

The Board meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on Thursday evening, August 27, 2009, in the Board Room.

Call to Order President Millard called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m. The following Board of Education members were present: John C. Allen IV, Jacques A. Conway, Terry Finnegan, Dr. Ralph H. Lee, Amy Leafe McCormack, Dr. Dietra D. Millard, and Sharon Patchak-Layman. Also present were: Dr. Attila J. Weninger, Superintendent; Jason Edgecombe, Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources; Amy Hill, Director of Assessment and Research; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; Cheryl L. Witham, Chief Financial Officer; Michael Carioscio, Chief Information Officer; James Paul Hunter, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair; Liz Turcza, Student Council Board of Education Liaison; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Visitors The Board of Education welcomed the following visitors: Kay Foran, OPRFHS Communications and Community Relations Coordinator; Jason Dennis, Jim Goodfellow, Tia Marr, Alyssia Walton; Michael Powell, Mark Wilson; faculty members; McLean, Jack and Becky Peterson, Wyanetta Johnson of APPLE; Lynn Allen, John Bokum, Valerie Cannon, Sally Koose, community members, Dr. Laverta Hurt, Northeastern Chapter of Phi Delta Kappa, of Congressman Davis' Educational Task Force; and Terry Dean of the *Wednesday Journal*.

Student Recognition OPRFHS honored student McLean Peterson for being cast in the All State Production of Urinetown and she will perform at least three songs.

Public Comments Dr. Laverta Hurt, member of the Northeastern Chapter of Phil Delta Kappa, honored teacher Michael Powell with the Northeastern Phil Delta Kappa 2009 Educator of the Year Award on behalf of Congressman Davis' Educational Task Force.

Ms. Val Cannon of 1214 N. Humphrey in Oak Park, and resident of Oak Park for 24 years asked if District 200 received funds from the State of Illinois and if it had to abide by the State of Illinois laws. To both questions, the answer was yes.

FOIA Requests Dr. Millard reported that ten FOIA requests were received and resolved.

Board of Education Comments Ms. Patchak-Layman noted three items.

- 1) Parents were disappointed that no Parent Visitation Days were scheduled for this year.
- 2) The Board of Education had not been informed of this change.
- 3) The high school did not make AYP again and she felt an important addendum to the Board of Education goals would be to have a plan for those students who had not made AYP in order for them to make gains in their senior year.

Mr. Allen read the following statement.

“Recently, OPRF was forced to notify parents and students that the Village of Oak Park had increased fees to buy parking permits near the high school. The increases were from \$80 to \$116 for Oak Park resident students and from \$80 to \$168 for River Forest resident students. As a result, student residents of River Forest would have to pay a larger increased fee since they do not reside in Oak Park. It would appear that this same two tiered rate increase also applies to families that attend Fenwick, a private school that also is in Oak Park. Even though our representatives from OPRF attended a meeting of the Village’s transportation committee in April and voiced our objection to the then-proposed policy, the Village Board of Trustees passed and implemented that increase with no advance notice or consultation to this high school until very late in the summer season. The high school has also been recently informed by the Village of Oak Park that the high school must send only one check, made out to Village of Oak Park, in the amount of all the parking fees.

“It is unfortunate that the Village of Oak Park has chosen to act this way against a group of people that are more than neighbors. More than neighbors because OPRF is the only public high school for both communities and as such is funded by both communities. The Village of River Forest is a substantial contributing revenue source to this institution. The revenue is taxed to the Village of River Forest meaning that it is not a voluntary contribution. The taxpayers of River Forest are owed certain duties, the least of which is bare consideration or courtesy for their taxes.

“It is not enough to say, “This is Oak Park and all others must pay more because we say so.” Oddly enough, that rude statement would have been more than what River Foresters actually received. It is also not enough to lump in other permits and fees that Oak Parkers pay to their Village as a comparison to the increased fees. Lastly, it is certainly not enough to say that the increase is only “\$1.00 per school day” more. Any imbalance is inappropriate whether it is one cent, one dollar, or one hundred dollars without some legitimate and justifiable advance rationale. The notion that Oak Park needs more revenue does not rise to that level, particularly when one views the small increase the Village will receive as a result of the increases: \$11,100. Any unfairness, no matter how small, is still unfairness. The ill will this has caused is not worth this price. The Village of Oak Park should strive to be better.

