

**Oak Park and River Forest High School
201 N. Scoville Avenue
Oak Park, IL 60302**

**Policy, Evaluation and Goals (PEG) Committee
Wednesday, August 29, 2012
Board Room**

A Policy, Evaluation and Goals Committee meeting was held on Wednesday, August 29, 2012 in the Board Room. Chair Phelan opened the meeting at 6:35 p.m. A roll call included the following members: Valerie J. Fisher, Dr. Dietra D. Millard, Terry Finnegan, Sharon Patchak-Layman, and John Phelan. Also present were Dr. Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; Dr. Tina Halliman, Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; Lauren M. Smith, Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board, Karin Sullivan, Community Relations and Communications Director.

In Secretary McCormack’s absence, Mr. Phelan moved to appoint Ms. Fisher as Secretary Protempore; seconded by Mr. Finnegan. A voice vote resulted in all ayes.

Visitors: Laurel DiPrima, Director of IASB Field Services and Brian Zumpf, Policy Consultant, with the Illinois Association of School Boards; and Bill Sullivan, community member.

The Board of Education continued its discussion of the Policy Book, Section 7, which deals with student rights and responsibility, and is controlled by state law.

Press Policy	District Policy	Recommendation
7:180 Preventing Bullying	101 5110 5114 5114-4 5310	<p>It was the consensus of the committee members to concur with the administration’s recommendations to add the definition of Cyberbullying to this policy and to repeat #15 from 7:190. Note: the District’s responsibility is to keep the definition up to date. The IASB included the concept of Cyberbullying in Policies 7:20 and 7:190.</p> <p>IASB recommended District counsel’s advice on altering Para. 2, No.3, as it concerned the nexus to the school and the current state of law. Several committee members supported being specific and including social media. Seek counsel advice on eliminating the word “similar” in line 2 of #3. Would that be too broad?</p> <p>Legal counsel will be sought on the definition of “port to port”. If District seeks to include school to home, it may be absorbing more liability. The District provides transportation for special education students and for field trips, which is reflected in the policy. The police are involved in off-campus situations and involve drugs or weapons. If an athlete were involved in a situation of that type, the consequence would be to remove a privilege, rather than receive a disciplinary consequence. Discipline consequences are given to students when an infraction occurs on school property. The District always has jurisdiction if there is a nexus to the school. Student discipline goes broader than just</p>

		<p>bully aspects. IASB will check with its attorneys for discrepancy of a bullying policy that ends at the school property line and a discipline policy that extends beyond school property.</p> <p>Actions: Move definition of Cyberbullying to 7:180, adding # 15 from the discipline policy, and remove “Preventing” will be removed from title as it pertains to discipline and prevention.</p>
7:190 Student Discipline	<p>103 5110 5114 5114-2 5114-4 5116 5133 5135 5152 5310 6160</p>	<p>IASB explained that Item 12 in policy reflects statute. Consensus to leave statement, as is even though it does not address organizations using Greek letters, e.g., Tau Gamma-type organizations, etc.</p> <p>IASB advised that language on Page 3, Nos. 1 & 2, was statutory language. IASB read footnote that recommended policy be as broad as possible, but vague examples were included to provide guidance.</p> <p>Consensus: #1: delete: “before, during or after schools” because it is redundant #2: delete: “or any activity or event that bears a reasonable relationship to school” because it is redundant. The intent was for the event to have a nexus to the school.</p> <p>Discussion ensued about the role of regulating conduct and disciplining for it or not regulating conduct and not disciplining for it relative to #4. IASB will clarify with legal counsel about its purpose. The Committee asked for clarification with the example of students walking home after school and one injured the other. Would the school would be able to discipline the students involved in the fight? Is there a question of liability if a student is injured? Does the District increase its liability stemming from a policy that addresses this? Does “anywhere” literary mean anywhere, i.e., New Zealand, etc.? Should the District limit its jurisdiction if there is a relationship between liability and jurisdiction? The Board of Education wants to send the message that it takes this seriously. How frequently has the District been consequence for extending its jurisdiction and have how often has it been sued?</p> <p>On page 4, clarification was given that the 1000 ft. was statutory language. IASB was unsure if it was the legislature’s intent that schools are responsible for the student 24 hours, 7 days per week, but it suggested that the movement has been for schools to have more authority.</p> <p>Dr. Isoye will contact legal counsel about the concept of District jurisdiction as it relates to several places in this policy. Foreign exchanges are school-related activities. If not a school activity, where is the line drawn.</p> <p>#11: It is not necessary that the District have Saturday school or transportation language, but the language could work because some students would have their parents drive them to school. In a discipline setting, make sure the students arrive at a set time on a Saturday. If transportation cannot be arranged with the parent to drive the student to</p>

