

MARK LONGIETTI, MEMBER
103 IRVIS OFFICE BUILDING
P.O. BOX 202007
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA 17120-2007
(717) 772-4035
FAX: (717) 780-4785

CONSTITUENT SERVICE OFFICE:
2213 SHENANGO VALLEY FREEWAY
UNIT 2-E
HERMITAGE, PENNSYLVANIA 16148
(724) 981-4655
FAX: (724) 981-6528

MLONGIETTI@PAHOUSE.NET
WWW.PAHOUSE.COM/LONGIETTI



House of Representatives
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
HARRISBURG

COMMITTEES

COMMERCE
MAJORITY SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMAN
ON HOUSING
EDUCATION
LOCAL GOVERNMENT
TOURISM & RECREATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
TRANSPORTATION

CAUCUSES

ALTERNATIVE ENERGY
AUTISM
FIREFIGHTERS & EMERGENCY SERVICES
GAS AND OIL
NORTHWEST
SPORTSMEN'S
STEEL

2696

August 28, 2009

Arthur Coccodrilli, Chairman
Independent Regulatory Review Commission
333 Market Street, 14th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101

RE: State Board of Education Final-Form Reg. No. 006-312
Chapter 4 Regulations – “Keystone Exams”

Dear Mr. Coccodrilli:

I am writing to you as a member of the House Education Committee and a former school solicitor to comment on and express legal concerns regarding the State Board of Education Final-Form Regulation No. 006-312 which would revise the current Chapter 4 regulations and establish the “Keystone Exams”. As I understand the regulations, end-of-course exams would be developed for implementation in 10 subject areas and exam results would constitute at least one-third of the student’s final grade, and a student scoring below Basic on an exam would receive a zero on the exam, which would be factored into the student’s final course grade, regardless of the actual number of points scored or achieved by the student. I believe that such a scoring or grading system is illegal as it would misrepresent the student’s academic record and I believe that the State Board of Education has exceeded its statutory authority by dictating a student’s score or grade.

Let me expand on these concerns. First, regarding what I believe to be the illegality of the proposed regulations, I cite the case of Katzman by Katzman v. Cumberland Valley School District, 84 Pa. Commw. 474, 479 A.2d 671 (1984), where the Commonwealth Court struck down a school district policy that reduced a student’s course grade by 2 points for every day of disciplinary suspension imposed, because such a policy would misrepresent the student’s academic record. Although the Katzman case involved the deduction of points for disciplinary reasons, I believe that the language of the court’s ruling applies to the proposed regulations here, as these regulations would require that a student receive zero credit for points scored on a Keystone Exam where the overall score is below the Basic level.

In Katzman, the Commonwealth Court stated: “Of course, for college entrance and other purposes this would result in a clear misrepresentation of the student’s scholastic achievement. Misrepresentation of achievement is equally improper, we think, illegal whether the achievement is misrepresented by upgrading or by downgrading, if either is done for reasons that are irrelevant to the achievement being graded.” Katzman at 481, A.2d at 675.

RECEIVED
2009 AUG 28 AM 11:12
INDEPENDENT REGULATORY
REVIEW COMMISSION

The Court cited cheating as an example of point deduction that is related to grading or achievement. Id. Clearly, assigning a student a zero score when or she actually scored 30 points out of 100, or some other value below the Basic threshold, is both an illegal misrepresentation of their achievement but also is unrelated to their actual grading or achievement.

