or hurting: The effects of retention in the third grade on student outcomes. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 47(1):65-88. doi · Slungaard Mumma K, Winters MA (2023). The Effect of Retention Under Mississippi's Test-Based Promotion Policy. Working paper, Wheelock Educational Policy Center, Boston University. link

Motion 20. Hazing and athletics safety: New policy (safety)

Current language. None; the manual is silent.

Why. Hazing is common in high school (48 percent of students in groups report hazing activities, 17 percent of grade 6 to 12 athletes in one survey, and only 14 percent of hazed students call it hazing), but no controlled study shows that any hazing policy or program reduces hazing; the evidence supports clear definitions, mandatory reporting and consent-does-not-matter language as a standard. For concussion, state remove-from-play and return-to-play laws produced a rise in reported concussions (better identification) followed by falling recurrent-concussion rates about 2.6 years after passage, and mandated preseason heat-acclimatization rules cut exertional heat illness in football by roughly half.

> Policy No. ____ Hazing Prevention and Athletic Safety Hazing, meaning any act required to join or stay in a team, club or group that endangers a student's physical or mental health or safety or humiliates the student, including physical abuse, forced consumption of any substance, excessive exercise, sleep deprivation, confinement, forced nudity or sexual acts, ridicule or degrading tasks, and coercion to break the law or Board policy, shall be prohibited regardless of consent. Coaches, activity sponsors and student participants shall complete hazing-prevention training each year before the season, and student athletes and parents shall sign a hazing and concussion acknowledgment each year. Coaches and sponsors shall report suspected hazing to the principal within 24 hours; the principal shall report each case to the Superintendent within three school days. A student suspected of a concussion shall be removed from practice or play immediately and shall not return until a licensed health care provider trained in concussion management gives written clearance, with a graduated return-to-learn plan coordinated by the school nurse. Preseason practices shall follow the National Athletic Trainers' Association heat-acclimatization schedule. Each athletic venue shall have a written venue-specific emergency action plan, rehearsed with local EMS each August, and an automated external defibrillator reachable within three minutes of every practice and competition site. By July 31 each year the Athletic Director shall report to the Board hazing reports and substantiated cases by activity, concussions and other serious injuries by sport, return-to-play clearance compliance, and emergency action plan rehearsal dates by venue.

How the Board will know it worked. Share of coaches, sponsors and student participants with current hazing training; hazing reports and substantiated cases per season by team or group; climate-survey item on initiation experiences; concussions per 1,000 athlete-exposures and share with documented written clearance before return; exertional heat illness and cardiac events per season; share of venues with a rehearsed emergency action plan and an AED within three minutes. Target: Within 1 year, 100 percent of coaches and sponsors trained before the season, 100 percent of venues with a rehearsed emergency action plan and an AED within three minutes, and 100 percent of concussion returns with documented written clearance. Reported concussions and hazing reports are expected to rise in the first 1 to 2 years as identification improves; within 3 years, the recurrent-concussion rate and exertional heat illness count per season should decline from the year-

one baseline, consistent with the 2.6-year post-law decline and the roughly 0.45 incidence rate ratio seen for heat rules. Athletic Director to the Board by July 31 each year, with the Superintendent presenting the climate-survey initiation item and any substantiated hazing cases in the same report.

Hoover NC, Pollard NJ (2000). Initiation Rites in American High Schools: A National Survey. Alfred University. link · Allan EJ, Madden M (2008). Hazing in View: College Students at Risk. University of Maine. link · Allan EJ, Madden M (2012). The nature and extent of college student hazing. International Journal of Adolescent Medicine and Health 24(1):83-90. doi

Motion 21. Lockdown and active shooter drills: New policy (safety)

Current language. None; the manual is silent.

Why. Announced, procedure-only lockdown drills paired with training raise students' and staff's sense of preparedness and correct execution (classroom procedural accuracy up 27 percentage points after training) without raising measured anxiety, and students in one district reported less fear and lower perceived risk after drills. High-intensity simulations with actors, gunfire or deception are a different intervention: a 114-school interrupted time series of 54 million social media posts found anxiety and stress up 42 percent and depression up 39 percent after active shooter drills, and the American Academy of Pediatrics calls for ending children's participation in high-intensity drills and prohibiting deception.

> Policy No. [to be assigned] Lockdown Drills Each school in the Greene County School District shall conduct lockdown drills at the frequency required by state law. Every drill shall be announced to staff, students and families at least one school day in advance and again immediately before it begins, and shall practice the lockdown procedure only. No drill in which students participate shall use simulated gunfire, weapons, actors posing as attackers, theatrical injuries, or any statement that the event is real. Students with disabilities, students with known trauma histories and students in pre-kindergarten through grade 2 shall receive accommodations set in advance by the school counselor and the building administrator, and a parent may excuse a student from any drill. An administrator shall observe each drill using a procedural checklist, and each drill shall be followed by a classroom debrief the same day. The Director of Safety shall report to the Board by June 30 of each year the number, type and date of drills held in each school, the procedural accuracy results, the counseling contacts in the week following each drill, and the drill-related items from the annual climate survey.

How the Board will know it worked. Share of drills that are announced and procedure-only; share of observed classrooms executing the lockdown procedure correctly; drill-related preparedness and anxiety items on the annual climate survey; counseling contacts in the week after each drill; parent notification compliance. Target: Within one year, 100 percent of drills in which students participate are announced, procedure-only and preceded by parent notification, with zero simulation-style drills; from year one to year three, the share of classrooms executing the procedure correctly rises each year while drill-related anxiety items on the climate survey do not rise and post-drill counseling contacts do not increase. Annual report from the Director of Safety

to the Board by June 30, with drill counts and types by school, procedural checklist results, post-drill counseling contacts, climate survey drill items and parent notification compliance.

ElSherief M, Saha K, Gupta P, Mishra S, Seybolt J, Xie J, O'Toole M, Burd-Sharps S, De Choudhury M (2021). Impacts of school shooter drills on the psychological well-being of American K-12 school communities: a social media study. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications 8:315. doi · Everytown for Gun Safety Support Fund, American Federation of Teachers, National Education Association (2020, updated 2024). The Impact of Active Shooter Drills in Schools. link · Schildkraut J, Nickerson AB (2020). Ready to respond: effects of lockdown drills and training on school emergency preparedness. Victims and Offenders 15(5):619-638. doi

Motion 22. Math acceleration, eighth grade algebra, and tracking: New policy (academics and access)

Current language. None; the manual is silent.

Why. The evidence favors objective, transparent placement into accelerated math with instructional support, and cuts against both extremes. Placing moderately prepared students into Algebra I in eighth grade without extra support lowered their pass rates and later math course completion in North Carolina and reduced tenth grade math scores in California's push for algebra for all; placing students by an objective prior-achievement rule in Wake County removed race and income from placement decisions, and a randomized Dee and Huffaker study found that putting below-grade-level ninth graders into Algebra I with teacher training raised grade 11 math achievement by up to 0.2 SD. Delaying algebra for everyone, as San Francisco did, cut AP math participation 15 percent at first and left ethnoracial gaps unchanged.