	<p>school, then the District must seek an alternative discipline consequence. Consensus: delete second sentence page 3, #11. Practice now is to provide alternative discipline.</p> <p>Under weapon section, policy reflects statue, which requires the District to expel a student for one year if he/she has a weapon, but allows the District the option of expelling the student for up two years.</p> <p>Discussion ensued regarding Superintendent’s ability to grant exception. Considerations was given to deleting second sentence in 2nd paragraph under weapons, as it is optional and to just allow the superintendent to use common sense to provide recommendation for exceptions. Discussion ensued about look-a-likes, i.e. wooden rifles used with marching band. Previously they were banned. Mr. Rouse will get background on their use. Discussions ensued about things that might be provided, i.e., things for biology, etc. If something were for a play, the administration is often advised and a disclaimer is included in the program. Consensus to change 2nd sentence to reflect the Superintendent making the decision about discretion at both times, either before knowing about the equipment or after the equipment has been brought to the school event and to set this off in its own paragraph.</p> <p>It was the consensus to add the Policy 5116, Alternative Education Programs, in the procedures manual.</p> <p>Administration felt 5135, Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse, was a philosophy statement and asked if it should be placed somewhere else. IASB agreed first half was policy but second half was treatment or alternatives and was procedural. IASB recommended that other policies in Section 7 were more related to student support services. If the individual does not adopt public health solutions, disciplinary consequences have to be provided; thus, this has to be in both places. Mr. Phelan wanted to discuss this policy in the future. Ms. Patchak-Layman wanted the public to have something to look at with regard to the Board of Education’s philosophy. Schools cannot have alcohol on campus, per statute. Does the District want the school to collaborate in helping a family rather than just policing the students? The Committee acknowledged being more explicit in the discipline policy than in the support policy. What can it do about the conflict? The District does offer more support, as it has just introduced a suspension reduction program for students. Students have the opportunity for less consequence, less lost instructional time and an educational awareness for the family. Mr. Phelan believed that an opt-in voluntary testing program for being under the influence would provide students access to a diversionary program rather than to the discipline system. Then all would have the opportunity to choose the rehabilitative services by opting into the testing program. The District’s current policy does not reflect the actions that the District is doing in support of students. Ms. Fisher asked the administration to draft a policy that redirects students and channels them to counseling,</p>
--	--

	<p>timeouts, etc. as a generic statement of policy. Mr. Rouse stated that the suspension reduction program is part of the Code of Conduct. It was the consensus was to have a placeholder for a specific policy on alcohol and drugs. Dr. Isoye noted that the new policy says disciplinary measures, not how or when, which is the District’s Code of Conduct. This policy will be added to the policies that are still outstanding. The discussion about whether the District must discipline for alcohol use or possession is authorized but not demanded. Gross disobedience is a term of art.</p> <p>The administration recommended including Policy 6160 in the procedures manual. Student handbooks include many things that are not policy. The first paragraph of Policy 6160 could be included there. The District’s practice is to have teachers clearly address academic honesty at the beginning of the class. There are also divisional standards. Unintentional incidents of plagiarism also occur, which can become a teachable moment. A form of self-plagiarism or academic dishonesty would be a student handing in the same paper to two teachers. The District outlined examples and what procedures had been used. Recording of plagiarism does occur because of requirements of such entities as Cum Laude, etc. A suggestion was made that the administration review types of academic dishonesty and list them in its own procedures so to put families on notice as to what this entails, as do universities.</p> <p>The administration will compare Page 1, #5 to new District Policy 5152, Electronic Devices.</p> <p>Lazar pointers had been a safety issue at one time.</p> <p>No. 11, Page 2, speaks to truancy, not to college visits, etc. While excused absences are listed in Policy 7:70, the District may extend that list. The Student Handbook lists makeup privileges for pre-arranged absences. The Committee members noted that the Attendance Office scrutinizes excuses.</p> <p>Due to an amendment to the School Code, an additional statement has been added: “A student who is subject to a suspension in excess of 20 days or an expulsion may be immediately transferred to an alternative program in the manner provided in Article 13A or 13B of the School Code.” The old language was “may be eligible” rather than “may be immediately transferred.”</p> <p>With regard to required notices, “No. 1, observes any person in possession of a firearm on or around school grounds; however, such action may be delayed if immediate noticed would endanger students under his or her supervision.” IASB will check on this language, it may be in the School Code.</p>
--	--

The next meeting to discuss the policy manual will be September 18 at 6:00 p.m. The other committee meetings and special board meeting will follow.

Adjournment

At 8:43 p.m., Mr. Phelan adjourned the Policy Evaluation and Goals meeting.

Terry Finnegan
President

Valerie J. Fisher
Secretary Protempore