Second, I also believe that the State Board of Education has exceeded its authority in attempting to adopt these regulations, particularly in regard to imposing a grade upon students that would take the Keystone Exams. The State Board derives its authority by statute, specifically Section 2603-B of the Public School Code of 1949, as amended. See, 24 P.S. §26-2603-B. The relevant grant of authority is found in 24 P.S. §26-2603-B (a), which states: "The board shall have the power, and its duty shall be, to review the statements of policy, standards, rules and regulations formulated by the Council of Basic Education and the Council of Higher Education, and adopt broad policies and principles, and establish standards governing the educational program of the Commonwealth." The assigning of a particular grade, in this case a zero for students scoring below Basic on a Keystone Exam, goes beyond "adopting broad policy and principles" or "establishing standards governing the education program of the Commonwealth". Further, the State Board's more general authority is reiterated in its own regulations found at 22 ADC §1.2 which, regarding the Function of the Board, states: "The Board will adopt broad policies and principles and establish standards governing the educational program of the Commonwealth." Once again, the specific assignment of a grade is neither a broad policy nor a broad principle and it is certainly beyond the establishment of standards governing the education program of the Commonwealth. Instead, the Public School Code grants the authority to assign grades to teachers, under the direction of the superintendent, as the Code specifically states: "Teachers in the public schools shall, under the direction of the proper superintendent of schools, grade and classify the pupils in their schools so that they may pursue the courses of study herein provided for, and all pupils found proficient may be promoted twice each year." See, 24 P.S. §15-1531.

Therefore, for the above reasons, I believe that Final-Form Reg. No. 006-312 as reported by the State Board of Education is illegal and exceeds the statutory of the State Board of Education.

Sincerely,



Mark Longiotti
District 7/Mercer County

Enclosures

cc: Joseph Torsella, Chairman, State Board of Education (w/encs.)
James Buckheit, Executive Director, State Board of Education (w/encs.)
Dr. Gerald Zahorchak, Secretary of Education (w/encs.)
Rep. James R. Roebuck, Chairman, House Education Committee (w/encs.)
Christopher Wakeley, Executive Director, House Education Committee (w/encs.)

Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania.
Deborah E. KATZMAN, a minor by her parents and natural guardians, Ronald M. KATZMAN and
Marjorie C. Katzman, Appellees,
v.
CUMBERLAND VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT, Appellant.

Argued April 30, 1984.
Decided Aug. 8, 1984.

Parents brought action on behalf of student to challenge action of school board in reducing student's earned grades for disciplinary reasons. The Common Pleas Court, Cumberland County, Dale F. Shughart, J., entered order in favor of parents, and school board appealed. The Commonwealth Court, No. 1747 C.D. 1983, Barbieri, J., held that policy adopted by school board when it determined to discipline a student for an infraction unrelated to education by reducing her grades in each subject for entire second marking period by ten points, two for each day of suspension, without affording student the option of choosing Saturday work as an alternative, amounted to a clear misrepresentation of student's scholastic achievement for college entrance and other purposes and, as such, represented an illegal application of school board's discretion.

Affirmed.

West Headnotes

[1]  KeyCite Citing References for this Headnote

- ↳ 345 Schools
- ↳ 345II Public Schools
- ↳ 345II(L) Pupils
- ↳ 345k174 Punishment
- ↳ 345k175 k. In General. Most Cited Cases

Provision of the public school code empowering a school board to adopt and enforce such reasonable rules and regulations as it may deem necessary and proper for the management of its school affairs and the conduct and deportment of all pupils attending the public schools in the district is not meant as a sanction for a grade reduction policy, without an optional makeup program, for infractions which are not related to education. 24 P.S. § 5-510.

[2]  KeyCite Citing References for this Headnote

- ↳ 345 Schools
- ↳ 345II Public Schools
- ↳ 345II(L) Pupils
- ↳ 345k174 Punishment
- ↳ 345k175 k. In General. Most Cited Cases

A school board may not adopt a policy which, though not specifically authorized or proscribed by statute or regulation, nevertheless authorizes penalties, affecting and reducing educational standing, for infractions by students that are not education related. 24 P.S. § 5-510.

[3]  KeyCite Citing References for this Headnote

↳ 345 Schools

↳ 345II Public Schools

↳ 345II(L) Pupils

↳ 345k163 k. Grades or Classes and Departments. Most Cited Cases

Misrepresentation by a school board of a student's academic achievement, whether by upgrading or by downgrading, represents an illegal application of school board's discretion since it is done for reasons that are irrelevant to academic achievement being graded. 24 P.S. § 5-510.

