

The Board meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on Thursday evening, September 27, 2007, in the Board Room of the high school.

Call to Order President Jacques A. Conway called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m. A roll call indicated that the following members were present: John C. Allen, IV, Jacques A. Conway, Dr. Ralph H. Lee, Sharon Patchak-Layman, and John Rigas. Also present were: Dr. Attila J. Weninger, Superintendent; Jason Edgecombe, Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources; Amy Hill, Director of Research and Assessment; Jack Lanenga, Assistant Superintendent of Operations; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Cheryl L. Witham, Chief Financial Officer; Don Vogel, Interim Principal; Christian Fernandes, Student Council Representative; James Paul Hunter, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Visitors The Board of Education welcomed the following visitors: Kay Foran, Director of Community Relations and Communications; Linda Cada, Director of Special Education; Carolyn Ojikutu, Colleen Biggins, Daphne LeCesne, and Joe Kostal, O.P.R.F.H.S. faculty members; Ryan Canfield and Margarita Pepova of the *Trapeze*; Angelica McClean of the League of Women Voters; Merry Beth Kowalczyk, Burcy Hines, Wyanetta Johnson, parents and community members; Terry Dean of the *Wednesday Journal* and Bridget Kennedy of the *Oak Leaves*.

Board Member Comments Mr. Conway reported that three F.O.I.A. requests were received. Two were resolved and one was pending.

Board of Education Comments Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that she was still waiting for information on the things she mentioned at the August Board of Education meeting. They were as follows: 1) the paperwork involved with the book and fee waiver; 2) the principal's job description and how that meshed with The School Code of Illinois; 3) the status of the residency forms needing correction; and 4) parent involvement with Title I.

Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that Instruction Committee members received an analysis of the Prairie State Achievement Exam (PSAE) results, a predictor of a student's college readiness. The ACT sets a number, which, if reached, indicates whether students will be ready for college classes. Of the 98 African-American females who took the test, only three were found to be ready for college science classes. The ramifications for the other 95 girls were not only bad test results, but they also set the tone for career choices available to them. While there

are many obstacles involved in achieving in math and science, Ms. Patchak-Layman was haunted by this statistic and the ramifications. If a student hears that he/she is not good at math or science, it shuts the door for that student. Ms. Patchak-Layman requested 1) extra effort to be given to this group of seniors; 2) the establishment of educational plans to help these students find the areas for which they are not prepared; and 3) support for them in the areas where they need to improve their knowledge base so that when they go college, they do not have to take remedial classes.

At that same meeting, Instruction Committee members received the beginning of a research project on what happens to District 97 students when they come to the high school. A sample group of 108 juniors who met state standards at District 97 on the ISAT test was used in the report. Of that group, 74 were White and 84 were African-American. After taking math at the high school and determining whether they would meet the college readiness benchmark, only 37 of the White students and three African-American students met the benchmark. When looking at readiness, although this was not part of the study, it looked as if the readiness scores followed a similar performance. It alarmed her that it had taken the high school so long to put these kinds of numbers together. At a different level, she was saddened and outraged at the same time that the high school was not fulfilling its promise or its obligation to the students in this community. To her, it looked like discussions were occurring about having two different schools—the college-prep regular courses and college-prep honors courses and that they were operating in a parallel universe. The promises made to students that they would be able to get to college and be ready for college are not being fulfilled. Most of the African-American students are in college-prep regular classes. She continued that the battle of separate schools was fought 50 years ago. How could there be two separate schools? She hoped the community would consider this and take action. People come to Oak Park because they want to be better than the best, beat the rest, have all people living together successfully, and obtain an education. This is a conversation about the students. She asked what the school was going to do to work with these seniors and the juniors behind them.