“Trustee Ray Johnson, in an email to a River Forest parent, argued that we should “factor in [that] Oak Park residents must purchase a \$45 vehicle sticker in addition to their parking permit.” He fails to observe that River Forest parents do not receive the same privileges that Oak Parkers receive for that \$45.00. If that comparison is not equal then his argument fails. In addition, that sticker fee plus the new parking fee for Oak Park residents added together is still less than what is asked of River Forest residents. That should not be acceptable to a group that pays taxes on the institution that serves both communities’ students equally.

“Those rationales and excuses ignore a very basic component of this shared community institution. The taxpayers of River Forest pay a disproportionate

share of the revenue allocated to OPRF. The most recent numbers for the 2006-2007 school year show that OPRF had an enrollment of 3245 students. Of that, 668 students were from River Forest and 2577 students were from Oak Park. Those numbers come from zip codes provided during opening registration of that school year. 20.6% of the student body was/is from River Forest. In that same year, the Cook County Clerk's Office shows that the funds provided to OPRF were \$58,486,675.70. Of that, \$14,686,004.27 (or 25.11%) was from River Forest taxes and \$43,800,671.43 (or 74.89%) was from Oak Park taxes. Again, 25.11% of the revenue for 20.6% of the students. Without River Forest Taxes, OPRF could not even make payroll.

“There's been some mention of the wear and tear on Oak Park streets but I would point out all the benefits that the Village of Oak Park enjoys, paid for in substantial part by River Forest: brand new tennis courts, several open sports fields, a stadium (which incidentally hosted the Marine Corps band for public benefit last spring), two swimming pools, theater productions, and the list goes on. The Village of Oak Park simply cannot ignore the financial benefit it receives from River Forest for the sake of short-term convenience.

“This action needlessly strains the common feeling and bond between our citizens from Oak Park and River Forest. Some mention should be made that River Forest, to the best of my recollection, has never charged excess fees for non-residents at any of its two parochial grammar schools, nor its private high school, nor either of its two universities, Dominican University and Concordia University. Yet, we still suffer the wear and tear on our streets from the traffic related to those institutions. The student parking fees' disproportionate increase is not merely an insignificant strain on the bonds between our two Villages. This creates a wound of ill will that can fester and grow.

“There is no legitimate or justifiable rationale to support this two tiered fee structure. It is simply gouging. The families of OPRF are being gouged. That is not the right thing to do to any family of an educational institution but it certainly is not the right thing to do to families that are already paying more than their fair share of the load. Like Oak Park residents, we are proud of OPRF; and, we willingly pay the cost of supporting the institution (as much as anyone can willingly pay taxes). This should never have been an issue. It should have been an unthinkable thought and I would ask the Board of Trustees for the Village of Oak Park to reverse their decision and make the fee structure for the parking around the high school level for all students who attend Oak Park and River Forest High School.”

Mr. Conway commented on the wonderful summer work program that with the help of Lee Wade helped 58 freshmen find summer employment. Some worked in the high school's B&G department and Mr. Conway complimented Buildings and Grounds personnel for supervising them. One of Mr. Conway's key indicators of success is a student's progress over time. Ninety percent of OPRFHS students went on to college last year but the test scores fail to support that fact. The things that are important are the students' gains, their knowledge, and their happiness about wanting to come to school.

Dr. Millard bolstered what Mr. Allen said regarding fees to students. All Oak Park and River Forest residents should be paying the same fee. She too wished everyone a happy new school year.

Agenda Changes

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked that Consent Item D, Approval of Resolution providing for the issue of not to exceed \$12,000,000 General Obligation Limited Tax Refunding School Bonds, Series 2009; and Consent Item E, Approval of Resolution authorizing an Escrow Agreement in connection with the issue of General Obligation Limited Tax Refunding School Bonds, Series 2009, be removed from the consent agenda.

Student Life

Ms. Turcza reported Student Council continued to meet over the summer on Homecoming, scheduled for October 3. The theme will be Circus and they will explore having jugglers, stilt walkers, etc.

Tradition of Excellence Award Recipient Thomas Lennon confirmed his appearance for the dinner and convocations.

Student Council wants to increase school spirit and student involvement so that students love this school, as sometimes it takes the love of the school to apply oneself.

