



# Policy News

## Topics

**On-campus interviews of child abuse victims**

**Expansion of COBRA premium assistance**

**Background checks for activity supervisors**

**Race to the Top initiatives**

**Governor's obesity summit and follow-up actions**

**Summer meal programs**

**Disciplining students for off-campus cyberbullying**

**CSBA education opportunities**

- Roadmap to Policy Updates
- Policy Online Webinar
- Training for Executive Assistants

**New resources from CSBA**

- Oral health policy guidebook
- Policy brief on discrimination and harassment of students
- Physical education and activity resources
- Annual report of policy services

**Customer Satisfaction Is Our Goal**

If you have any comments, suggestions or questions about CSBA's sample policies and regulations or our various policy services, please contact Martin Gonzalez, deputy executive director, Financial Programs and Policy Services, at (800) 266-3382 or [mgonzalez@csba.org](mailto:mgonzalez@csba.org).

## On-campus interviews of child abuse victims

A recent decision by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals (*Greene v. Camreta*) defines the parameters under which social workers and law enforcement may conduct on-campus interviews of alleged victims of child abuse. A copy of the court decision can be found at [www.ca9.uscourts.gov/opinions/view\\_subpage.php?pk\\_id=0000010134](http://www.ca9.uscourts.gov/opinions/view_subpage.php?pk_id=0000010134).

### Background

In this case, a man was arrested on suspicion of molesting his nine-year-old daughter and another child. A caseworker from the Oregon Department of Human Services, accompanied by a deputy sheriff, interviewed the daughter at school. The interview lasted two hours. The child admitted that her father had molested her, but later recanted, and a physical examination failed to confirm abuse. The child's mother filed suit on behalf of her daughter alleging that the questioning constituted a "seizure" under the Fourth Amendment and interfered with her and her child's right to have a parent present.

The court made a distinction between the circumstances of this case and searches and seizures by school officials related to maintaining school discipline. For school discipline purposes, school officials do not need a warrant or parental permission, but are required to demonstrate "reasonable suspicion" in accordance with long-established case law. However, in this case, school officials were not present and the interview had a law enforcement objective (i.e., police investigating the father, uniformed officer present at the interview). For "seizures" by law enforcement, the traditional Fourth Amendment protection applies, meaning that the interview ("seizure") can only occur (1) under exigent circumstances, (2) per court order or warrant, or (3) with parental consent. It is important to note that the school district was not a party to the litigation at this stage of the process; thus, this case did not create any new liability for districts.

There is much debate in the legal community within the Ninth Circuit as to how broadly to interpret this court decision or whether the holding can be limited to the specific facts of the case. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals declined review of the case. Defendants have indicated that they plan to request that the U.S. Supreme Court hear the case, but the Supreme Court accepts few cases and such a process is lengthy. Thus, in the meantime, districts/county offices of education (COEs) will need to proceed cautiously until the case is ultimately resolved by the courts.

### Impact on school districts and COEs

CSBA has revised AR 5141.4 - Child Abuse Prevention and Reporting and BP 5145.11 - Questioning and Apprehension by Law Enforcement to reflect this court decision. CSBA has also developed a new sample form (E 5145.11) to use when law enforcement interviews a student at school.



There are many unresolved questions and the case law is still evolving on this issue. CSBA recommends consultation with legal counsel prior to adopting these revised materials and using the sample form. In addition, CSBA strongly recommends consultation with city or county law enforcement officials and social services representatives to develop procedures for interviewing students at school. Obviously it is in the best interest of all agencies if these issues can be discussed before the need for an interview arises to ensure that the procedures preserve students' privacy rights while at the same time allow law enforcement officials to perform their investigative duties.

The revised samples reflect the following:

- **Interviews by social services agencies:** California law (Penal Code §11174.3) authorizes social workers to interview students at school. This court opinion does not require schools to turn away social workers investigating reports of child abuse nor does it require social workers to present a warrant, court order or evidence of parental consent prior to conducting an interview. However, if a social worker is accompanied by law enforcement, then the interview should be conducted in accordance with the procedures in BP 5145.11 - Questioning and Apprehension by Law Enforcement.
- **Interviews by law enforcement:** While open to interpretation, this decision can be read to place limits on law enforcement interviews of students on school grounds, whether the interview is concerning an investigation of child abuse or another issue. Before interviewing a student, law enforcement should first obtain a court order or warrant, have parental consent or demonstrate exigent circumstances necessitating the interview. Although it is the responsibility of law enforcement to determine if the questioning is lawful and that these conditions are satisfied, school officials must be careful when acquiescing to student interviews by law enforcement and consult legal counsel as necessary.
- **Interviews by school resource officers or school personnel:** This court decision has no impact on interviews of students by school resource officers or other district/COE personnel pertaining to school discipline issues.
- **Mandated reporters:** This case has no impact on the laws regarding mandated reporting of suspected child abuse. Persons specified in law as mandated reporters are required to report any suspected child abuse or neglect to the appropriate agency.