> Policy No. ____ Mathematics Placement and Acceleration By March 1 each year the Superintendent shall publish the objective criteria for placement in accelerated mathematics in grades 6 through 9. Criteria shall rely on at least two measures of prior achievement, including the most recent state assessment, and shall not rely on teacher recommendation alone. Every student who meets the criteria shall be placed in the accelerated course for the following year unless a parent or guardian opts out in writing after written notice of eligibility. The district shall offer Algebra I in grade 8 at every middle school and shall provide a supported placement, such as a double period, scheduled tutoring, or summer bridge, to students within one standard error of the cutoff and to any student placed in Algebra I below grade level. Students shall be reassessed for placement at least once each school year, and no grade 6 placement decision shall be used to limit course access in later grades. The Superintendent shall report to the Board by October 15 each year placement rates by school and student group, the share of eighth graders completing Algebra I with a passing end-of-course score, Algebra I repeat rates, and the share of graduates completing calculus or statistics, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status.

How the Board will know it worked. Share of students meeting the published placement criterion who are placed in the accelerated course, and share of eighth graders completing Algebra I with a passing end-of-course

score, each disaggregated by race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status, plus the Algebra I repeat rate. Target: Within 1 year, every student who meets the published criterion is placed unless a parent opts out in writing, and Algebra I is offered in grade 8 at every middle school; within 3 years, the share of eighth graders completing Algebra I with a passing end-of-course score rises for every student group with no increase in the Algebra I repeat rate for any group, and the gap in criterion-meeting placement rates between student groups closes to zero. The Superintendent reports to the Board by October 15 each year, with every measure disaggregated by race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status, and with placement appeals and overrides listed by school.

Dougherty SM, Goodman JS, Hill DV, Litke EG, Page LC (2015). Middle School Math Acceleration and Equitable Access to Eighth-Grade Algebra: Evidence From the Wake County Public School System. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 37(1S):80S-101S. doi · Dougherty SM, Goodman JS, Hill DV, Litke EG, Page LC (2017). Objective course placement and college readiness: Evidence from targeted middle school math acceleration. Economics of Education Review 58:141-161. doi · Clotfelter CT, Ladd HF, Vigdor JL (2015). The Aftermath of Accelerating Algebra: Evidence from District Policy Initiatives. Journal of Human Resources 50(1):159-188. doi

Motion 23. Recess: New policy (health and wellbeing)

Current language. None; the manual is silent.

Why. Daily recess is associated with better classroom behavior and attention: in a national sample of 11,000 third graders, children with at least one daily recess of 15 or more minutes had better teacher-rated class behavior, a within-subject experiment found fourth graders more on task and less fidgety on recess days, and a cluster-randomized trial of a structured-recess program (Playworks) in 27 to 29 schools reduced teacher-reported bullying and exclusion and cut transition time back to learning. The AAP and CDC state that recess is a necessary break and should not be withheld as punishment or to complete work.

> Greene County Board of Education Policy No. [to be assigned]: Elementary Recess Each student in kindergarten through grade 5 shall receive at least twenty (20) minutes of supervised, unstructured recess each school day. Recess shall be held outdoors when weather permits and shall be scheduled in addition to physical education and separate from the seated lunch period. No staff member shall withhold, shorten or assign recess as a consequence for behavior, incomplete work, tardiness or missed assignments, and no staff member shall require a student to complete academic work during recess. A student may be removed from recess only for an immediate safety risk. Any such removal shall be recorded in the student information system on the same day, together with the reason for the removal. Each building principal shall certify the building recess schedule to the Superintendent by September 15 of each year. By November 1 of each year, the Superintendent shall report to the Board the daily recess minutes for each elementary building, the number of recorded recess removals by building and reason, and the correction plan for any building providing fewer than twenty (20) minutes.

How the Board will know it worked. Share of K-5 students scheduled for at least 20 minutes of daily recess per the certified master schedules, and the count of recess removals logged in the student information system by building and reason Target: Within 1 year, 100 percent of K-5 students in every elementary building have at least 20 minutes of scheduled daily recess, and all logged recess removals cite an immediate safety risk, with the count of removals declining year over year in years 1 to 3 Superintendent reports to the Board by November 1 each year with recess minutes by building, recess removals by building and reason, and correction plans for any building below 20 minutes

Council on School Health, American Academy of Pediatrics (2013). The crucial role of recess in school. Pediatrics 131(1):183-188. doi · Barros RM, Silver EJ, Stein REK (2009). School recess and group classroom behavior. Pediatrics 123(2):431-436. doi · Jarrett OS, Maxwell DM, Dickerson C, Hoge P, Davies G, Yetley A (1998). Impact of recess on classroom behavior: Group effects and individual differences. Journal of Educational Research 92(2):121-126. doi

Motion 24. Access to rigorous coursework (automatic enrollment, AP, IB, dual credit): New policy (academics and access)

Current language. None; the manual is silent.

Why. When districts automatically place every student who meets an objective readiness threshold into the next advanced course, with parent opt-out instead of opt-in, advanced course enrollment rises and gaps by race and income narrow without lowering grades or graduation; Washington's Academic Acceleration policies raised the chance of taking any advanced course by about 5 percent district-wide and more among proficient students who had been passed over. Effects on later college enrollment and persistence from the high school version of the policy are null so far.

> Greene County Board of Education, Board Policy No. ____: Automatic Enrollment in Advanced Coursework Each student who meets or exceeds the state standard on the most recent state assessment in English language arts, mathematics, or science, or who earns a grade of B or higher in the prerequisite course, shall be enrolled for the following term in the next most rigorous level of coursework the Greene County School System offers in that subject, including honors, Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, and dual-credit courses. Enrollment shall not depend on a teacher recommendation, an application, or a test fee. A student may be placed in an alternative course only when a parent or guardian submits a written opt-out after receiving written notice of the student's eligibility. Principals shall provide the notice by June 1 for the following year. The Superintendent shall report to the Board by October 15 each year the number of eligible students, the number enrolled, the number opted out, and advanced course completion and exam pass rates, each disaggregated by school, race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status, and shall publish the report on the district website.

How the Board will know it worked. Share of students meeting the readiness threshold who are enrolled in the corresponding advanced course the next term, disaggregated by school, race, ethnicity, income, English learner

status, and disability status, plus AP, IB, and dual-credit participation and pass rates by group and opt-out counts by school. Target: By the first October 15 report, every eligible student not covered by a written opt-out is enrolled in the corresponding advanced course, and by the third annual report the enrollment rate among eligible students no longer differs by race, ethnicity, or income, with advanced course completion and exam pass rates by group holding steady or rising rather than falling. The Superintendent's annual report to the Board by October 15, published on the district website, with the eligible, enrolled, and opted-out counts and completion and exam pass rates disaggregated by school, race, ethnicity, income, English learner status, and disability status, cross-checked against the state report card and College Board and IB data.

