

From: Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC), Poudre School District

Date: March 25, 2026

RE: District Policy Review

On Wednesday, March 25, 2026, the PSD Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) was joined by Autumn Aspen, PSD General Counsel and Bri Champ, PSD Assistant Legal Counsel. Autumn and Bri shared Poudre School District's Policy Review Process and asked for input on the proposed changes of five PSD policies with particular implications for students with disabilities.

SEAC members broke into five groups, with each group reviewing and discussing one policy, and then sharing their thoughts and recommendations with the presenters and membership.

Policy JICH - Student Conduct involving Drugs and Alcohol

Do any part of these proposed changes conflict with the District's mission (Educate...Every Child, Every Day) and vision (to support and inspire every child to think, to learn, to care, and to graduate prepared to be successful in a changing world)?

- 1) Suggest adding clarity around the student record being cleared and considering the implications of a discipline record.
- 2) Consider how the policy will be equitable for ALL.
- 3) Clarify what programs will be used to educate and ensure the programs are research-based.

Do the proposed changes make the policy more understandable and accessible?

- 1) The actionable language makes the policy much easier to read.
- 2) Suggest adding or changing "student current level" to "student current grade level" or other language to clarify the intent (as explained by Autumn) that the language refers to changes in school levels (from elementary to middle school and from middle school to high school).

Are there any unintended consequences or harm coming from the proposed changes?

- 1) The term "equitable" need input from the BIPOC community.
- 2) Consider revisiting the "Authorized Drugs" bullet point.

Other feedback on the proposed changes:

- 1) Clarify who will pay for out-of-district programming.
- 2) Expand on the information about distribution and the steps to expulsion.
- 3) Address who makes up the team to represent the student when the caregiver is absent or unable to advocate for the student.

Policy JK - Student Discipline

Do any part of these proposed changes conflict with the District's mission (Educate...Every Child, Every Day) and vision (to support and inspire every child to think, to learn, to care, and to graduate prepared to be successful in a changing world)?

- 1) The goal is to be as proactive as possible in order to avoid the serious measures outlined in the policy.
- 2) Clear definitions and consistency throughout schools would support the district's mission and vision.

Do the proposed changes make the policy more understandable and accessible?

- 1) Suggest providing more information or clarification on the “factor test” (pg 1), “expulsion prevention program” (pg 2), who pays for alternative setting (pg 6), and definition of terms such as “serious bodily injury”.

Are there any unintended consequences or harm coming from the proposed changes?

- 1) Consider creating a standardized process for how to track this information (e.g. what interventions have been done before).
- 2) Parent confusion/fears around approving assessments and behavior intervention plans for fear of student being labeled.

Other feedback on the proposed changes:

- 2) Clarify how informal suspension are addressed and ensure consistency throughout the district.

Policy JKD/JKE – Suspension/Expulsion of Students

Do any part of these proposed changes conflict with the District’s mission (Educate...Every Child, Every Day) and vision (to support and inspire every child to think, to learn, to care, and to graduate prepared to be successful in a changing world)?

- 1) Ensure that alternatives to out-of-school suspension are being used – the wording, “The principal or designee may consider the following alternatives to out-of-school...” could lead to inconsistency across the district.

Do the proposed changes make the policy more understandable and accessible?

- 1) Yes, the policy is more understandable and accessible by dropping “Shakespearean language” of shall, etc. The use of the word “caregiver” feels more inclusive.

Are there any unintended consequences or harm coming from the proposed changes?

- 1) An unintended consequence is the inconsistency of principal discretion across schools. Suggest wording to increase consistency.

Other feedback on the proposed changes:

- 1) None.

Policy JKD/JKE-R – Procedures Regarding Suspension/Expulsion of Students

Do any part of these proposed changes conflict with the District’s mission (Educate...Every Child, Every Day) and vision (to support and inspire every child to think, to learn, to care, and to graduate prepared to be successful in a changing world)?

- 1) Offering coursework for the students does support the mission and vision.
- 2) Readmittance policy does align with the vision, but does not align with the mission. The language of “every child, every day” is not evident here.

Do the proposed changes make the policy more understandable and accessible?

- 1) The proposed language is helpful and makes more sense – could still be improved.

- 2) Consider clarifying how students can access assistance/support with coursework, quantity of assignments, and timelines and deadlines.

Are there any unintended consequences or harm coming from the proposed changes?

- 1) Clarify if the IEP team will be consulted – procedures for students with IEPs are not clear (stems from not having a separate policy for students with disabilities).
- 2) Consider a separate procedure for crimes of violence.

Other feedback on the proposed changes:

- 1) Section 2 – the group questioned why the student can bring a witness only at the school principal's discretion, yet the principal can bring a witness.
- 2) Consider changing the format to bulleted or numbered points to better show the sequence of steps in the procedure.
- 3) Consider how to make this procedure more consistent across the district rather than leaving things to the school's discretion.

Policy JLCDC – Medically Necessary Treatment in School Setting

Do any part of these proposed changes conflict with the District's mission (Educate...Every Child, Every Day) and vision (to support and inspire every child to think, to learn, to care, and to graduate prepared to be successful in a changing world)?

- 1) Policy should include all students, not just students on IEPs and 504s – medically necessary treatment could impact students with no support.
- 2) Consider a more defined timeline – suggest a meeting within 2 weeks of request, a decision within 1 week from the meeting date, and an appeal process that is no longer than 1 week.
- 3) Ensure equitable implementation across all schools.

Do the proposed changes make the policy more understandable and accessible?

- 1) Yes, but the process is still complex so suggest making a family advocate available to families.

Are there any unintended consequences or harm coming from the proposed changes?

- 1) The timeline is lengthy – see above for suggested timeline.
- 2) Free appropriate public education (FAPE) could be impacted if outside care is denied. Suggest that a denial triggers an IEP meeting to determine any impact to IEP services.

Other feedback on the proposed changes:

- 1) Define the appeal process if caregivers and other team members disagree.
- 2) Maintain focus on what the student needs to access their education rather than on where the service is coming from.

Thank you for bringing this topic to SEAC for feedback and consideration.