---

## Expansion of COBRA premium assistance

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act provides for reduced premiums for health continuation coverage under the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (COBRA) or Cal-COBRA. "Assistance eligible individuals" pay only 35 percent of their COBRA premiums and the remaining 65 percent is reimbursed to the coverage provider (either the employer, insurer or health plan provider, as applicable) through a tax credit.

Assistance eligible individuals are those who have been involuntarily terminated, other than by reason of gross misconduct, since September 1, 2008. The program has been extended more than once since the ARRA was first enacted. The Department of Defense Appropriations Act of 2010 (P.L. 111-118, Sec. 1010), signed by President Barack Obama on December 19, 2009, extended the program until the end of February 2010. Then, on March 10, the President signed the Temporary Extension Act of 2010 (P.L. 111-144, Sec. 3), which extends the subsidy to individuals who were involuntarily terminated up to March 31, 2010. The Temporary Extension Act also provides that individuals may be eligible if their COBRA eligibility was originally caused by a reduction in hours of employment and they subsequently experienced an involuntary termination between March 2 and March 31, 2010. It is the responsibility of the health care service plan administrator to notify individuals of their eligibility, once the administrator is notified by the district/COE of the COBRA qualifying event.

CSBA has revised BP/AR 4154/4254/4354 - Health and Welfare Benefits to reflect these changes in law.

However, districts/COEs should be aware that it is likely the program will be extended again. As of this writing, numerous bills have been proposed to extend the subsidy to individuals involuntarily terminated up to April 30, June 30 or December 31, 2010.

Because of the frequent changes in the dates defining assistance eligible individuals, CSBA has revised AR 4154/4254/4354 to add "or a later date if extended by law." This statement should make the administrative regulation legally compliant in the event of future extensions but, to the extent possible, districts/COEs should attempt to monitor and update their regulations to keep them up to date. CSBA will issue alerts and update this sample administrative regulation as needed.

For further information about the COBRA subsidy, visit [www.dol.gov/ebsa/COBRA.html](http://www.dol.gov/ebsa/COBRA.html).

---

## Background checks for activity supervisors

Beginning July 1, 2010, new state law (AB 1025, 2009) requires any noncertificated employee or volunteer who supervises, directs or coaches a student activity program that is sponsored by or affiliated with a district/COE to possess an Activity Supervisor Clearance Certificate issued by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). Student activity programs include, but are not limited to, scholastic programs, interscholastic programs and extracurricular activities such as cheer team, drill team, dance team and marching band. Volunteer supervisors for breakfast, lunch or other nutritional periods and nonteaching volunteer aides under the immediate supervision and direction of certificated personnel are excluded from the new requirement.

In addition to submitting an application and processing fee, individuals applying for the certificate must electronically submit fingerprints for processing by LiveScan using a form on the CTC Web site ([www.ctc.ca.gov](http://www.ctc.ca.gov)). Even if classified employees or other persons have already passed a Department of Justice clearance as part of obtaining clearance for their employment, they are still required to obtain this new certificate if their duties fall within the scope of AB 1025. The background check required by AB 1025 is broader and includes clearance from the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The certificate will be valid for five years and is renewable.

There has been some concern that the cost of the application (\$51 for the fingerprinting and criminal background check plus \$55 for the application processing fee) would discourage volunteerism in the schools, but it is important to note that this law is not applicable to all volunteers.

The CTC's *Frequently Asked Questions* regarding the implementation of AB 1025 (available at [www.ctc.ca.gov/credentials/files/ASCC-FAQ.pdf](http://www.ctc.ca.gov/credentials/files/ASCC-FAQ.pdf)) emphasizes that the requirement applies only to individuals who "supervise, direct or coach" an activity program. For instance, it would generally not apply to an assistant coach who reports to a head coach, a volunteer chaperoning a field trip or a classified staff person working in an after-school program unless he/she supervises the program. However, it is the responsibility of the district/COE to determine which of its positions are subject to the new law and whether it wishes to extend the requirement to any other positions beyond those mandated by law to obtain the certificate.