[4]  KeyCite Citing References for this Headnote

↳ 345 Schools

↳ 345II Public Schools

↳ 345II(L) Pupils

↳ 345k174 Punishment

↳ 345k175 k. In General. Most Cited Cases

Policy adopted by school board when it determined to discipline a student for an infraction unrelated to education by reducing her grades in each subject for entire second marking period by ten points, two for each day of suspension, without affording student the option of choosing Saturday work as an alternative, amounted to a clear misrepresentation of student's scholastic achievement for college entrance and other purposes and, as such, amounted to an illegal application of school board's discretion. 24 P.S. § 5-510.

***672** Richard C. Snelbaker, Snelbaker McCaleb & Elicker, Mechanicsburg, for appellant.

James W. Evans, Goldberg, Evans & Katzman, Harrisburg, for appellees.

***474** Before ROGERS, MacPHAIL and BARBIERI, JJ.

BARBIERI, Judge.

Cumberland Valley School District, (District) appeals here alleging error in a decision of the Common Pleas Court of Cumberland County holding improper the action of the Board of School Directors of the Cumberland Valley School District (Board) in reducing for disciplinary reasons the earned marks of a high school student, Deborah E. Katzman (Debbie), and ordering her "grades for the second marking period of the 1982-83 school year readjusted to reflect the marks she actually earned."

The parties agree that this case is one of first impression in this Commonwealth. Simply stated, we are asked to determine the legality of the grade reduction policy as administered here by the Board.

The facts are undisputed.

On December 3, 1982, Debbie, an eleventh grade student at Cumberland Valley High School, while on a field trip to New York City with her Humanities Class, joined four other students in ordering and drinking a glass of wine in a restaurant. When questioned later by school authorities she admitted the incident whereupon she was suspended for five days, ***476** excluded from classes, expelled from the cheer leading squad, prohibited from taking part in school activities during the five days' suspension period and was later permanently expelled from the National Honor Society. Under the District's disciplinary policy a further penalty of grade reduction was imposed. This policy is stated as follows:

Suspension and Expulsions ...

6240.9d Reduce grades in all classes two percentage points for each day of suspension. The grades are to be reduced during the marking period when the in-school or out of school suspension occurred. In lieu of a two percentage point reduction the student may be assigned to a supervised Saturday work program provided the parent(s) and student accept the conditions of this option.

In imposing the penalty pursuant to this "policy," she was advised that, as a consequence of this suspension, her grades in each subject for the entire second marking period would be reduced by ten points, two ****673** points for each day of suspension,^{FN1} but that the alternative of Saturday work in lieu of suspension would be denied her because her transgression was a violation of District's policy on "alcohol abuse." There appears in the record as Exhibit No. 1 the following:

FN1. Appellant advises that at the end of the marking period (9 weeks) all grades are compiled for a gross score of 94 (out of a possible 100); that the grade reduction policy (2% x 5) would reduce the 94 by 10 points or 84.

Drug and Alcohol Prevention and Abuse

The policy of the Cumberland Valley School District prohibits any student to possess, to use, to sell, to deliver, or to give to another person, or to have consumed any narcotic, dangerous***477** drug, marijuana, or alcoholic beverage or any pill, capsule, powder, liquid, or other substance of whatever form or texture, *which may adversely affect the health, safety, or welfare of any student*, including but not limited to stimulants or depressants, prior to or during participation in a school activity. The above policy is also in effect when any violations occur on any property owned or leased by the Cumberland Valley School District. (Emphasis added.)

Further in the record, apparently Exhibit No. 5, setting forth the "Saturday Work Program," there is included the following: "The Saturday Work Program option will not be offered to students that violate the district policies on smoking and drug and alcohol abuse."