Mr. Allen stated that last month Ms. Patchak-Layman commented that her emails had been F.O.I.A.'ed by the school's lawyer. At the time, I expressed serious concern about a contractor who would use that avenue to get communication. He had qualified his statement by saying, "If that were the case." As it turns out, the school has been in contact with the Attorney General's office. The lawyer to whom Ms. Patchak-Layman had spoken wrote in a letter to the Superintendent that stated, "When the attorney posed the same question to me...I informed

him that we have received that identical inquiry from his board and offered to send him a copy of the inquiry.” The attorney continued, “Let me be precise: The lawyer did not contact our office seeking a copy of correspondence between Ms. Patchak-Layman or any Board of Education member and the Office of the Attorney General. In fact, to my knowledge, he had no idea that our office had even received an inquiry from District 200 related to this matter.” The attorney continued, “When he posed the same OMA question to me that Ms. Patchak-Layman had posed, I informed him that we had received that identical inquiry from his Board of Education and offered to send to him a copy of the inquiry to ensure that the Board of Education was clear about the Attorney General’s position with regard to closed-door sessions and self-evaluation.” Mr. Allen stated that the attorney had contacted Ms. Patchak-Layman about whether she wanted her contact information redacted and Ms. Patchak-Layman chose not to have it redacted. This is a three-fold problem.

- 1) Mr. Allen jumped to a conclusion and he owed Dr. Weninger and the lawyer an apology. He suggested others do the same.
- 2) At a certain point, the Board of Education stretches the lines of civility. Since his tenure as a Board of Education member starting May 15, the level of civility has deteriorated to the point where common courtesy simply does not apply. It is almost embarrassing. Facts are used and twisted to suit certain wills, certain purposes, without any real goal for the image that we are supposed to present to our most important clients—the students. People cannot play with getting lawyers involved against the people who are trying to provide the best education
- 3) It affects integrity. Time after time, the Board of Education gets a series of facts. When the whole situation is reviewed, it turns out the allegation made is not the valid. He then referred to the board meeting held in the summer when an allegation was made that the Open Meetings Act was being violated. Only half the facts were given and when the school contacted the Attorney General’s office, the school received a ruling that was exactly opposite. At a certain point, the Attorney General’s Office will grow weary of that and it will affect the school’s credibility.

Principal’s Report Principal Vogel reported on: 1) the success of the class meetings; 2) the wonderful spirit assembly held last Friday; 3) the honoring of the National Merit and National Achievement Scholarship semifinalists; 4) the 32 students who were named commended students; 5) the notification from Carleton College that faculty member Kristin Knake had been nominated as the teacher who had made the difference in a former student’s life; 6) the Athletic Department’s program on the

essentials of athletic performance; and 7) the compliment received from North Allegany High School's field hockey team on O.P.R.F.H.S.'s facilities.

**Superintendent's
Comments**

Dr. Weninger reported on a successful beginning of the new school year, including the exciting spirit assembly. He thanked those responsible for making it so successful—Cindy Milojevic, Jack Lanenga, the Math Department, the Huskies Athletic Council, the student athletes and all of the spirited students.

Dr. Weninger reported that the National Thespan Awards were given to 13 theatre students for providing 100 hours of service to the theatre program beyond their plays, practices, and rehearsals.

Dr. Weninger reported that he continues to meet with the District Leadership Team (DLT) and various leadership groups within the school and the community regarding the issue of raising student achievement in coordination with preparing a comprehensive plan to be presented to the Board of Education October 25, 2007.

Dr. Weninger reported on his meeting with Oak Park Police Chief Tanksley and Deputy Chief Scianna, reaffirming the positiveness of the school resource officer position.

Dr. Weninger thanked Ms. Witham for working to get video and audio equipment installed in the buses.

Dr. Weninger complimented *Trapeze's* outstanding first issue.

Dr. Weninger reported that the Jazz Band performed in the Student Center from 7:15 to 7:45 that morning, an example of the opportunities O.P.R.F.H.S. offers across the academic spectrum.