Austin M, Backes B, Goldhaber D, Li D, Streich F (2025). Leveling Up: An Academic Acceleration Policy to Increase Equity in Advanced High School Course Taking. American Educational Research Journal 62(1):136-179. doi · Austin M, Mbekeani P, Backes B, Chen B, Goldhaber D (2026). High School Academic Acceleration and Early Postsecondary Outcomes: Evidence from Washington State. CALDER Working Paper 341-0826. link · Dougherty SM, Goodman JS, Hill DV, Litke EG, Page LC (2015). Middle School Math Acceleration and Equitable Access to Eighth-Grade Algebra: Evidence From the Wake County Public School System. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 37(1S):80S-101S. doi

Motion 25. Special education placement and inclusion: New policy (academics and access)

Current language. None; the manual is silent.

Why. Receiving special education services causally raises achievement and attainment for students with disabilities (Texas: removing services lowered high school completion and college enrollment; NYC and Texas: entering special education raised test scores by roughly 0.1 SD), and large correlational and meta-analytic literatures find that students with disabilities who spend most of the day in general education classrooms do better academically with no detectable cost to their peers (d = 0.35 for students with general learning difficulties; peers d = 0.12 to null). Co-teaching shows a medium positive effect in a 2021 meta-analysis. The causal evidence on placement itself, as opposed to services, is thin and contested, so the best-supported policy is a documented, data-driven least restrictive environment decision for each student rather than a placement quota in either direction.

> Policy IDDF Placement of Students with Disabilities Each IEP team shall first consider placement in the general education classroom with supplementary aids, services and specially designed instruction. Before recommending any more restrictive placement, the team shall document in the IEP the specific supports tried or considered and the data showing why the student cannot be educated satisfactorily in the general education classroom. No student shall be placed in a separate class or school on the basis of disability category, the availability of staff, or administrative convenience. Each co-taught section shall be staffed by a general educator and a certified special educator for the full instructional period, and the principal shall schedule weekly common planning time for those teachers. The Director of Special Education shall review every placement in a setting of less than 40 percent general education at least annually against the student's progress data. By November 1 of each year, the Director shall report to the Board, by school, disability category, race and

> English learner status: educational environment percentages, state test achievement and growth, graduation and dropout rates, suspension rates, and the number of placement reviews that resulted in a less restrictive placement. The Superintendent shall provide at least 12 hours of training per year in specially designed instruction and co-teaching to every teacher assigned to a co-taught section.

How the Board will know it worked. Share of students with IEPs in general education 80 percent or more of the day, 40 to 79 percent, and under 40 percent, disaggregated by school, disability category, race and English learner status; achievement and growth of students with disabilities on state tests versus peers; graduation, dropout and suspension rates of students with disabilities; share of IEPs documenting consideration of supplementary aids and services before a more restrictive placement; share of co-taught sections staffed by a certified special educator for the full period. Target: Within 1 year, every reviewed IEP recommending a setting below 80 percent general education documents the supplementary aids and services considered and the supporting data, every co-taught section is staffed by a certified special educator for the full period, and every assigned teacher completes 12 hours of training; within 3 years, the share of students with IEPs in general education 80 percent or more of the day rises and the achievement gap, dropout rate and suspension rate for students with disabilities fall from baseline, with no decline in peer achievement. Director of Special Education reports to the Board by November 1 each year, by school, disability category, race and English learner status, with the Board comparing each year's figures to baseline and to the state's Indicator 5 targets.

Hehir, T., Grindal, T., Freeman, B., Lamoreau, R., Borquaye, Y., & Burke, S. (2016). A Summary of the Evidence on Inclusive Education. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, for Instituto Alana. link · Cole, S. M., Murphy, H. R., Frisby, M. B., Grossi, T. A., & Bolte, H. R. (2020). The Relationship of Special Education Placement and Student Academic Outcomes. The Journal of Special Education 54(4):217-227. doi · Gilmour, A. F. (2018). Has Inclusion Gone Too Far? Weighing Its Effects on Students With Disabilities, Their Peers, and Teachers. Education Next 18(4). link

Motion 26. New teacher induction and mentoring: New policy (staffing and instruction)

Current language. None; the manual is silent.

Why. The one large randomized trial (Glazerman et al. 2010, 1,009 teachers in 17 districts) found that two years of comprehensive induction raised student achievement in the teachers' third year (+4 percentile points reading, +8 math; about 0.11 and 0.20 SD) but one year did not, and neither version changed retention. Nationally representative surveys and a field experiment on structured peer pairing find that first-year mentoring, common planning time and collaboration predict lower attrition and that pairing low-performing teachers with high-performing colleagues raised their students' achievement by about 0.12 SD.

> Greene County Board of Education Policy No. ___ Teacher Induction and Mentoring The Superintendent shall operate a two-year induction program for every teacher new to the profession and a one-year induction program for every teacher new to the district. Before the first student day, each inductee shall be assigned a mentor who holds certification in the same subject or grade band, has at least three years of effective ratings, and has completed

> district mentor training of no fewer than 15 hours. Mentors shall receive a stipend and at least two release periods per month for structured observation and feedback. Principals shall schedule common planning time for each inductee and mentor at least weekly in year one and twice monthly in year two. Mentors shall log contact hours monthly in the district system. The Director of Human Resources shall report to the Board by October 31 of each year the one-year, three-year and five-year retention of new hires by school and by induction participation, mean mentor contact hours per inductee, the share of inductees assigned a same-subject mentor, and the results of the annual inductee survey. The Board shall review program funding against that report at its November meeting.

How the Board will know it worked. Share of first-year and second-year teachers assigned a trained same-subject or same-grade-band mentor before the first student day; mean mentor contact hours per inductee per month; one-year, three-year and five-year retention of new hires by school and by induction participation Target: Within 1 year, every inductee has an assigned trained mentor before the first student day and every year-one mentor pair logs weekly contact; within 3 years, one-year and three-year retention of new hires who completed induction is higher than the pre-policy baseline and no lower than for new hires who did not participate Director of Human Resources to the Board by October 31 each year, with Board review of program funding at the November meeting

Glazerman, S., Isenberg, E., Dolfin, S., Bleeker, M., Johnson, A., Grider, M., & Jacobus, M. (2010). Impacts of Comprehensive Teacher Induction: Final Results from a Randomized Controlled Study. NCEE 2010-4027. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences. link · Ingersoll, R. M., & Strong, M. (2011). The Impact of Induction and Mentoring Programs for Beginning Teachers: A Critical Review of the Research. Review of Educational Research 81(2):201-233. doi · Ronfeldt, M., & McQueen, K. (2017). Does New Teacher Induction Really Improve Retention? Journal of Teacher Education 68(4):394-410. doi

Motion 27. School nurses and health services: New policy (health and wellbeing)

Current language. None; the manual is silent.