Debbie and her parents as guardians (Appellees), before us here on appeal in a proceeding under the Local Agency Law,^{FN2} have from the outset raised no procedural issues, nor have they contested any of the penalties imposed except only the issue as to the propriety of the grade reductions as punishment for her disciplinary infraction. We note in this connection that Debbie was a high achieving student, ranking tenth in a class of approximately 600 pupils, and that she had no record of disciplinary problems or prior offenses of any kind. The common pleas court terming the grade reductions and other punishments imposed "harsh" and "excessive,"^{FN3} stated, however, ***478** that the nature of the punishment would have no effect in its decision invalidating the grade reductions on the basis that the Board's "policy" was in conflict with Section 12.6(f) of the Student Rights and Responsibilities Regulations adopted by the State Board of Education, 22 Pa.Code 12.6(f),^{FN4} and, as we have noted, ordering that ****674** Debbie's grades as originally fixed by her teachers be reinstated.

FN2. 2 Pa.C.S. § 752 and 42 Pa.C.S. § 933(a)(2).

FN3. The Court also stated:

From the outset we note that grades are not merely of fleeting interest; rather, they become a permanent record upon which all future educational opportunities are based.

FN4. The regulation provides:

Students shall be permitted to make up exams and work missed while being disciplined by temporary or full suspension within guidelines established by the board of school directors.

The Court stated:

Nevertheless, ... we believe the unmistakable policy behind the regulation is that students suspended for disciplinary violations should not only be permitted to make up the work they miss, but also should receive credit for that work. For this reason, we believe that the Cumberland Valley School Board's use of grade reduction as a form of punishment is inconsistent with and antithetical to regulation 12.6(f).

....
The board argues that the purpose of regulation 12.6(f) is only to insure that a suspended student receives instruction missed by reason of the suspension, but does not require such work to be counted for a grade. We disagree. If the state board of education meant only to extend to suspended students a chance to acquire the knowledge their classmates have received in their absence, there would be no reason to allow them to make up examinations as provided in regulation 12.6(f). While there are those who view examinations as a learning experience, the primary purpose of an examination has always been to measure a student's proficiency for purposes of assigning a grade. In short, we think it clear that the state board of education intends that suspended students receive grades for make up work. Clearly, Cumberland Valley School Board policy 6240.9d is in direct conflict with regulation 12.6(f).

***479** Appellant contends here that the Board of School Directors, a local public school district such as the one in this case, has the "inherent right to determine the nature of discipline to be administered to students violating its codes of behavior," that neither Section 12.6(f) or any other provision in the Students Rights and Responsibilities Regulation contains any provision which places a limitation on the Board's "discretionary authority" to impose discipline, as in this case, for a violation of its policy with regard to alcohol. In this connection, Appellant points to Section 510 of the Public School Code of 1949, Act of March 10, 1949, P.L. 30, *as amended*, 24 P.S. 5-510, in which the Board of School Directors is empowered to "adopt and enforce such reasonable rules and regulations as it may deem necessary and proper, regarding the management of its school affairs and the conduct and deportment of all ... pupils attending the public schools in the District...." Appellant refers us to authorities, including decisions of this and other appellate courts of Pennsylvania ^{FN5} which we find helpful but not controlling or sufficiently persuasive to direct our disposition. Rather, it is our conclusion that there is no specific provision in State statutes, in the regulations of the State Board of Education or in prior decisions of our courts which we have been able to find in our research that specifically deals with and serves as a determinative ***480** guide to us in reaching a decision here. As a matter of first instance, therefore, we must decide the legality of a Board policy, not specifically authorized or proscribed by statute or regulation, which authorizes penalties, affecting and reducing educational standing, for infractions that are not education related.

FN5. E.g., Commonwealth v. Hall, 309 Pa. Superior Ct. 407, 455 A.2d 674 (1983) (Conviction of parents for parent-induced truancy sustained"; Girard School District v. Pittenger, 481 Pa. 91, 392 A.2d 261 (1978) (Regulations of Board of Education pertaining to student conduct and discipline authorized by the Legislature); Abremski v. Southeastern School District, 54 Pa. Commonwealth Ct. 292, 421 A.2d 485 (1980) (expulsion for period, but with alternative education by assigned home study and weekly in-school counselling).