**Certification of
Summer Graduates**

Mr. Allen moved to certify the 2007 summer school graduates as presented (attached to and made a part of the minutes of this meeting); seconded by Mr. Rigas. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

**Foreign Exchange
Student Report**

Mr. Vogel presented the names of the foreign exchange students for the 2007-08 school year. They are as follows:

<u>Student</u>	<u>Country</u>	<u>Program</u>
Asli Aydin	Turkey	AFS
Diana Durusbek	Kyrgustan	AFS
Juliette Lessing	Netherlands	ISE

Irene Nager Martorell	Spain	AFS
Arpaporn Pimwapee	Thailand	ISE
Tim Rutetzki	Germany	Northwest Student Exchange

District Committees/ Liaison Reports PTO—Mr. Allen reported that the Principal and the Superintendent attended the September PTO’s meeting. Discussion included 1) parties held after dances, and 2) getting more parents involved.

Citizens’ Council—Mr. Allen reported that the Citizens’ Council meeting was well attended. The Council renewed its purpose by reading its bylaws. After the Superintendent’s report, the members broke into small groups to discuss future agenda items.

Concert Tour—Ms. Patchak-Layman reported on the activities of the Concert Tour Association: 1) Friday Huskie Music Fest, 2) the Marching Band traveling to Indiana for a meeting at Purdue, where the members attended classes, watched the competitions and, then, performed but not for competition. An idea to encourage freshman involvement was discussed. In Pennsylvania, they were very successful in getting students into the mainstream of the school by giving them punch cards which they used at different activities, i.e., debates, clubs, music, sporting events, etc.

A.P.P.L.E.—Dr. Lee was optimistic about what A.P.P.L.E. would be able to contribute this year. There were many new parents.

Cooperative for Early Childhood Education—Dr. Lee was glad to have been appointed as the liaison to this group. He had had little experience in this area and is learning a great deal. He has a great deal more appreciation for early childhood education and how progress in that area will make it easier for the high school to do good things.

Faculty Senate—Mr. Hunter was appreciative of the fact that both Dr. Weninger and Mr. Vogel were interested in talking with faculty on a variety of issues and have offered cooperative and instructive time for the future. The faculty is excited about the October Plan. Mr. Hunter has been at the high school since 1985 and has attended a number of Instruction Committee meetings. However, he felt the one he attended September 20 was one of the best. The discussion was wonderful. Mr. Prale gave an honest depiction of the status of the high school. The Board of Education did an outstanding job of grasping the issues and setting a framework to work together. He understood that it was challenging for the Board of Education, but he felt invigorated and excited as all move to work together on the challenges, as a learning community. He hoped that the Board of Education is able to grasp the faculty’s enthusiasm and support for Dr. Weninger.

Oak Park Park District—Mr. Conway reported that he attended an Oak Park Park District discussion regarding Ridgeland Commons. The Park District is looking at the cost of repairing/replacing that facility. Mr. Lanenga is a regular attendant at these meetings. Ridgeland Commons has outlived its usefulness and the Park District is looking to the high school and to the Village of Oak Park to find a way to offer better services to the whole community.

West 40—Ms. Patchak-Layman reported that she attended a meeting at West 40, where it was reported that HARBOR Academy had a successful beginning.

In addition, West 40 will work with individual schools that have not made AYP. She distributed West 40 manuals to each of the Board of Education members as to what West 40 thought modeled good school improvement teams. She also spoke with Doug Dirks, senior consultant, on the school leadership team. One of the models this team is hoping to profile came from the high school's feeder school, District 97. West 40 recommends that a school improvement plan team consist of a cross section of teachers, stakeholders, etc. West 40 has more information and help available for the high school.

Consent Items

Mr. Edgecombe noted that the amendment of Policy 5114, Student Discipline, did not include acceptance of the procedures, as the Policy Committee members had not yet discussed them. Procedures are accepted rather than approved because the Board of Education has given the administration the power to change the procedures as necessary. While they are part of the information, the Board of Education does not approve them.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked that the following items be removed from the consent agenda: B, D, E, F, and L.