The new qualifications requirement is reflected in the revised BP/AR 4127/4227/4327 - Temporary Athletic Team Coaches and BP/AR 1240 - Volunteer Assistance.

Note that the CTC does not address whether or not a holder of this certificate will be considered a certificated or classified employee. According to the CTC, this determination is a local employment issue.





## Race to the Top initiatives

A number of bills were passed in the Fifth Extraordinary Session (SBX5 1, SBX5 2 and SBX5 4) in an effort to make California more competitive for the federal Race to the Top grant program. Although California was not one of the finalists in Phase 1 of that program, the bills are now law and affect all districts/COEs. Key provisions of the legislative package include common core standards, open enrollment, interventions in persistently lowest achieving schools, and parent empowerment to petition the governing board for an intervention.

For further information, see the Web site of the California Department of Education (CDE) at [www.cde.ca.gov](http://www.cde.ca.gov) as well as CSBA's advisory, *Race to the Top Enabling Legislation: Implications for All School Districts and County Offices of Education*, at [www.csba.org](http://www.csba.org). As soon as further guidance from the CDE and new state regulations are finalized, CSBA will be issuing new or revised sample policies as appropriate to address local responsibilities related to these initiatives.

### Common core standards

By August 2, 2010, the State Board of Education (SBE) is required to either adopt or reject common core standards aligned with national standards in language arts and mathematics, as recommended by the Academic Content Standards Commission. If the SBE adopts the standards, the Curriculum Commission will immediately begin the process to create the related curriculum frameworks and then to approve a timeline for instructional materials adoption.

### Open enrollment

The Open Enrollment Act allows any student enrolled in one of the 1,000 schools identified by the CDE as “low-achieving schools” to enroll in a higher performing school within the district/COE or any other public school in the state. By the first day of the school year (except as otherwise specified), districts/COEs with low-achieving schools must notify parents of the school’s status and the option to transfer. Parents will be required to apply for a transfer by January 1, 2011, for the 2011-12 school year and must be notified within 60 days if their application to transfer will be accepted or denied.

Districts/COEs should be aware that the timelines for this option do not align with existing interdistrict transfer laws. Over the spring and summer, they should develop the transfer application, as well as local criteria and procedures for acceptance or denial of transfer applications, in order to be prepared to send the notification and the application on the first day of the school year. The SBE will be adopting emergency regulations to provide further guidance on implementation.

### Interventions in persistently lowest achieving schools

Based on the definition provided in law, the CDE has identified and posted a list of “persistently lowest achieving schools” in the state. These schools may apply for School Improvement Grants to implement one of four intervention models:

- **Turnaround model.** The district/COE must replace the principal and up to 50 percent of the staff and grant the new principal sufficient operational flexibility to implement a comprehensive approach to improve student achievement and graduation rates.
- **Restart model.** The district/COE converts a school or closes and reopens a school under a charter school operator, charter management organization or education management organization.
- **School closure.** The school is closed and its students enrolled in other, higher achieving schools within the district/COE.

- **Transformation model.** The district/COE implements a range of strategies including replacement of the principal, staff evaluation systems that include use of student achievement data, rewards for staff who have increased student achievement and removal of staff who have not, high-quality professional development and other strategies designed to recruit, place and retain skilled staff.

The selection of the intervention model is at the discretion of the governing board, following at least two public hearings.

## Parent empowerment

When a school is not identified as “persistently lowest achieving” but meets other specified criteria (i.e., is subject to corrective action under the No Child Left Behind Act, continues to not make adequate yearly progress and has an Academic Performance Index of less than 800), parents may petition the board to implement one of the intervention models listed above or other alternative governance arrangements authorized by the No Child Left Behind Act. The petition must have signatures of at least 50 percent of the parents of current and future students who normally matriculate into a particular school site. The district/COE must implement the specific intervention requested in the petition unless the board holds a public hearing, makes a written finding stating the reason it cannot implement that model and designates another intervention model that will be implemented in the following school year. The board also shall not be required to implement the model requested by the petition if the request is for reasons other than improving academic achievement or student safety.

The Parent Empowerment Act is limited to 75 schools statewide. The schools that will be subject to the petition are the first 75 schools whose district/COE notifies the Superintendent of Public Instruction that the board has approved the petition.