[1] [2] [3] [4] We are aware, of course, as Appellant points out, that under Sections 510, 1317 and 1318 of the Public School Code of 1949, ^{FN6} a board of school directors may adopt "reasonable rules and regulations" regarding the "conduct and deportment" of pupils while under the supervision of the board and teachers; that teachers may exercise certain authority "as to conduct and behavior;" that suspensions may be meted out to pupils for "disobedience or misconduct;" and that "in the absence of a gross abuse of discretion, courts will not second guess policies of the several boards of school directors," Commonwealth v. Hall, 309 Pa. Superior Ct. 407, 412, 455 A.2d 674, 677 (1983). Nevertheless, we cannot conclude that the

Legislature in authorizing the adoption and enforcement of "reasonable rules and regulations" intended to sanction a grade reduction policy, without an optional make up program, for the kind of infraction involved here. Indeed, as the common pleas court in this case points out, there is in Section 12.6(f) of the Students Rights and Responsibilities Regulations ^{FN7} a provision indicating a legislative intent that educational make up be provided to a student for "exams and work missed while being disciplined by temporary *481 or full suspension." The trial court reasoned that the "unmistakable policy behind the regulation is that students suspended for disciplinary violations should not only be permitted to make up the work they miss, but also should receive credit for that work." We believe, however, that the policy and the **675 penalty here goes beyond the scope of making up for time lost, such as the five days of suspension. Here, rather, although the penalty was for the five days missed, the assessed penalty downgraded achievement for a full marking period of nine weeks. Of course, for college entrance and other purposes this would result in a clear misrepresentation of the student's scholastic achievement. Misrepresentation of achievement is equally improper and, we think, illegal whether the achievement is misrepresented by upgrading or by downgrading, if either is done for reasons that are irrelevant to the achievement being graded. For example, one would hardly deem acceptable an upgrading in a mathematics course for achievement on the playing fields. In this connection, we find inapt Appellant's example of downgrading for cheating. Cheating is related to grading.

FN6. 24 P.S. §§ 5-510, 13-1317, 13-1318.

FN7. 22 Pa.Code 12.6(f). The Regulation was approved by our Supreme Court in Girard School District v. Pittenger, 481 Pa. 91, 392 A.2d 261 (1978).

We conclude, for the reasons stated, that the Board's policy and the manner in which it was exercised in this case represent an illegal application of the Board's discretion and that, therefore, as the trial court held, the grade reduction was improper. Accordingly, we will affirm the order of the common pleas court.

ORDER

NOW, August 8, 1984, the decision and order of the Court of Common Pleas of Cumberland County in the above-captioned matter, 571 CIVIL 1983, dated June 10, 1983, is hereby affirmed.

Pa.Cmwth., 1984.

Katzman by Katzman v. Cumberland Valley School Dist.
84 Pa.Cmwth. 474, 479 A.2d 671, 19 Ed. Law Rep. 318

END OF DOCUMENT

24 P.S. § 26-2603-B

Purdon's Pennsylvania Statutes and Consolidated Statutes Currentness

Title 24 P.S. Education

▣ Chapter 1. Public School Code of 1949 (Refs & Annos)

▣ Article XXVI-B. The State Board of Education

➔ **§ 26-2603-B. Powers and duties of the board**

(a) The board shall have the power, and its duty shall be, to review the statements of policy, standards, rules and regulations formulated by the Council of Basic Education and the Council of Higher Education, and adopt broad policies and principles, and establish standards governing the educational program of the Commonwealth.

(b) The board and the Secretary of Education shall jointly employ and fix the compensation of such staff as it deems necessary to perform the duties of the board. The board shall be entitled to legal counsel which shall be designated by the Office of General Counsel, which legal counsel shall not also be legal counsel to the Department of Education.

(c) The board shall develop an annual operating budget, including projected operating expenses of the Professional Standards and Practices Commission. It shall include salaries for staff, office materials and equipment, and all expenses for the operation of the board and commission. This budget shall be presented to the Secretary of Education. Upon adoption of the general appropriations act, the department shall notify the board of the amount of its allocation.