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

- The open minutes of August 23, September 11, and 18, 2007 and the closed session minutes of August 23, September 11 and 18, 2007, and a declaration that the audiotapes of February 2006 be destroyed;
- Resolution Ratifying and Confirming Execution of certain vouchers and payment of certain bills and expenses, fund transfers and list of bills for September 2007 (attached to and made part of the minutes of this meeting);

- Resolution Authorizing Execution of Certain Vouchers for the Month of October 2007 (attached to and made a part of the minutes of this meeting);
- Check Disbursements dated September 27, 2007 (attached to and made a part of the minutes of this meeting);
- Application of Recognition of Schools;
- Appointment of Citizens' Council Member;
- Physical Therapist Contract;
- Occupational Therapist Contract; and
- Psychologist Contract;

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

**Personnel
Recommendations**

Mr. Rigas moved to approve the personnel recommendations (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.

Per its contract, Classified Personnel Association (CPA) personnel are notified of open CPA positions before the positions are posted for the public. Positions are posted outside of the Human Resources' Offices. Non-certified positions are not part of a bargaining unit and there is no exclusivity.

**Policy 20,
Board of Education**

Mr. Allen moved to amend Policy 20, Board of Education, as presented; seconded by Mr. Rigas. A roll call vote resulted in four yeas and one nay. Ms. Patchak-Layman voted nay. Motion carried.

Ms. Patchak-Layman felt strongly that the Board of Education should have a policy that states that the Board of Education sets the goals of the district and that should be annotated in the *Policy Manual*. Therefore, she could not support the policy as written.

**Policy 5114,
Student Discipline**

Mr. Allen moved to amend Policy 5114, Student Discipline, as presented; seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in four yeas and one nay. Ms. Patchak-Layman voted nay. Motion carried.

Ms. Patchak-Layman reiterated her desire to discuss the procedures of this policy. She felt strongly that the Board of Education should be the hearing officer on expulsion hearings. The Board of Education needs to

hear from the family and student, making the decision to expel a student based on the family coming before it. She recommended this to the Policy Committee. She did not support this policy as written.

Dr. Lee disagreed strongly with Ms. Patchak-Layman's position. He did not feel the duties of the members of the Board of Education included sitting as hearing officers every time a hearing was set for a student where the result might end up in an expulsion. There are hearings that do not result in expulsion. He would not have run for the Board of Education if he had to sit for every hearing because it might result in an expulsion. He did not believe this to be the role of a Board of Education member. He supported the changes in the policy as presented. Mr. Rigas strongly concurred with Dr. Lee.

Ms. Patchak-Layman referenced page 5 of the Policy 5114, where it talked about possession. She was unclear if the examples on page 6 met the benchmark of knowledge and control of which, she understood, meant the student had knowledge of and had to be in control of something. This question was for clarification. Was this a true example? Does that meet the knowledge and control of ___? If not, it should be stricken from policy. Mr. Edgecombe responded that it was his understanding that if drugs were found in a vehicle or in someone's locker and there were others present in the vehicle or there were individuals who shared the locker, the premise would be that everyone was equally culpable and that further investigation would lead to those in possession. He felt it met the criteria. Mr. Conway stated that it is a case-by-case situation.

Referring to Page 1, Letter A, where it stated that insubordination is defined as disobeying a person in authority, Ms. Patchak-Layman asked what would happen when a student felt the person's direction was not right or by following the direction, he/she would be doing a wrong. Mr. Edgecombe responded that any student who was convicted is assumed wrong. If the student made the decision not to follow the directive, in the face of it, it would look like insubordination. In general, it is the expectation that students will follow the direction of the adults.

Referring to Page 4, Item Z, Ms. Patchak-Layman questioned whether free speech would have been affected had there been a political walkout. Would the school consider that a disruptive activity? Dr. Weninger reported that the administration runs a school. It is up to the school, parents and community to operate a school that is efficient, smooth, and protects the rights the students. Students do not shed their constitutional rights at the school's doors. If a student or group were to conduct a walkout and it was disruptive, it would be the judgment of the administrative staff if it constituted free speech or a disruption. In

reference to the walkout, only one student was involved and was not prohibited from doing anything. Because the student did not walk out, no consequences were issued, as it did not interfere with the other students or the assembly.