Why. A full-time registered nurse in every school pays for itself: the Massachusetts cost-benefit study found $2.20 in avoided medical costs, teacher time and parent lost wages for every $1 spent. Schools that add a full-time nurse show lower illness absence, with the clearest gains for students with asthma (23 percent fewer days missed with a full-time versus part-time nurse in Toledo; fewer illness absences and emergency visits after San Jose added full-time nurses), but the attendance evidence is quasi-experimental, integrative reviews rate it weak, and no study shows a nurse effect on test scores.

> Greene County Board of Education Policy No. [to be assigned]: School Nursing Staff The Greene County School District shall employ at least one full-time registered nurse assigned to each school building for the full instructional day on every day students are present. The Coordinator of Health Services, who shall be a registered nurse, shall complete a workload and acuity analysis for each building by June 30 of each year. The analysis shall use the

> student health conditions, medication and treatment orders, individualized healthcare plans and enrollment in that building. The Superintendent shall assign additional licensed nursing staff where the analysis shows a single nurse cannot provide safe care. Licensed practical nurses and health aides shall practice only under the delegation and supervision of a registered nurse. The Coordinator of Health Services shall report to the Board by October 15 of each year the nursing staff assigned to each building, the results of the workload analysis, the number of days each building lacked a registered nurse on site, and illness-related absence rates for students with chronic health conditions.

How the Board will know it worked. Share of school buildings with a registered nurse on site every full school day, and number of days any building lacked an RN, from the district staffing roster; illness-related absence rate for students with asthma, diabetes, seizure disorders and food allergies, from the student information system; count of emergency 911 calls from schools. Target: 100 percent of buildings have a full-time RN on site every day students are present, with zero uncovered days, within 1 year of adoption; illness-related absence for students with chronic health conditions declines from the baseline within 2 years and does not rise thereafter. Coordinator of Health Services reports to the Board by October 15 each year: nursing staff by building, workload and acuity results, days each building lacked an RN on site, illness-related and chronic absence for students with chronic health conditions, 911 calls from schools, and Medicaid reimbursement received.

Wang LY, Vernon-Smiley M, Gapinski MA, Desisto M, Maughan E, Sheetz A (2014). Cost-benefit study of school nursing services. JAMA Pediatrics 168(7):642-648. doi · Telljohann SK, Dake JA, Price JH (2004). Effect of full-time versus part-time school nurses on attendance of elementary students with asthma. Journal of School Nursing 20(6):331-334. doi · Rodriguez E, Rivera DA, Perlroth D, Becker E, Wang NE, Landau M (2013). School nurses' role in asthma management, school absenteeism, and cost savings: A demonstration project. Journal of School Health 83(12):842-850. doi

Motion 28. Seated lunch time: New policy (health and wellbeing)

Current language. None; the manual is silent.

Why. Children with fewer than 20 minutes seated to eat consume less of their lunch, especially fruit and vegetables: in a randomized crossover trial, 10 minutes of seated time versus 20 cut fruit consumption by 11 percentage points and vegetables by 14 points, and observational cafeteria studies in Massachusetts and California show the same pattern at scale. CDC guidance is at least 20 minutes seated after being served.

> Greene County Board of Education Policy [number to be assigned]: Seated Time for School Meals Each building schedule shall provide every student at least twenty (20) minutes of seated time to eat lunch after receiving the meal, and at least ten (10) minutes seated for breakfast served at school. Lunch periods shall be scheduled so that no student receives a meal fewer than twenty minutes before the period ends. Elementary buildings shall schedule recess before lunch where the facility permits. The Director of Food Services, with each building principal, shall observe serving-line times in every cafeteria at least once each semester and shall report seated lunch minutes by building and lunch period to the

> Superintendent. The district shall measure and report seated time, not the length of the lunch period. The Superintendent shall include in the annual wellness report presented to the Board, no later than its first regular meeting in October, the seated lunch minutes by building, the number of buildings not meeting twenty minutes, and a dated correction plan for each building that does not meet twenty minutes.

How the Board will know it worked. Seated lunch minutes per lunch period by building, measured from the time the last student in line is served to the end of the period, from the master schedule plus a cafeteria line-time observation each semester; the share of buildings meeting 20 seated minutes; fruit and vegetable plate-waste or production-record data from food service. Target: Every building and every lunch period provides at least 20 seated minutes for lunch and 10 for breakfast by the start of the next school year, with the count of buildings below 20 minutes at zero in each annual report thereafter and fruit and vegetable plate waste moving down from baseline over 1 to 3 years. Annual wellness report presented to the Board no later than its first regular meeting in October, showing seated lunch minutes by building and lunch period, the number of buildings not meeting 20 minutes, a dated correction plan for each, and fruit and vegetable plate-waste or production-record data.

Burg X, Metcalfe JJ, Ellison B, Prescott MP (2021). Effects of longer seated lunch time on food consumption and waste in elementary and middle school-age children: A randomized clinical trial. JAMA Network Open 4(6):e2114148. doi · Cohen JFW, Jahn JL, Richardson S, Cluggish SA, Parker E, Rimm EB (2016). Amount of time to eat lunch is associated with children's selection and consumption of school meal entree, fruits, vegetables, and milk. Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics 116(1):123-128. doi · Gosliner W (2014). School-level factors associated with increased fruit and vegetable consumption among students in California middle and high schools. Journal of School Health 84(9):559-568. doi

Motion 29. Physical restraint and seclusion: New policy (discipline and climate)

Current language. None; the manual is silent.

Why. No outcome study shows that restraint or seclusion improves behavior or learning; the GAO found hundreds of allegations of abuse and death linked to their use in schools between 1990 and 2009, with untrained staff and non-aggressive children with disabilities as the recurring pattern. In 2021-22 about 105,700 students were restrained or secluded, and students served under IDEA were 14 percent of enrollment but 76 percent of those physically restrained and 68 percent of those secluded. A systematic review of 15 studies finds that school-wide prevention approaches reduce the frequency of restraint, but none is an RCT.

> Policy ___: Restraint and Seclusion No student shall be secluded, meaning involuntary confinement alone in a space the student cannot leave, or subjected to mechanical, chemical, prone or supine restraint or any hold restricting breathing or pressing on the neck, chest or back. Physical restraint shall be used only when a student poses an imminent danger of serious physical harm to self or others, only by staff currently certified in a Board-approved crisis intervention program, only while danger persists, and never as punishment or consequence, for property damage alone or for noncompliance. The restraining staff

> member shall notify the principal that day; the principal shall notify the parent or guardian verbally the same day and in writing within one school day. Within two school days, a written incident report describing the behavior, hold, duration, staff involved, any injury and parent notification shall enter the student's record and the principal shall debrief those staff. After a second restraint in a school year, the student's IEP, Section 504 or behavior support team shall meet within ten school days to revise the behavior intervention plan. The Superintendent shall report quarterly to the Board, and publish on the district website by September 30 for the prior school year, restraints by building, disability status, race and sex, injuries and the district's Civil Rights Data Collection submission.