## Governor’s obesity summit and follow-up actions

On February 24, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger convened the *2010 Summit on Health, Nutrition and Obesity: Action for Healthy Living*, bringing together a diverse group of stakeholders from both the public and private sectors to discuss strategies for promoting the health and physical fitness of Californians. The summit featured a discussion with the Governor and former President Bill Clinton, moderated by The California Endowment’s President and Chief Executive Officer Dr. Robert Ross, which focused on three topic areas: promoting healthy beverages, increasing physical activity and incorporating the idea of “health in all policies.”

Subsequently, the governor announced legislation he is sponsoring toward the goals of the summit, which would:

- Require school districts/COEs to make fresh, free drinking water available in food service areas by January 1, 2012 (SB 1413)
- Eliminate electrolyte replacement beverages (i.e., sports drinks) from being sold during the day in public middle and high schools by July 1, 2011 (SB 1255)
- Require students to spend at least 50 percent of physical education class time in moderate to vigorous physical activity and require after-school programs to provide at least 30 minutes of moderate to vigorous physical activity to all students, effective January 1, 2013 (AB 2705)
- Expand eligibility and flexibility for communities to apply for joint use funds for shared recreational facilities (AB 2705)





CSBA is tracking the proposed legislation and will update the relevant sample policies and administrative regulations should the legislation become law.

In addition, the governor hopes to expand the Governor's Fitness Challenge to one million participants in 2010; has called for the development of strategies to ensure equitable access to Safe Routes to School state program funding for schools that have the highest concentrations of children in need; and has issued an executive order to establish a Health in All Policies Task Force to help identify priority programs, policies and strategies to improve the health of Californians.

---

## Summer meal programs

Noting that the number of families struggling to put food on the table is "skyrocketing," Superintendent of Public Instruction Jack O'Connell is encouraging school districts and COEs to increase participation in programs that give students access to nutritious meals during the summer months.

Last summer, only 30 percent of eligible students participated in one of the two summer meal programs administered by the CDE. The Summer Food Service Program is a federally funded program that reimburses agencies for providing nutritious meals to children age 18 and younger during periods when school is not in session for 15 continuous school days. The Seamless Summer Feeding Option provides meals in low-income areas and is for agencies participating in the National School Lunch or Breakfast Program.

In a letter dated January 6, 2010, O'Connell urges districts/COEs to locate summer school sessions at sites where at least 50 percent of enrolled students are eligible for free or reduced-price meals so they will be able to provide summer meals to all students attending summer school and all children in the surrounding community. He adds that access to summer meal programs can be expanded by coordinating with recreation districts and community organizations to provide students with summer meals in safe settings when schools close for the summer. In June, schools should provide information to students and parents about the location(s) and dates that summer meal sites will operate.

For further information about summer meal programs, see [www.cde.ca.gov/lb/nu/sf](http://www.cde.ca.gov/lb/nu/sf).

---

## Disciplining students for off-campus cyberbullying

The Internet and other technologies provide valuable educational and communication tools for students, but have also given tech-savvy students a new venue to harass or intimidate peers or school staff. As a result, boards have adopted policies to discourage cyberbullying and provide for disciplinary consequences for students who engage in such conduct (see BP 5131 - Conduct). However, since such conduct frequently is initiated off campus using students' personal equipment, questions continue to arise regarding how far districts/COEs can go in disciplining students for their off-campus conduct. The need to protect students and staff from harm must be balanced with students' First Amendment right to freedom of speech.

A number of disputes regarding this question have landed in the courts. In an unpublished case in 2009 (*J.C. v. Beverly Hills Unified School District*), a California federal court held that a district may discipline a student for off-campus conduct only if the conduct (1) impacts school activities or is brought to the attention of school authorities, and (2) causes, or is foreseeably likely to cause, a substantial disruption of school activities. In this case, the student recorded a video insulting another student. The video was created off campus, not using district equipment, and was posted on YouTube. The court found that the discipline imposed on this student was not justified because the district did not present evidence

of specific facts that led school officials to predict that the video would cause substantial disruption. The video was not threatening and did not lead to any confrontation between the students. The court stated that “substantial disruption” goes beyond ordinary personality conflicts, hurt feelings or embarrassment that occurs among middle school students. CSBA has revised BP 5131 to reflect this court decision.

Other court decisions from across the country, although not directly applicable in California, underscore the difficulty in disciplining a student for off-campus conduct. For example, in *Layshock v. Hermitage School District* (2010), the Third Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that a Pennsylvania school district violated the free speech rights of a high school student who was disciplined for creating an off-campus parody MySpace profile of the school principal. The student had downloaded the principal’s photograph from the school’s Web site and created what the district considered to be a vulgar, lewd and offensive profile, which other students began accessing on school computers after hearing about it. Nevertheless, the court found that the relationship between the conduct and the school was so attenuated that it could not allow school authorities to “reach into a child’s home and control his/her actions there.”