Principals Report

Mr. Rouse reported on the Freshman Kickoff Day, including the Activity Fair and the significant increase of juniors and seniors who volunteered as mentors that day. Mr. Rouse reported that 3,016 students attended the first day of school but OPRFHS was still waiting for 164 to attend. Mr. Rouse encouraged all parents to attend the Open House on September 10.

Superintendent's

Dr. Weninger welcomed everyone back to another school year, noting that the opening had gone well thanks to the administrative leadership in all areas of the school and to all the employee groups. He extended a special thanks to Phil Prale and Milanne Bancroft for the hard work on a successful Institute Day; Cheryl Witham's crew of Pam Jansen and Jacqui Charette-Bassirirad for a smooth registration process; Cindy Milojevic, John Stelzer, Mark Wilson, and Nate Rouse for a wonderful freshman Kickoff Day; and the Buildings and Grounds crew for getting the building ready in time and in great fashion.

Dr. Weninger shared information relative to the recent controversy of student parking fees in the Village. OPRFHS had representation at the April Transportation Committee meeting. The Village told OPRFHS that changes would only include the area south of South Blvd. and north of Madison St., and not affect OPRFHS. The Village staff supposedly did not recommend a two-tiered structure but the Committee did so to the Village Board. The Village Board then, in its deliberations, added OPRFHS to the mix. OPRFHS has officially expressed its deep concern to the Village regarding the two-tiered structure and have asked that the Village Board reconsider its decision in a letter penned by both he and Dr. Millard. When the high school learned of the change, it immediately notified the parents.

The Job 1 Program with Rotary identified 20 students, placed 19 of them, and 17 completed the program. The WIA P.O.E.T. Grant Job program identified 50 students; placed 43 of them; and 41 completed the program. These 58 current sophomores will be tracked in the areas of attendance, discipline, GPA, class rank, course selections, and standardized achievement tests. This group of students will be compared with the group of students who choose not to participate each semester.

Dr. Millard and Dr. Weninger sent a letter to each board president and superintendent of Districts 90 and 97 asking if they would be interested in discussing the possibility of a shared goal. All agreed to do that and a meeting will be arranged this fall.

The high school is working on many levels to ensure that the first night games under the lights are successful for the students, the neighbors, the community, and the visitors. Those areas include but are not limited to traffic and parking, safety, cleanup, light usage, and sound. All physical plant preparations, including a new sound system, should be ready. The neighbors will be kept informed through regularly scheduled meetings with meetings added to debrief. The first official games under the lights are a boys' soccer game, Thursday, September 17, and a football game, Friday, September 18. In addition, with the last bit of Booster fundraising currently taking place, the lights and stadium improvements should be fully paid.

Post Secondary Plans

Mr. Rouse referred to the Post Secondary Plans report in the packet. He reviewed the highlights of the report.

Dr. Millard asked if it were possible to know how many students now go to two- and four-year colleges whose parents never went. She wanted to know if the school was moving its students forward.

Residency Report

Ms. Bishop reported that each year the Board of Education is provided with a residency report that provides statistics and the residency verification process.

Few students were not yet registered because of residency issues.

Intergovernmental Agreement of Regional Safe School Programs

Dr. Lee moved to approve the Intergovernmental Agreement of Regional Safe Schools Program (attached to and made a part of the minutes of this meeting); seconded by Mr. Allen. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if the evaluation component had taken place from last year. Dr. Weninger noted that he would obtain the evaluation from West 40.

Mr. Rouse stated that conversation was occurring about strengthening the curriculum at alternative schools to ensure that students do not lose ground academically.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked how the higher amount would affect the budget. Ms. Witham responded that if all of the spaces were used, an additional \$40,000

would be needed. If it was found to be necessary to amend the budget, it could be amended in December.

Student Discipline Report

Ms. Bishop reviewed the highlights of the Student Discipline Report for 2008-2009, included in the packet. African-American males received 38% of the 5,955 infractions and White males received 16%. Sixty-two percent of all of the infractions related to attendance, e.g., truancies, and tardies, etc. A large number of tardies occur around lunch periods.