(d) The board shall also have the authority and duty to:

(1) approve or disapprove an application for the creation of a new school district, or change in the boundaries of an existing school district;

(2) establish, whenever deemed advisable, committees of professional and technical advisors to assist the councils in performing research studies undertaken by them;

(3) manage and have custody of the State School Fund;

(4) (i) apply for, receive and administer, subject to any applicable regulations or laws of the Federal Government or any agency thereof, any Federal grants, appropriations, allocations and programs for the development of academic facilities on behalf of the Commonwealth, any of its school districts or any institution of higher education, public or private, within this Commonwealth;

(ii) subject to criteria developed by the Secretary of Education and subject to any applicable regulations or laws of the Federal Government or any agency thereof, to develop, alter, amend and submit to the Federal Government State plans for participation in Federal grants, appropriations, allocations and programs for the development of academic facilities and to make regulations, criteria, methods, forms, procedures and to do all other things which may be necessary to make possible the participation of the Commonwealth in such Federal grants, appropriations, allocations and programs for the development of academic facilities;

(iii) hold hearings, issue subpoenas and render decisions as to the priority assigned to any project, or as to any other matter or determination affecting any applicant for Federal grants, appropriations, allocations and programs for the development of academic facilities;

(iv) adopt rules or procedures and prescribe regulations for the submission to it of all matters within its jurisdiction; and

(v) submit, annually, to the Governor, on or before the first Monday of December, a report of its proceedings during that year, together with such recommendations as the board shall deem necessary;

(5) adopt policies under which the Secretary of Education shall approve or disapprove any action of a State-owned university, community college or State-related or State-aided college or university in establishing additional branches or campuses, or in discontinuing branches or campuses;

(6) adopt policies under which the Secretary of Education shall approve or disapprove any action of a State-owned university, community college or State-related or State-aided college or university in establishing new professional schools or upper division programs by two (2) year institutions;

(7) adopt policies under which the Secretary of Education shall approve or disapprove applications by two (2) year institutions to become four (4) year institutions;

(8) adopt policies under which the Secretary of Education shall approve or disapprove the request of any private institution of higher education for admission to State-related or State-aided status, or for eligibility for other State financial support; and

(9) require the submission of long-range plans from all public and private institutions of higher education at the times and in the form requested by the board. Such documents shall be reviewed by the Council of Higher Education and the board in the development of a master plan for higher education as provided in subsection (h) and section 2604-B(c)(1).

(10) (i) Approve or disapprove standards proposed by the department in order to comply with the provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 [FN1] to maintain the eligibility of this Commonwealth to receive Federal funding for education programs. The board shall approve or disapprove the standards within 30 days of submission to the board's office or at its next scheduled meeting, whichever is sooner. Failure of the board to approve or disapprove the standards within the time established under this section shall be deemed an approval of the standards. [FN2]

(ii) Standards promulgated under this section shall be deposited with the Pennsylvania Bulletin for publication.

(iii), (iv) Expired effective June 30, 2004.

(e) With regard to State-owned institutions, approval or disapproval by the Secretary of Education under the provisions of clauses (5) and (6) of subsection (d) shall not be made until after recommendation by the Board of Governors of the State System of Higher Education, whenever such recommendation is deemed necessary or required by law.

(f) No institution of higher education may proceed with any action unless it has been approved by the Secretary of Education under the provisions of clauses (5) through (8) of subsection (d).

(g) With regard to approval by the Secretary of Education under the provisions of clauses (5) through (8) of subsection (d), no action to be financed wholly or in part from State appropriations shall be taken by an institution of higher learning (i) prior to the next fiscal year or until the General Assembly approves the Governor's budget for the next fiscal year, and (ii) prior to the Governor and the Secretary of the Budget being provided with written notification of such approval, including projected five (5) year fiscal analysis and an explanation as to the necessity for the proposed action in relation to the master plan for higher education.