**Approval of
Activities
Per Policy 5132**

Dr. Lee moved to approve the list of 2007 IHSA Clubs/Activities and Athletes, as presented (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 noted that all activities were listed last year and she wondered why they were not included this year. Mr. Vogel stated that the wrong list was submitted last year because the activity director was not clear on what was required. Mr. Vogel stated the activities listed have rosters of members and they are inputted into the tracking system for weekly reports on all of these students. Ms. Patchak-Layman liked that fact that, if students were receiving C's, then they would go to study tables. She felt it was a good intervention and a way to keep track of students. Dr. Weninger, while thinking that was a good point, said it would only be feasible in an ideal world. The high school cannot track 3200 students and provide study tables for them. This is about what the school can do and what it can achieve. Mr. Edgecombe added that the activities listed meet every day of the week for blocks of time, while others activities meet only once a month or irregularly. Ms. Patchak-Layman hoped to address this in the Policy Committee. The high school pays clubs and activities money so there must be a sponsor.

**Approval of Safe
School Funding
Agreement**

Dr. Lee moved to approve the Intergovernmental Agreement regarding Regional Safe School Programs Funding for 2007-08; seconded by Mr. Allen. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked whether the alternative schools being used were a program match for the academic needs of the students there. Dr. Weninger stated that typically the curriculum offered to students in alternative schools, in this situation HARBOR or Ombudsman, are individualized programs. They assess the students when they are enrolled and work toward their needs. They will not and cannot offer the complete compliment of services offered at O.P.R.F.H.S., given their resources. Mr. Conway stated it was a consequence of being out of this building because of discipline. The students may accept that and work themselves back into the building or enroll in a private school. Each facility may not provide the same curriculum because of space, finances, etc. The high school is keeping the students in the system, but it cannot offer them the specialties of this building.

Dr. Weninger presented the following information on last year's students at HARBOR. Of the 19 who attended:

- 2 returned to O.P.R.F.H.S.
- 5 continue there
- 2 will continue at HARBOR first semester and then return to O.P.R.F.H.S.
- 6 graduated.
- 2 were remanded to Special Education.
- 1 dropped out
- 1 went from HARBOR to Ombudsman.

Mr. Allen asked about the students' performances when they returned to the high school. Unsure because the school does not track that information, Dr. Weninger stated that an overall assessment would be developed and that information would be included.

Public Hearing on FY '08 Budget A public hearing on the FY'08 Budget was called to order at 8:52 p.m. Ms. Witham noted that this was an opportunity for hear public comment on the budget and asked for any public oral or written comments. Hearing no oral or written comments, the hearing was closed at 8:55 p.m. Ms. Witham noted that no one had come to view the budget during the time it was on display.

Approval of FY '08 Budget Dr. Lee moved to approve the FY'08 Budget as presented; seconded by Mr. Rigas. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Acceptance of Gifts and Donations Mr. Conway moved to accept with gratitude the gifts and donations, as presented (attached to and made a part of the minutes of this meeting); seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Acceptance of FY'06 Audit Report Mr. Conway moved to approve the FY'06 Audit Report; seconded by Dr. Lee. Discussion ensued.

Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that there was no interest listed on page 67 of the audit document, just the principal. Ms. Witham will explore that question with the auditors.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked what debt service to expenditure ratio was acceptable by industry standards, as stated in the report. Ms. Patchak-Layman also asked why school districts were not part of the overlapping taxing districts, as noted on page 84. She asked how the auditors figured the overlapping rates. Ms. Patchak-Layman was surprised at the lack of appreciable increase in commercial assessed evaluation since 1996. Ms. Witham noted that most commercial

properties in the Oak Park and River Forest communities were in the TIF districts. O.P.R.F.H.S.'s Levy amount for commercial property is capped at the original TIF amount; it will not increase.