Dr. Lee noted that there seemed to be fewer cell phone problems now than two years ago. What changed? Mr. Goodfellow said the Board of Education changed the policy: students may have cell phones on their persons but they must be turned off and not seen. If a student has a cell phone out, he/she is asked to put it away. Many students, however, are not complying with the policy. The District is choosing its battles as so many students have cell phones. The situation has not been remedied and the consequences outside of the school are significant as cell phones have cameras, etc. Mr. Dennis stated more and more students are refusing to hand over their cell phones when asked. They would rather be defiant to a faculty member than release a cell phone. He did not think the policy was working and it needed to be addressed. Faculty members are hesitant to address this issue of cell phones with students. Other schools have been surveyed as to their policies and no one had any great ideas. Some schools keep the phones longer than just a day, a week, or a month, etc.

Dr. Weninger stated that schools are in a personal technologies learning curve. Ms. Bishop, Ms. Milojevic, and Student Council representatives are conversing about personal technologies from the student's perspective. Mr. Finnegan stated that this was a double-edged sword; while these tools are valuable and can be positive, they can also infringe on the privacy rights of others. Another issue is that of stadium lights. The school community has to do everything possible to show that it is the best citizen and neighbor. It is a right and a privilege to have the lights and he saw the use of personal technologies in the same light.

Ms. Patchak-Layman wondered whether infractions were occurring in the classroom or were they occurring when students traveled to other parts of the building, etc. Mr. Rouse stated that the class structure provides a unique opportunity for the teacher and the students to know each other well; as a result, things are handled appropriately within the classroom. When students are there only part time, they may be consequence outside the Special Education areas because the regular staff deals with things differently. Ms. Patchak-Layman remarked that if PBIS were the basis of self-regulation in Special Education, it ended when a student stepped outside the door into an unpredictable climate.

With regard to the chart on page 7, Ms. Patchak-Layman learned that the only time a manifestation hearing is conducted is when a student has received a 10-day suspension.

Dr. Lee questioned why the number of infractions in the second semester was about half the number in first semester for non-Special Education students and the opposite for Special Education students. The theory was that many students return to campus for second semester to see if they can be successful within the

building. Many times these students cannot be successful and influence others. Constant discussions occur with Special Education staff about transitioning students back to the high school from outside placements.

Ms. Bishop, in wanting to decrease the time a student serves in ISS, established a room for restricted lunch to be used as an intervention and as a consequence. Saturday detentions have also been scheduled.

Consequences were being assigned in a racially equitable manner, e.g., 60% white, 25% African-American, 6% multiracial, 4-5% Asian, etc. Mr. Wilson stated that when they looked at the level of infractions generating the same percentages of consequences among races, it was the same. After two referrals, students are automatically referred to their PSS Team.

Mr. Rouse remarked on the decrease in the number of expelled students. Dr. Weninger credited the Deans, the Counselors, and the Resource Managers for doing interventions at critical times in students' lives. Ms. Bishop noted that the deans were addressing the large number of Class II infractions. Dr. Lee asked if someone were trying to find fault with the high school and the argument was given that the number of expulsions had dropped dramatically. The person would then argue that the reason for that was that the high school had let a larger number of students get away with things. He asked how the high school would respond. Ms. Bishop said that there is no recidivism of Class IV fractions.

Mr. Conway stated that often the only supervision a student gets is what he/she receives in this building. He has seen students turned their lives around during their time in this building. He asked what role the SRO played in interventions. Ms. Bishop said it was significant, particularly in educating students on how to make better choices.

Mr. Rouse thanked Ms. Bishop and the Deans for their work before, during, and after school. Four deans serve over 3,000 students. Ms. Bishop felt fortunate to work with them. Deans are usually the disciplinarians in schools and are generally feared and disliked. That is not the case with these four deans. Students learn that their compassion is to help them improve.

Dr. Millard applauded the depth of the report.

Faculty Senate—Mr. Hunter noted that it was a delightful opening of school and he thanked the Board of Education for bringing back the breakfast. The faculty appreciates the time for collaboration and communication and the breakfast was a nice start.

Mr. Hunter complimented Mr. Powell for being a one-of-a-kind and thanked Lynn Allen for encouraging Mr. Powell's recognition for the great job he was doing to help students.

Mr. Hunter appreciated Mr. Allen's comments regarding the parking situation.

Mr. Hunter appreciated Mr. Conway's comments regarding the use of test scores within this building. Many graduates return the first day of school to tell the teachers how well they were doing. Often it is not the high-achieving students who return, an indication of how well they were prepared at the high school.