How the Board will know it worked. Incidents of physical restraint, mechanical restraint and seclusion per 100 students, by building and by disability status, race and sex, from the district incident log reconciled to the Civil Rights Data Collection submission; injuries to students and staff; share of incidents with same-day parent notification; share of incidents involving a student with no behavior intervention plan. Target: Zero seclusions, mechanical restraints, chemical restraints and prone or supine restraints from the first quarterly report onward; physical restraints per 100 students declining each year for 3 years against the baseline year; 100 percent of incidents with same-day parent notification and a written report within two school days by the end of year one; the share of restraints involving students with disabilities moving toward their share of enrollment over 3 years. The Superintendent reports to the Board each quarter and publishes on the district website by September 30 for the prior school year the number of restraints by building, disability status, race and sex, the number of injuries, the share with same-day parent notification, and the district's Civil Rights Data Collection submission, with a note explaining any difference between the log and the submission; a zero submission from a district with special education programs is flagged for Board inquiry.

US Government Accountability Office (2009). Seclusions and Restraints: Selected Cases of Death and Abuse at Public and Private Schools and Treatment Centers. GAO-09-719T, May 19, 2009. link · US Government Accountability Office (2019). K-12 Education: Education Should Take Immediate Action to Address Inaccuracies in Federal Restraint and Seclusion Data. GAO-19-551R, June 18, 2019. link · US Government Accountability Office (2020). K-12 Education: Education Needs to Address Significant Quality Issues with its Restraint and Seclusion Data. GAO-20-345, April 21, 2020. link

Motion 30. Lead in school drinking water: New policy (health and wellbeing)

Current language. None; the manual is silent.

Why. Lead harms learning at every measured level: in Rhode Island, each 1 ug/dL lower average preschool blood lead cut the chance of scoring substantially below proficient in third-grade reading by about 1 percentage point on a 12 percent base, Swedish and North Carolina natural experiments find the same for school grades, crime and suspensions, and Flint's water crisis lowered math achievement and raised special education classification district-wide. Lead in school water is common: in seven state testing programs 13 to 81 percent of tested schools had at least one outlet above 5 ppb, and 37 percent of US districts that tested found elevated lead, but no study links school-water lead itself to achievement, so testing policy rests on the blood-lead evidence plus prevalence data.

> Policy No. ____ Lead in Drinking Water The Director of Facilities shall test every outlet used for drinking or food preparation in every district building for lead using the sampling protocol in the EPA 3Ts guidance. The initial test of every outlet shall be completed by June 30, 2027. Each outlet shall be retested at least once every 3 years and within 90 days after any plumbing repair or replacement affecting it. Any outlet with a result at or above 5 parts per billion shall be removed from service within 24 hours of receipt of the result and shall not be returned to service until it is replaced or filtered and a follow-up sample is below 5 parts per billion. The Director of Facilities shall post all results by outlet on the district website and notify the families and staff of each building within 30 calendar days of receipt. The Director of Facilities shall install at least one filtered bottle-filling station certified to NSF/ANSI 53 for lead on every floor of every building, replace filters on the manufacturer's schedule, and log each replacement. By September 30 of each year the Director of Facilities shall report to the Board the outlets tested, the results, the outlets removed from service and their status, and the filter replacement log.

How the Board will know it worked. Share of drinking and cooking outlets tested within the last 3 years, share of tested outlets at or above 5 ppb, days between a result at or above 5 ppb and outlet shutoff, number of NSF/ANSI 53 filtered bottle-filling stations per building floor, and share of families notified within 30 days, all drawn from the district's published results and the annual Board report. Target: 100 percent of drinking and cooking outlets tested by June 30, 2027 and retested within every 3 year cycle thereafter; every outlet at or above 5 ppb out of service within 24 hours of the result; 100 percent of results posted and families notified within 30 days; at least one filtered station on every floor of every building by the end of year one; and the share of outlets at or above 5 ppb falling each cycle toward zero. The Director of Facilities reports to the Board by September 30 each year, with results posted by outlet on the district website within 30 days of receipt and the filter replacement log attached.

Aizer A, Currie J, Simon P, Vivier P (2018). Do low levels of blood lead reduce children's future test scores? American Economic Journal: Applied Economics 10(1):307-341. doi · Aizer A, Currie J (2019). Lead and juvenile delinquency: New evidence from linked birth, school, and juvenile detention records. Review of Economics and Statistics 101(4):575-587. doi · Gronqvist H, Nilsson JP, Robling PO (2020). Understanding how low levels of early lead exposure affect children's life trajectories. Journal of Political Economy 128(9):3376-3433. doi

Motion 31. Language access for families: New policy (family and community)

Current language. None; the manual is silent.

Why. Federal civil rights law (Title VI, the Equal Educational Opportunities Act and Lau v. Nichols) requires districts to communicate with limited-English parents in a language they understand, and IDEA requires native-language notices and interpreters for special education. Nationally representative data show that immigrant parents report the most barriers to school involvement and that English ability predicts how involved they are; the largest communication RCT that improved attendance (131,312 students) delivered its notices in five languages, and a vendor-funded matched study of a translated two-way messaging platform reports attendance gains concentrated among English learner and Latino families.

> Policy ____ Language Access Each family's preferred language shall be requested at enrollment, confirmed each August and recorded in the student information system. Limited-English parents shall receive free, timely, competent language assistance. Vital documents, including enrollment forms, handbooks, conduct codes, consent forms, report cards, progress reports, and discipline, attendance, special education, health, emergency and parent meeting notices, shall be translated into every language spoken by at least 5 percent of families or 1,000 families, whichever is less, and on request into any other language. A qualified interpreter shall be provided free within five school days of request, or sooner where law requires, for conferences, discipline hearings, IEP and Section 504 meetings and any other meeting with a limited-English parent; remote interpretation shall cover unscheduled contacts. Students, siblings, other children and staff without demonstrated proficiency shall not interpret except in an emergency to arrange a qualified interpreter. Machine translation shall serve routine messages only; a proficient speaker shall review vital documents before release. The Superintendent shall designate a language access coordinator, post the language access plan and translated document list online, and report to the Board annually by October 31: families by preferred language, share of required notices delivered in that language, interpreter requests and fulfillment times, conference and IEP participation of limited-English and all families, and complaints.