(h) Every five (5) years, the board shall adopt a master plan for higher education which shall be for the guidance of the Governor, the General Assembly, and all institutions of higher education financed wholly or in part from State appropriations. The master plan shall:

- (1) define the role of each type of institution (State-owned universities, State-related universities, community colleges, private colleges and universities and off-campus centers of any of these and other institutions authorized to grant degrees) in this Commonwealth;
- (2) recommend enrollment levels for each such institution;
- (3) recommend methods for governance;
- (4) recommend methods for the distribution of State funds among the institutions;
- (5) evaluate the status of physical plants and technical equipment and project needs;
- (6) evaluate the status of and projection of manpower needs;
- (7) evaluate enrollment accessibility to institutions of higher learning by the public; and
- (8) otherwise provide for an orderly development of institutions of higher education in this Commonwealth.

(i) Every five (5) years, the board shall adopt a master plan for basic education which shall be for the guidance of the Governor, the General Assembly, and all public school entities. The master plan shall consider and make recommendations on the following areas, and any other areas which the board deems appropriate:

- (1) school program approval, evaluation and requirements;
- (2) school personnel training and certification;
- (3) student testing and assessment;
- (4) school governance and organization;
- (5) curriculum materials development;
- (6) school finance;
- (7) school buildings and facilities;
- (8) transportation;
- (9) technical services and support services to local education agencies; and
- (10) projected long-range needs of the public school system of this Commonwealth.

(j) The board shall request from and receive publicly at a scheduled meeting recommendations of the Professional Standards and Practices Commission pertaining to teacher certification, professional practices, accreditation of teacher-education programs and long-range plans affecting these subject areas. When such recommendations are received, the board shall consider and review these recommendations during the development of any statements of policy, guidelines, standards or rules and regulations as they relate to the above subject areas. If such recommendations are not received in a timely fashion, the board may continue to develop and adopt statements of policy, guidelines, standards or rules and regulations in these subject areas.

(k) The board shall make all reasonable rules and regulations necessary to effectuate the purposes of this article and carry out all duties placed upon it by law.

CREDIT(S)

1949, March 10, P.L. 30, No. 14, art. XXVI-B, § 2603-B, added 1988, March 30, P.L. 321, No. 43, § 5, imd. effective. Amended 2002, June 29, P.L. 524, No. 88, § 31, imd. effective; 2003, Dec. 23, P.L. 304, No. 48, § 37, imd. effective. Reenacted 2004, July 15, P.L. 722, No. 82, § 4, retroactive effective June 30, 2003.

[FN1] See 20 U.S.C.A. § 6311 et seq.

[FN2] On Sept. 19, 2002, the State Board approved standards necessary to comply with the provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 20 U.S.C.A. § 6301 et seq., as proposed by the Department. See 32 Pa.B. 5151, Oct. 12, 2002. See, also, 32 Pa.B. 6030, Dec. 7, 2002.

TITLE 22. EDUCATION
PART I. STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
SUBPART A. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS
CHAPTER 1. PRELIMINARY PROVISIONS

Current through Supp. 417 (August 2009)

§ 1.2. Function of the Board.

The Board will adopt broad policies and principles and establish standards governing the educational programs of the Commonwealth.

<General Materials (GM) - References, Annotations, or Tables>

22 Pa. Code § 1.2, 22 PA ADC § 1.2

22 PA ADC § 1.2

END OF DOCUMENT

Title 24 P.S. Education
Chapter 1. Public School Code of 1949 (Refs & Annos)

▣ Article XV. Terms and Courses of Study

▣ (C) Records and Reports

➡ **§ 15-1531. Grading, classification and promotion of pupils**

Teachers in the public schools shall, under the direction of the proper superintendents of schools, grade and classify the pupils in their schools so that they may pursue the courses of study herein provided for, and all pupils found proficient may be promoted twice each year.

CREDIT(S)

1949, March 10, P.L. 30, art. XV, § 1531. Amended 1949, May 9, P.L. 977, § 1.

HISTORICAL AND STATUTORY NOTES

2006 Main Volume