Mr. Hunter was enthusiastic about the year and was seeing many good qualities that he wanted to impress upon the Board, e.g., the discipline, the Bridge Program, the summer practicum, AP scores. He hoped that the Board of Education recognized how engaged and excited the faculty was to work at OPRFHS and he hoped they believed in their abilities to make the students' lives better.

APPLE—The first APPLE meeting will be October 6.

Boosters—The first meeting is scheduled for September 2, which will be an outdoor outing to work on paying for the lights.

Consent Items

Mr. Allen moved to approve the consent items as follows:

- Approval of the Check Disbursements and Financial Resolutions dated August 27, 2009 (attached to and made a part of the minutes of this meeting);
- June 2009 Treasurer's Report; and
- Monthly Financials;

seconded by Mr. Conway. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Bond Opportunity

Mr. Conway moved to approve the resolution providing for the issue of not to exceed \$12,000,000 General Obligation Limited Tax Refunding School Bonds, Series 2009; seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Ms. Witham explained that the Board of Education was approving a resolution to find savings in the marketplace on the high school's existing bonds. If it were done now, the high school would save a net of \$357,000. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked how this would affect Life Safety. Ms. Witham responded that the school levies Life Safety and repays those bonds. In response to Ms. Patchak-Layman's question as to whether this would affect the tax rate for the bonds and the savings that would be generated, the response was no. Mr. Allen stated that this was a good time to take advantage of the opportunity.

Escrow Account

Dr. Lee moved to approve the resolution authorizing an Escrow Agreement in connection with the issue of General Obligation Limited Tax Refunding School Bonds, Series 2009; seconded by Mr. Allen. A roll call vote resulted in all six ayes and one nay. Mr. Conway voted nay. Motion carried.

Policy 20

Mr. Finnegan moved to amend Policy 20, Board of Education; seconded by Mr. Conway. A roll call vote resulted in five ayes and two nays. Ms. Patchak-Layman and Mr. Allen voted nay. Motion carried.

The Board of Education was informed that the revisions to the policy were constructed after consultation with the lawyers. Ms. Patchak-Layman opposed the amendment because she wanted 1) a checks and balance over the review of the audio recordings and minutes, and 2) the new paragraph under Verbatim Recordings to be eliminated. Mr. Allen concurred that the Board of Education has an obligation to rule by majority action and it is not necessary to include that paragraph. The quotation marks will be removed from this policy.

Policy 3310

Dr. Lee moved to amend of Policy 3310, Contracts/Purchasing, as presented; seconded by Ms. McCormack. A roll call vote resulted in six ayes and two nays. Motion carried. Ms. Patchak-Layman voted nay.

Dicsussion ensued relative Ms. Patchak-Layman’s desire to make a stronger statement with regard to bidders. The Administration informed the Board of Education that all of the school’s legal counsels submitted what could and could not be requested in the bid documents and that the language inserted reflected that. Case law also supported it.

Ms. Patchak-Layman preferred being more restrictive than *The State Code of Illinois* and wanted to change the limit to \$15,000 rather than \$25,000 under D. 2 and E.1.

Mr. Allen stated that the Procurement Code Law encourages state agencies to achieve a BEP (women or minority) contracting goal of 2%. While OPRFHS is not a state agency, it was the reason for adding the law firm of Pugh Jones Johnson to the list of attorneys the school uses.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked how Chicago and other construction contracts state 15% as being the goal for women and minority owned contracts with government funding. Ms. Witham could not speak for the City of Chicago but opinions have said that if discrimination has been found and remediation has occurred, quotas can be assigned. If not, one is not supposed to do that. It becomes troublesome when collecting the bids and then saying that one has not used that criteria to make a decision.

Ms. McCormack noted that her company was a WBE-certified firm. It is really about the ownership of the company. Ms. Patchak-Layman stated that the bidding forms at the Village of Oak Park have specified sheets that allows bidders to submit their demographics. Ms. Patchak-Layman hoped that they were paid prevailing wage.

Policy 3550 & 3555

Mr. Allen moved to adopt Policy 3550, Reimbursement of Board Of Education Member Expenses, and amend Policy 3555, Attendance at Conferences and Workshops, as presented; seconded by Dr. Lee.