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

**Public Hearing
On Life Safety
Amendment**

Mr. Lanenga called the hearing on the Mall Life Safety Amendment to order at 8:58 p.m. He asked for any public oral or written comments.

Ms. Patchak-Layman was concerned about asking the community to pay for \$600,000 in life safety work via bonds. She had understood from the previous budget that this money was supposed to come from the Restricted Building Fund. Mr. Rigas informed her that the District already had these dollars; the District was not borrowing any funds. Ms. Witham explained that Life Safety Funds were used to pay for the mall. Under the cap, as long as the District gets prior Levy plus CPI, it can distribute the money to the different funds, as long as the funds are under the rate. Thus, the District levied money into the Life Safety Fund, instead of the Education Fund. Life Safety includes architects certifying this as Life Safety. If the expenditure were from the O&M Fund, certification would not be necessary. While, the Restricted Building Fund had sunset, the Board of Education instructed Ms. Witham to maintain a reserve. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked, if it were not paid from Life Safety Funds, which fund would pay for it. The choices would be the Education Fund, the Restricted Building Fund or the Operations & Maintenance Fund, and with an identical Levy. Ms. Patchak-Layman thanked Ms. Witham for the clarification.

At 9:05 p.m., the hearing was closed.

**Approval of Life
Safety Amendment:
Mall**

Mr. Allen moved to approve Resolution Regarding the Need to complete Paving Work and Use Fire Prevention and Safety Code Funds and to approve Certification of Need for Fire Prevention and Safety Funds, as presented; seconded by Mr. Conway. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Mr. Lanenga reported that West 40 was aware of the amendment. This project was originally approved in May, but it is late because the District had to wait until other Life Safety Amendments expired. Life Safety Funds will pay for this work because it is a project about water drainage, sewer hazards, etc. The District is not issuing bonds for this work.

Approval of Mastery Manager Contract Dr. Lee moved to accept the Mastery Manager Software Subscription as presented (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.

Mastery Manager was found superior for O.P.R.F.H.S. in both the features it offers and price. The contract term of 39 months provides the best pricing structure and O.P.R.F.H.S. is entitled to software updates at no charge.

Approval of Spoken Word Contract Dr. Lee moved to approve the contract with Siskel/Jacobs Productions, to film O.P.R.F.H.S.'s Spoken Word team as part of a documentary feature on the annual *Louder than a Bomb* poetry slam competition, as presented; seconded by Mr. Conway. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Dr. Weninger reported that this documentary about students in Spoken Word would be filmed at the high school. If there were to be commercial success, then the District would reap scholarships for students. Dr. Weninger thanked Ms. Foran for helping to assure the contents of the contract.

Decision & Appeal Process Dr. Weninger presented the Board of Education members with drafts of the Suspension/Expulsion Process and an Appeals Chart.

The Appeals Chart identified twenty areas as to where decisions were made for parents/students/staff and where they would go to make an appeal of a decision. These documents have been vetted over the last six to eight weeks by the Pupil Support Team, Instructional Council, BLT (Building Leadership Team), and DLT (District Leadership Team). He now welcomed the Board of Education's feedback. Once complete it will be included in the *Student Handbook*, the *Faculty Handbook*, the *Academic Catalog*, posted on the O.P.R.F.H.S. website and printed in the newsletter.

Dr. Lee commented that he felt the chart would be helpful as in making things clear.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked the definition of enrollment versus residency. Dr. Weninger noted that three processes—enrollment, registration, and residency—were packaged into one.

- 1) Enrollment to be come a student (what forms are filled out, who does one speak to, etc.);
- 2) Registration into courses, (registration fees, etc.); and
- 3) Residency.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked for the delineation of “Per Illinois School Code” and “Per School Procedures.” Were they not all School Code? How are the choices made between them? Dr. Weninger used the example that *The School Code of Illinois* strictly covers the PE Waiver. Some decisions may be made by *The School Code of Illinois*, but not entirely; it may be a combination of Per School Code and Procedures.