How the Board will know it worked. Share of families with a recorded home language other than English who received each required notice category (enrollment, discipline, special education, attendance, health, emergency) in their preferred language, share of interpreter requests fulfilled within five school days, and conference and IEP meeting participation rates of limited-English families compared with all families. Target: Within 1 to 3 years, the share of required notices delivered in the family's preferred language rises each year, every interpreter request is fulfilled within five school days or sooner where a legal deadline applies, and the gap in conference and IEP participation between limited-English families and all families narrows year over year. The language access coordinator reports to the Board by October 31 each year in a public written report, broken out by language, with interpreter fulfillment times, participation rate comparisons and complaints received.

Turney K, Kao G (2009). Barriers to school involvement: are immigrant parents disadvantaged? Journal of Educational Research 102(4):257-271. doi · Kim Y (2009). Minority parental involvement and school barriers: moving the focus away from deficiencies of parents. Educational Research Review 4(2):80-102. doi · Cheatham GA (2011). Language interpretation, parent participation, and young children with disabilities. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education 31(2):78-88. doi

Motion 32. Student searches and due process in discipline: Amend Penalties for Weapons (part 2)

Current language. *42 Student Searches - School officials may search a student if there is reasonable suspicion the student is in possession of an item that is illegal or against school rules.*

Why. This domain is governed by constitutional standards rather than outcome research: Goss v. Lopez requires notice and an opportunity to respond before any suspension of ten days or less, New Jersey v. T.L.O. permits school searches on reasonable suspicion when justified at inception and reasonable in scope, and Safford v. Redding holds that a search of a student's underwear requires suspicion that the item is dangerous or hidden there. The one federal randomized trial of random drug testing found lower self-reported use among tested students (16 versus 22 percent) with no spillover to untested students, while national correlational studies find no association between testing and student drug use.

> Before any suspension of ten school days or fewer, the principal or designee shall tell the student the charge, explain the evidence, and give the student an opportunity to present the student's side; where a student's presence poses a continuing danger to persons or property or an ongoing threat of disrupting instruction, the student may be removed immediately and this conference shall occur within one school day. Written notice of the suspension, its basis and the appeal procedure shall be sent to the parent or guardian the same day. Any proposed exclusion of more than ten school days or expulsion shall require written notice to the parent at least five school days before a hearing before a hearing officer or Board panel not employed at the referring school, at which the student may be represented, present evidence and witnesses, and question the district's evidence, and a written decision with findings shall issue within five school days of the hearing; for a student with a disability, the manifestation determination required by law shall be completed within ten school days of the decision to remove. A search of a student's person, belongings, locker or vehicle shall require individualized reasonable suspicion, recorded in writing by the staff member before or immediately after the search, that the search will turn up evidence of a violation of law or school rules, and shall be no more intrusive than the suspected violation warrants. No student shall be strip searched or required to remove or expose undergarments by any district employee; where there is reasonable suspicion of an imminent danger to life, the principal shall contact law enforcement. Random or suspicionless searches of lockers may be conducted only under a written annual notice to students and families; the district shall not conduct suspicionless drug testing of students. Each principal shall log every search of a student's person or belongings and every suspension conference in the student information system. The Superintendent shall report to the Board by September 30 each year, for the prior school year and by building, race and disability status, the number of searches, the number of suspensions and expulsions, the share of suspensions with a documented pre-removal conference, the number of appeals and their outcomes, and the number of complaints alleging a search or hearing violation.

How the Board will know it worked. Share of suspensions with a documented pre-removal conference (charge, evidence and student response) and same-day parent notice; share of expulsion hearings with timely written notice, an independent hearing officer and a written decision within five school days; number of searches logged with a written basis, by building, race and disability; number of strip searches; manifestation determinations completed within ten school days; complaints and appeals and their outcomes. Target: Zero

strip searches in every year; every exclusion over ten days has written notice at least five school days before the hearing and a written decision within five school days after it; every manifestation determination completed within ten school days; the share of suspensions with a documented pre-removal conference and same-day parent notice rises each year, with the gap between buildings and between student groups narrowing, as shown in the September 30 report within 1 to 3 years. Superintendent's annual report to the Board by September 30, disaggregated by building, race and disability status, with the discipline record audit results attached.

Goss v. Lopez, 419 U.S. 565 (1975). Supreme Court of the United States, decided January 22, 1975. link · New Jersey v. T.L.O., 469 U.S. 325 (1985). Supreme Court of the United States, decided January 15, 1985. link · Safford Unified School District #1 v. Redding, 557 U.S. 364 (2009). Supreme Court of the United States, decided June 25, 2009. link

Motion 33. Dress codes and uniforms: Amend School Sponsored Clubs (part 9)

Current language. *53 creates a significant risk of disruption to the school environment; clothing worn in such a manner so as to reveal underwear, cleavage or bare skin; spaghetti straps, strapless tops, halter tops, see-through or mesh garments or other clothing that is physically revealing, provocative or contains sexually suggestive comments ● Severity Level 3 - Invasive*

Why. The best causal evidence on uniforms (school fixed effects in a large urban district) finds a modest attendance gain in secondary grades and no effect on achievement or discipline, and national longitudinal data show no behavior or attendance advantage; the evidence that dress rules improve learning is weak. The evidence on enforcement is clearer: GAO's national review found dress codes restrict items typically worn by girls more than boys, strict enforcement in more than four in five predominantly Black schools against about one third of predominantly white schools, informal class removals in 44 percent of codes, and body-measuring rules in 60 percent; Black girls receive disproportionate office referrals for dress code and other subjective infractions.

> School Sponsored Clubs (part 9): Student Dress Code The Greene County dress code shall be limited to health and safety requirements and to prohibiting clothing that displays obscenity, threats, hate speech, or the promotion of illegal substances or violence. Students shall be permitted to wear religious and cultural dress and head coverings, protective and natural hairstyles, and clothing consistent with their gender identity. No rule shall apply to one sex only or require a staff member to measure any part of a student's body or clothing. Shoulders, collarbones, midriffs and leggings shall not be grounds for discipline. A violation shall be addressed by private conversation and, where available, a loaner garment. No student shall be removed from class, sent home, assigned in-school or out-of-school suspension, or excluded from any school activity for a violation, and no staff member shall comment on a student's body in enforcing this policy. Each principal shall log every intervention, including informal removals, in the student information system. The Superintendent shall report to the Board by September 30 each year the prior school year's interventions by school, race and sex, and the Board shall revise any rule whose enforcement rate for Black or female students exceeds twice the rate for white or male

> students. A uniform requirement shall provide free uniforms to students qualifying for free or reduced-price meals and shall not be enforced by exclusion from instruction.

How the Board will know it worked. Dress code interventions, class removals and suspensions per 100 students by building, race and sex, drawn from the student information system log that includes informal removals; instructional minutes lost to dress code enforcement; share of code rules that are gender-specific or require measuring a student's body; parent and student complaints about dress enforcement. Target: Zero class removals, send-homes, suspensions or activity exclusions for dress code violations in every year after adoption; zero gender-specific rules and zero body-measuring rules in the district and building codes within 90 days; and no student group's dress code intervention rate exceeding twice the rate for white or male students in any building by the end of year one, holding in years two and three. Annual report to the Board by September 30 covering the prior school year, presented by the Superintendent, with the count of rules revised or repealed and the number of complaints received, and posted publicly with the Board minutes.