Regarding 3550, Ms. Patchak-Layman stated that replacing “shall” with “may upon request and approval” in line one was wrong because she did not feel that if the Board of Education member was attending meetings on behalf of the District that the Board of Education would have to approve the expenses in connection with it. It also did not comply with Policy 3555 where it states shall.

Mr. Allen noted that 3550 was for Board of Education members and Policy 3555 was for staff.

While the policy states that the expenses are reimbursable under Illinois State Law, the law does not limit dollar amounts. Previously, Board of Education members were never reimbursed for any of their expenses in attending official meetings. Dr. Lee wanted to be more conservative at this point due to current finances.

Mr. Allen moved to remove his motion; seconded by Dr. Lee.

Policy 3550

Dr. Millard moved to adopt Policy 3550, Reimbursement of Board Of Education with the change as noted; seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in six ayes. Ms. Patchak-Layman voted nay.

2nd paragraph: Add the words “upon request and approval” after the word “may.”

Policy 3555

Mr. Allen moved to amend Policy 3555, Attendance at Conferences and Workshops, as presented; seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll all vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

**Policies 1320,
6130, 6131,
6133, 6134, 6160**

Mr. Allen moved to approve for first reading Policy 1320, School Visitors, Policy 6130, Objections To Instructional Materials, Policy 6131, Objections To Materials In Library Collection, Policy 6133, Consultation With Parents And Teachers, Policy 6134, Instructional Materials, and Policy 6160, Academic Honesty, seconded by Dr. Lee.

Ms. Patchak-Layman questioned the time that Policy 1320 would be in effect. Mr. Rouse stated that it was intended to be from 7:30 a.m. until 4:30 p.m. when Safety and Support Personnel manned the Welcome Center. There was consensus to add language to that effect for second reading.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if students could sponsor visitors or could they have their parents accompany them. The Administration will explore these questions.

Dr. Lee asked that the Board of Education members either vote yes or no to the question and then to do the rewording in the Policy, Evaluation, and Goals meeting.

Relative to Policy 6160, Academic Honesty, Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if the Assistant Principal for Student Services will issue a consequence based on the *Code of Conduct*. Mr. Prale responded that the goal of the policy is to separate out academic honesty from the Code of Conduct so that students are not penalized twice: once in the academic system and once in the discipline system.

Dr. Lee moved the question. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes.

A roll call vote to accept the policies for first reading resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Public Hearing

At 9:46 p.m., a hearing was held on the FY 2010 budget, as presented; hearing no written or oral comments, Mr. Allen closed the hearing at 9:47 pm.

Approval of FY 2010 Budget

Mr. Finnengan moved to approve the FY 2010 Final Budget; seconded by Dr. Lee.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if there were any potential to change? Ms. Witham itemized the following:

- 1) General State Aid about \$10,000 less;
- 2) Safe School Grant about \$70,000 less, resulting in a potential increase of about \$40,000 for tuition;
- 3) Hirings.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked how the school would compensate for lost revenue and additional hirings. Ms. Witham responded that the largest part of the budget is salary, benefits, and supplies. Construction work is completed and paid for during the summer. While it would be difficult to find this money, it may not be needed depending on how many students were outplaced. However, it represents less than one percent of the budget.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked how much was allotted for Board of Education goals. At this point the goals were not yet approved and no dollar amount was included with them other than the contract for the Baldrige Assessment of \$22,000.

A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Comprehensive Group Contract

Mr. Finnegan moved to approve the contract for services with The Comprehensive Group for FY 2010 at a rate of \$74 per hour; seconded by Dr. Millard.

Because these services had been in place since 2002, Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if the District would go out for an RFQ. Ms. Witham responded that the Special Education Department had not been asked to do that. Dr. Weninger added that when it comes to professional services such as this, it is important to have consistency over time. These are relationships that occur over time. Had issues arose, adjustments would be made. Parents were not complaining. Mr. Finnegan concurred with Dr. Weninger.

A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

2009 AP Exam Scores

The Board of Education received a report from Fred Galluzzo regarding the 2009 AP scores.

Mr. Prale stated that of the total number of enrollments, 1850 students, on average, take 2.21 courses. They have the opportunity to enroll in as many as 8 AP courses over their career at OPRFHS. While the more select colleges are less interested in AP scores for credit, other schools do offer placement considerations. OPRFHS feels that taking an AP course is a great experience for students. Of note, 28 students with IEPs took 53 tests this year; last year 24 students with IEPs took 29 tests.