On the other hand, in *J.S. v. Blue Mountain School District* (2010), the Third Circuit Court of Appeals ruled in favor of a school district that had disciplined a student for creating an off-campus fake MySpace profile of a principal which used profanity and depicted the principal as a pedophile and sex addict. Even though substantial disruption in school activities had not yet occurred, the court was sufficiently persuaded that the profile presented a reasonable possibility of a future disruption. The court stated, “We simply cannot agree that a principal may not regulate student speech rising to this level of vulgarity and containing such reckless and damaging information so as to undermine the principal’s authority within the school, and potentially arouse suspicions among the school community about his character.”

These court decisions, and others that are beginning to emerge, illustrate the need for districts/COEs to proceed cautiously when considering student discipline for off-campus conduct, consult with legal counsel, and document, with specific examples, how the speech significantly disrupted, or was likely to disrupt, school activities or the targeted student’s educational performance.

---

## CSBA education opportunities

To register online or learn more about any of the following education opportunities, go to the Events Calendar on CSBA’s Web site at [www.csba.org](http://www.csba.org) or contact CSBA at (800) 266-3382.

### Roadmap to Policy Updates

CSBA’s complimentary Roadmap to Policy Updates workshop helps districts/COEs maximize the benefits they receive from CSBA’s policy services. In this 2½ hour workshop, participants will explore and discuss best practices and procedures for keeping their policy manual current through CSBA’s GAMUT Online and Manual Maintenance services and will discover ways to access policies online. The workshop includes a discussion of the components of a policy manual and a GAMUT Online demonstration.

Upcoming workshops include:

- May 4 – Kern County Office of Education
- May 12 – Stanislaus County Office of Education
- May 18 – Shasta County Office of Education
- May 26 – CSBA, West Sacramento

Executive assistants, administrators, board members, board policy committee members and others charged with the task of creating or maintaining the policy manual would all benefit from this workshop.





## Policy Online Webinar

Districts/COEs that have placed their policy manuals online through CSBA's Policy Online service are invited to participate in a complimentary Webinar to hear more about the features of the service. *My Policy Manual is Online: Now What?* will assist board members and staff with locating, viewing, printing and downloading policies. Districts/COEs will also learn how to increase transparency by giving staff and the public access to their policy manual.

The Webinar is scheduled for April 22 from 10:00-11:00 a.m. and June 24 from 2:30-3:30 p.m.

## Training for Executive Assistants

This popular session will give executive assistants the skills, tools and strategies they need to effectively meet the needs of the superintendent, board, students and community. The \$125 registration fee includes a continental breakfast, lunch and materials. The all-day (9:00 a.m. - 3:00 p.m.) session is scheduled for:

- April 19 - Sacramento County Office of Education
- April 27 - Santa Clara County Office of Education
- April 30 - West End Education Service Center, Rancho Cucamonga

## New resources from CSBA

### Oral health policy guidebook

CSBA and the Dental Health Foundation have jointly issued a comprehensive guidebook designed to empower governance teams to create an effective school-based oral health infrastructure. *Integrating Oral Health into School Health Programs and Policies* provides background information, district/COE strategies, policy development tools, case studies and resources for addressing students' oral health needs. It is based on the recognition that a broad-based, collaborative effort involving local governmental agencies, community organizations, health professionals, parents, students and other stakeholders is the most cost-effective and efficient means of implementing effective oral health programs and policies.

"Research shows that untreated dental decay and other oral health problems can lead to school absences, difficulty concentrating and lower academic achievement. Unfortunately, budget cuts and the temporary suspension of requirements for oral health assessments upon school entry have hurt efforts to promote children's oral health," says Martin Gonzalez, CSBA's deputy executive director, Financial Programs and Policy Services. "However, school districts and county offices have opportunities—through policies, curriculum and school health services—to be partners in supporting children's health. This new guide from CSBA and DHF outlines key issues that governance teams should consider as they develop strategies to address this issue."

The guide, along with CSBA's related 2008 policy brief and other oral health resources, is available at [www.csba.org/wellness.aspx](http://www.csba.org/wellness.aspx). This project was supported by a grant from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.