Gentile E, Imberman SA (2012). Dressed for success? The effect of school uniforms on student achievement and behavior. Journal of Urban Economics 71(1):1-17. doi · Brunsma DL, Rockquemore KA (1998). Effects of student uniforms on attendance, behavior problems, substance use, and academic achievement. Journal of Educational Research 92(1):53-62. doi · Ansari A, Shepard M, Gottfried MA (2022). School uniforms and student behavior: is there a link? Early Childhood Research Quarterly 58:278-286. doi

Motion 34. Grading practices (zeros, late work, minimum grades, standards-based grading): New policy (academics and access)

Current language. None; the manual is silent.

Why. Grades measure a mix of academic mastery and behavior and vary widely from teacher to teacher. The causal evidence favors two things: higher grading standards raise learning (Algebra I students of tougher graders learn more and keep the gain in later courses), and a standards-based system with formative feedback and reassessment for full credit raised ninth-grade math test scores by 0.33 SD in a cluster RCT. The specific rules districts fight over, no zeros, 50-percent floors and late-work penalties, have almost no outcome research; the one study of a minimum-grade policy is from a single school.

> Greene County Board of Education Policy No. [to be assigned]: Grading and Reporting of Student Achievement Each teacher shall publish to students and parents, within the first ten school days of each course, the standards the course assesses, the categories and weights used to compute the grade, the reassessment procedure, and the late-work procedure. The reported academic grade shall reflect achievement on course standards. Attendance, participation, effort and conduct shall be reported separately and shall not reduce the academic grade. A student who does not meet a standard on a summative assessment shall be permitted at least one reassessment of that standard within the grading period, and the higher score shall count. Late work submitted within the grading period shall be scored on the same standard as on-time work, and any penalty for lateness shall be reported in the separate conduct or work-habits mark. Teachers of the same course in the same school shall

> use a common grading scale and weights. The Director of Assessment shall report to the Board each August, by school and course, the correlation between final grades and end-of-course or state test scores, the failure rate by teacher for courses with three or more sections, and the number of grading appeals, and shall recommend revisions to this policy where grades and test results diverge.

How the Board will know it worked. Correlation between final course grades and end-of-course or state test scores by school and course; spread of failure rates across teachers of the same course; share of students with a D or F who passed the end-of-course exam and vice versa; count of grading appeals; share of courses with a published grading plan within ten school days. Target: Within 1 year, 100 percent of courses have a published grading plan within the first ten school days and all same-course sections in a school use a common scale and weights; within 1 to 3 years, the grade-to-test correlation rises and the spread of failure rates across teachers of the same course narrows in every school and course relative to the baseline, and the share of students with a D or F who passed the exam, and with an A or B who failed it, falls each year. The Director of Assessment reports to the Board each August, by school and course, with the first report due in the August following adoption and the baseline comparison carried forward in every later report.

Brookhart SM, Guskey TR, Bowers AJ, McMillan JH, Smith JK, Smith LF, Stevens MT, Welsh ME (2016). A century of grading research: Meaning and value in the most common educational measure. Review of Educational Research 86(4):803-848. doi · Kramer SL, Posner B, Browman A, Lawrence N, Cardichon J (2024). The impacts of a standards-based grading system emphasizing formative assessment, feedback, and re-assessment: A mixed methods, cluster randomized control trial in ninth grade mathematics classrooms. Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness 18(1):56-87. doi · Gershenson S, Holt SB, Tyner A (2024). Making the grade: The effect of teacher grading standards on student outcomes. Contemporary Economic Policy 42(2):305-318. doi

Motion 35. Student data privacy and vendor contracts: New policy (technology and data)

Current language. None; the manual is silent.

Why. Audits find that most school-assigned apps send student data to third parties (Internet Safety Labs: 96% of apps used in a sample of 663 US schools; Human Rights Watch: 146 of 164 government-endorsed products worldwide, 89%, engaged in practices that risked children's rights), and breaches are frequent and large (99 K-12 breaches reported to the GAO sample 2016 to 2020; the December 2024 PowerSchool breach reached tens of millions of student records). There is no outcome research showing that any particular policy reduces harm; the standard rests on federal and state law and professional consensus.

> Policy IFBG Student Data Privacy No employee shall use, or direct students to use, any application, website or service that collects personally identifiable student information unless the Director of Technology has placed it on the district's approved-software list. A product shall be approved only after the Director of Technology and the district's designated Privacy Officer confirm a signed data privacy agreement that (a) limits collection to data needed for the stated educational purpose, (b) prohibits sale of data, targeted advertising,

> profiling and use of student data to train or improve vendor products, (c) requires deletion or return of student data within 60 days of a district request or contract end, (d) requires notice to the district within 72 hours of a confirmed breach, and (e) names the subcontractors who will receive data. The Director of Technology shall publish the approved-software list, with the data elements each product collects, on the district website and update it within 30 days of any change. The Privacy Officer shall report to the Board by September 30 each year the number of products reviewed, approved and removed, every breach and the date families were notified, and the status of parent requests to inspect or correct records under FERPA. Teachers shall receive privacy training at least once each year; completion shall be reported with the annual report.

How the Board will know it worked. Share of software products in use that collect student PII with a signed data privacy agreement on file containing all five required terms, plus days from confirmed breach to family notification and share of FERPA parent requests fulfilled within the statutory window Target: 100% of products in use have a compliant signed agreement by the end of year one and at every September 30 report thereafter; every confirmed breach is reported by the vendor within 72 hours; the public list is updated within 30 days of each change; 100% of teachers complete annual training Privacy Officer presents to the Board by September 30 each year, with the public approved-software list and breach log posted on the district website

Federal Trade Commission (2022). Policy Statement of the Federal Trade Commission on Education Technology and the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act. Adopted May 19, 2022. link · Human Rights Watch (2022). How Dare They Peep into My Private Life? Children's Rights Violations by Governments that Endorsed Online Learning during the Covid-19 Pandemic. link · Internet Safety Labs (2022). 2022 K-12 EdTech Safety Benchmark: National Findings, Part 1. December 13, 2022. link

Motion 36. Personal phones during the school day: Amend Arrival & Dismissal

Current language. *CELL PHONES & PERSONAL ITEMS of VALUE Students are allowed to carry cell phones; however, they must remain powered off throughout the school day.*

Why. Banning phone possession during the school day raises test scores modestly, with the gain concentrated among lower-achieving students (England: +0.07 SD overall, about +0.14 SD for the lowest quintile). Norway's middle-school bans cut bullying for both sexes and improved girls' grades, academic-track placement and mental-health care use, with no average effect on boys; the pooled effect across five European studies is small (d = 0.16) and larger for social wellbeing than for achievement.