**Approval of Minutes
And Destruction of
Tapes**

Dr. Millard moved to approve the Open Minutes of June 25, July 16, and 21, 2009 and the closed session minutes of May 28 and June 25, and July 16, 2009 with the noted change and the destruction of the November 2007 closed session audiotapes; seconded by Mr. Allen. A roll call vote resulted in six ayes and one nay. Ms. Patchak-Layman voted nay.

**Goals for 2009
2010**

Dr. Millard moved to approve the Board of Education goals for the 2009-2010 School Year, as presented; seconded by Dr. Lee.

Goal 1: Racial Equity

OPRFHS will provide an inclusive education for all students by reducing racial predictability and disproportionality in student achievement and reducing systemic inhibitors to success for students and staff of color.

Goal 2: Student Academic Achievement

Raise student academic achievement through the development of definitions and measurements for student achievement and the racial achievement gap, one new program affecting underachieving students, a data-driven model of school improvement, and academic support for students assigned to In School (ISS) and Out of School (OSS) suspensions.

Goal 3: Recruitment, Employment, and Retention of Professional Staff

Recruit, employ, develop, and retain the highest quality staff, in ways that are fair to applicants and clear to employees.

Goal 4: Finance

Develop a new budgeting process that includes program priority procedures, identification of additional revenue sources, expenditure priority procedures, and cost containment measures.

Goal 5: Learning Environment

Improve the learning environment for students and staff considering aspects of respect, safety, academic promise, and social-emotional well-being.

Ms. Patchak-Layman expressed concern about students in ISS and OSS not reviewing appropriate academic support. She did not believe what was proposed was different from what was currently in place. Mr. Rouse responded with the following:

- 1) currently no tutoring occurs in ISS;
- 2) an academic coach job description is being developed and the position will be filled;
- 3) A stronger relationship will also be developed with alternative schools;
- 4) Teachers will fill out surveys relative to how well prepared these students were for class when they return.

When asked if the same will happen for students with OSS, Mr. Prale replied that they already receive tutoring and they will continue to do so. Mr. Prale and Mr. Vogel were working on appropriate distance learning opportunities that meet OPRFHS academic standards in addition to the tutoring provided at the

public libraries. While a student in OSS is entitled to receive services, the student has done something to put himself/herself out of school.

Dr. Millard cautioned that the Board of Education had developed a very ambitious set of goals and it was the administration's decision on how to implement them, not the Board of Education's decision.

Mr. Allen noted that each administrator has a responsibility to the goals. He cautioned that the goals were ambitious. In April/May, the Board of Education will have to be realistic about how well the goals have been accomplished. The Board of Education and the administration are trying to make the school proud, but there are only 24 hours per day. He did not want to de-motivate what was trying to be achieved. Ms. McCormack suggested the Board of Education might be broader in its articulation of goals. Ms. Patchak-Layman suggested that part of specifying is accountability. Mr. Allen stated that part of accountability is also not setting people up to fail.

A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Board of Education Meetings

Dr. Lee moved to approve the Goals and Procedures for the Conduct of the Board of Education Meetings, as presented (attached to and made a part of the minutes of this meeting); seconded by Dr. Millard. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Closed Session

At 10:27 p.m., on August 27, 2009, Dr. Millard moved to go into closed session for the purpose of discussing Student disciplinary cases 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(10); discussing the appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of specific employees of the District or legal counsel for the District, including hearing testimony on a complaint lodged against an employee or against legal counsel for the District to determine its validity. 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(1), as amended by PA. 93—57; and Litigation, when an action against, affecting or on behalf of the particular District has been filed and is pending before a court or administrative tribunal, or when the District finds that an action is probable or imminent, in which case the basis for the finding shall be recorded and entered into the closed meeting minutes. 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(11); seconded by Ms. McCormack. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

At 1:30 a.m. on Friday, August 28, 2009, the Board of Education resumed its open session.

Adjournment

At 1:31 a.m., on Friday, August 28, 2009, Mr. Conway moved to adjourn the Board of Education meeting; seconded by Mr. Allen. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Dr. Dietra D. Millard
President

John C. Allen, IV
Secretary