### Policy brief on discrimination and harassment of students

To help boards understand their responsibility to provide a school environment that is free of harassment, CSBA has issued a new policy brief, *Providing a Safe, Nondiscriminatory School Environment for All Students*, and has updated its sample BP 5145.3 - Nondiscrimination/Harassment.

While state and federal law prohibit discrimination with respect to many personal characteristics (ethnicity, race, religion, disability, etc.), this brief focuses on issues surrounding discrimination and harassment of students on the basis of gender or gender nonconformity. The brief outlines the problem and describes the negative consequences of harassment for students, such as physical, emotional and psychological harm; decreased attention, concentration and achievement; and increased school absences. It also examines the role of the governance team in promoting a positive climate free from discrimination and establishing effective procedures to address grievances.

This policy brief, developed with support by a grant from the Ford Foundation, will be available on CSBA's Web site at [www.csba.org/pab.aspx](http://www.csba.org/pab.aspx). It is part of a broader two-year project addressing issues of comprehensive sexual health education.

## Physical education and activity resources

CSBA and California Project LEAN (Leaders Encouraging Activity and Nutrition) jointly hosted three trainings entitled "Policy in Action: Maximizing Physical Activity Opportunities in Tough Budget Times" in February and March, 2010. Attendees learned how to strengthen physical education and physical activity opportunities, develop comprehensive physical activity policies, and develop cost-effective strategies to improve the quantity and quality of physical activity before, during and after school, such as through P.E., recess, classroom activities, safe routes to school, joint use of facilities and before- and after-school programs. Materials distributed at those trainings are now available on CSBA's Web site at [www.csba.org/wellness.aspx](http://www.csba.org/wellness.aspx).

With support from The California Endowment, CSBA and California Project LEAN issued a number of resources related to physical activity, including:

- *Active Bodies, Active Minds: Physical Activity and Academic Achievement* (February 2010), a new fact sheet summarizing research on the link between physical activity and learning
- *Maximizing Opportunities for Physical Activity Through Joint Use of Facilities* (revised February 2010), a policy brief addressing a strategy to expand opportunities for physical activity through shared community use of facilities and grounds for recreational programs
- *Moderate to Vigorous Physical Activity in Physical Education to Improve Health and Academic Outcomes* (November 2009), a fact sheet which presents research and strategies for improving the quality of P.E. programs by increasing the amount of time students spend in moderate to vigorous physical activity
- *Maximizing Opportunities for Physical Activity During the School Day* (November 2009), a fact sheet presenting strategies for increasing physical activity outside the regular P.E. curriculum (e.g., during breaks in the school day, classroom-based activities, special school events, extracurricular activities) and ways that boards can support these efforts
- *Safe Routes to School: Program and Policy Strategies* (August 2009), a policy brief describing state and federal programs designed to increase walking, bicycling and other forms of active transport to and from school

In addition, in March CSBA reissued BP/AR 6142.7 - Physical Education and Activity to expand concepts related to physical activity outside the regular P.E. curriculum. A new sample policy BP 1330.1 - Joint Use Agreements outlines issues to consider when entering into agreements for joint use of either school or community facilities in order to expand opportunities for physical activity or other joint-use programs.





In May 2010, CSBA plans to conduct an online survey of district/COE perceptions and practices related to P.E. and physical activity. This survey will follow up on an earlier survey conducted by CSBA in January 2009 and assess progress and remaining challenges districts/COEs face in establishing new and implementing existing P.E. and activity policies and programs. The results of the first survey are summarized in a research brief, *Physical Education and Physical Activity in California Schools: A Survey of District/County Office of Education Perceptions and Practices* (September 2009), also available at [www.csba.org/wellness.aspx](http://www.csba.org/wellness.aspx).

## Annual report of policy services

Each year CSBA's Policy Services Department publishes an overview of the major policy issues addressed in sample policies and administrative regulations, policy briefs, fact sheets and the *Policy News* throughout the year. *2009 Policies in Review* describes critical policy issues in the categories of accountability, assessment, attendance options, child care/preschool programs, curriculum and instruction, facilities, fiscal operations, personnel, safety, special student populations, student health and miscellaneous. Appendices provide complete lists of publications, continuing education opportunities, and sample policies and regulations issued in 2009, as well as descriptions of the policy services offered by CSBA.

*2009 Policies in Review* is available at [www.csba.org/pab.aspx](http://www.csba.org/pab.aspx).



Contact us at (800) 266-3382.

3100 Beacon Boulevard | West Sacramento, CA 95691 | [www.csba.org](http://www.csba.org)