> CELL PHONES & PERSONAL ITEMS of VALUE 72 Students shall keep personal electronic devices, including phones, smartwatches and earbuds, powered off and stored in a location designated by the principal, away from the student, from the start of the first scheduled period through the end of the last scheduled period, including passing time and lunch. Exceptions shall be granted only (a) where required by a student's IEP, Section 504 plan or a written medical order on file with the school nurse, or (b) for a specific lesson at the written direction of the teacher. Each Greene County school shall provide a telephone through which

> a parent or guardian can reach a student during the school day. The Superintendent shall report to the Board by October 1 each year the number of device violations by school and grade, the number of exemptions on file, and the results of a fall classroom walkthrough sample. Violations shall be handled under the progressive discipline matrix and shall not result in exclusion from instruction for a first or second offense.

How the Board will know it worked. Share of classrooms observed with phones stored in the semester walkthrough sample; device-violation referrals per 100 students by school and grade; student survey item on in-class distraction; and the state assessment trend for the lowest-achieving quartile compared with the district average. Target: Within 1 year, the share of classrooms with phones stored rises and device-violation referrals per 100 students fall from the first semester to the second; within 1 to 3 years, the student distraction item improves and the lowest-achieving quartile's state assessment trend closes toward the district average rather than widening, with no first or second offense resulting in exclusion from instruction in any year. The Superintendent presents the annual report to the Board by October 1 each year, disaggregated by school and grade, and the Board reviews the lowest-quartile achievement trend at the same meeting once state assessment results are available.

Beland LP, Murphy R (2016). Ill Communication: Technology, distraction and student performance. Labour Economics 41:61-76. doi · Abrahamsson S (2026). Smartphone Bans, Student Outcomes and Mental Health. Journal of Human Resources, 0224-13403R2 (online first). doi · Kessel D, Hardardottir HL, Tyrefors B (2020). The impact of banning mobile phones in Swedish secondary schools. Economics of Education Review 77:102009. doi

Motion 37. Suspension and expulsion: Amend Types of Actions (part 7)

Current language. *A principal or assistant principal may suspend a student without notice of the reason for the suspension or an opportunity to provide an explanation if the student is intoxicated, under the influence of drugs, or where his/her presence otherwise poses a continuing*

Why. Out-of-school suspension lowers the suspended student's own math and reading achievement (Philadelphia student panel with instrumental variables), and attending a school with a one standard deviation higher suspension rate raises the chance of adult arrest and incarceration by 15 to 20 percent (North Carolina boundary-change natural experiment). Reforms that ended suspension for minor nonviolent conduct raised achievement and attendance in New York City and Chicago, while reforms that cut suspensions without a replacement behavior system lowered achievement and raised absences for most students in Los Angeles and Philadelphia.

> 4. Out of School Suspension (Short-Term) - Limits and Reporting Out of school suspension shall be imposed only when a student's presence poses a danger to persons or property or an ongoing threat of serious disruption to instruction, and only after the principal has documented the less restrictive interventions attempted under the district's tiered behavior system. No student shall be suspended out of school for defiance, disrespect, dress code, tardiness, truancy or other attendance-related conduct. A single out of school suspension shall not exceed five (5) school days except for conduct for which state or federal law

> requires a longer exclusion. Every suspended student shall receive assignments and instruction during the exclusion and a re-entry meeting with a staff member on the first day back. Each principal shall report monthly to the Superintendent the number of suspensions, days lost and the offense category for each, by race, disability status, sex and English-learner status. The Superintendent shall publish to the Board by September 30 each year a report for the prior school year showing suspensions and expulsions per 100 students by building and student group, the risk ratio for Black students and for students with disabilities, and the corrective plan for any building whose risk ratio exceeds 2.0. The Board shall review this policy against that report at a public meeting each October.

How the Board will know it worked. Out-of-school suspensions per 100 students and instructional days lost, by building and by race, disability, sex and English-learner status; share of suspensions for subjective or nonviolent categories (defiance, disrespect, dress code, tardiness, attendance); risk ratios for Black students and students with disabilities; attendance and achievement of non-suspended peers in buildings that reduce suspensions. Target: Within one year of adoption, zero out-of-school suspensions recorded for defiance, disrespect, dress code, tardiness, truancy or other attendance conduct, and no single suspension exceeding five school days outside the state and federal exceptions; within 1 to 3 years, every building's risk ratio for Black students and for students with disabilities at or below 2.0, with suspensions per 100 students and days lost declining each year while attendance and achievement of non-suspended students in those buildings hold steady or improve. Monthly principal reports to the Superintendent; an annual Superintendent report to the Board by September 30 covering the prior school year, published publicly, with the corrective plan for any building above a 2.0 risk ratio; Board review of the policy at a public meeting each October.

Bacher-Hicks A, Billings SB, Deming DJ (2024). The school-to-prison pipeline: long-run impacts of school suspensions on adult crime. American Economic Journal: Economic Policy 16(4):165-193. doi · Lacoe J, Steinberg MP (2019). Do suspensions affect student outcomes? Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 41(1):34-62. doi · Sorensen LC, Bushway SD, Gifford EJ (2022). Getting tough? The effects of discretionary principal discipline on student outcomes. Education Finance and Policy 17(2):255-284. doi

One page for the public

SCORE	SECTIONS READ	DOMAINS	CONFLICT
26	85	57	4

SILENT
49

Policies that conflict with the evidence: The following penalties may be assessed (chronic absence response); Types of Actions (part 3) (tiered positive behavior supports and restorative practices); Penalties for Weapons (part 2) (student searches and due

process in discipline); School Sponsored Clubs (part 9) (dress codes and uniforms). Nothing in the manual on: early literacy instruction and k-3 reading screening, corporal punishment, dual enrollment and early college, high-dosage tutoring, school-based mental health, counseling and suicide prevention, school resource officers and school policing, high-quality instructional materials and adoption, multi-tiered systems of support (mtss / rti), behavioral threat assessment, english learner programs and reclassification, classroom temperature, ventilation and indoor air, secondary school start time, generative ai use by students and staff, gifted and advanced learner identification, grade retention and promotion, hazing and athletics safety, lockdown and active shooter drills, math acceleration, eighth grade algebra, and tracking, recess, access to rigorous coursework (automatic enrollment, ap, ib, dual credit), special education placement and inclusion, new teacher induction and mentoring, school nurses and health services, seated lunch time, physical restraint and seclusion, lead in school drinking water, language access for families, grading practices (zeros, late work, minimum grades, standards-based grading), student data privacy and vendor contracts.

Alignment Audit by EarthPilot. Every citation is checked against Crossref and OpenAlex before it is shown; evidence tiers and counter-evidence are printed, not hidden. Scores are a judgment with a published formula, not a measurement.