It was noted that parents requesting a level change, moving between ability levels, before the student starts the class is called an “override.” That would be part of the registration process. Once the student had enrolled in a course, one would have to follow the procedures on the chart.

Ms. Patchak-Layman wanted the payment of fees centralized in the Business Office. Ms. Witham responded that the Food Service Department had taken care of the Free and Reduced Lunch Program, as part of a requirement of a federal project. The federal government has now asked the District not to do that anymore. The State of Illinois has said that the Bookstore may ask for verification in order to receive free books. If parents go to the Food Service Department first and qualify there, there is nothing further they have to do. However, if they have not, the Bookstore may ask for verification. When parents do not qualify for the program and are not able to pay the entire fee, Ms. Witham stated that they might ask for time to make the payments. While the information is being verified, students continue to go to school.

Mr. Allen asked who were the Co-equity Coordinators in the building. Mr. Edgecombe responded that for sexual harassment complaints, he and Marcia Hurt were the Co-equity Coordinators. When asked what kind of complaint might be envisioned, Mr. Edgecombe responded that it could be a faculty member or a student alleging he/she has been harassed sexually or in another inappropriate way. While the issue of immigration issue has not arisen, Mr. Edgecombe would be the person to deal with that issue. Mr. Allen’s concern was that an issue of discrimination would stop inside the building; it could be dealt with summarily. Because the same eyes would not be seeing it, a pattern might be missed. He suggested that the process involve the Board of Education and/or the Superintendent and/or the principal. The present process is as follows: 1) Ms. Hurt investigates the complaint; 2) Mr. Edgecombe reviews the complaint from the standpoint of completeness; 3) Mr. Edgecombe draws a conclusion. Because of confidentiality, no more people are involved with these issues. Should the situation rise to a higher level, Mr. Edgecombe would bring it to the attention of Dr. Weninger and to the Board of Education. Mr. Allen continued that Board of Education members are the link between the school and the community at large. A back-and-forth communication must be

maintained and a major portion of that communication is social equity. If the Board of Education does not have an awareness of something, it is not able to keep its promise to the community.

Mr. Rigas remarked that he had similar questions. If a teacher had an issue with a student who went to the counselor/dean and another student had another issue with that teacher and went to another counselor/dean, a pattern would not be recognized. Past practice has been that when something has been asserted, there is an investigation. The assertion has come to the Board of Education as an information item first. This area is very sensitive. He did not want it too broad-based, because it might ruin a person's reputation.

Policy does not preclude it going beyond Co-equity Coordinators. It was suggested that instead of counselor/dean, it could be Principal or Assistant Principal and after Co-equity Coordinator, add Superintendent or Board of Education. It is beyond the scope of the Board of Education to hear evidence, but it should have knowledge of it. Mr. Edgecombe noted that should these cases arise, the Board of Education would be informed that the school would do an investigation about "x," which parties were involved, and the outcome. Mr. Rigas suggested modifying the policy. Mr. Vogel suggested that students would go to a teacher or someone they knew rather than someone in an office to make a report.

Ms. Patchak-Layman suggested adding notations as to where the parents/students/staff could find specific Board of Education policies. She assumed that students/parents/community could come to the Board of Education independent of this Appeal Process to address an issue. While Dr. Weninger had not intended that, anybody would have the ability to come to the Board of Education to address any issue. When asked if Ms. Patchak-Layman thought this was a good idea, she responded affirmatively, but she did not want to see it as limiting options.

Of note, *The School Code of Illinois* dictates that the Principal is the only one who can make the decision to change a grade.

Dr. Weninger viewed the Suspension/Expulsion Process as a tool to help parents and students understand the process, to whom they could appeal, and at which point. The chart also showed that there were many opportunities for alternative interventions.

Dr. Weninger developed two forms for this process, one for the BLT and one for the DLT. Student information would include the student's year in school, credits earned, GPA, Class Rank, Special Education, Behavioral Contract, and Discipline Record. These two entities are

asked to give a formal vote and a rationale for the vote and that would be provided to the Board of Education with the recommendation. Discussion ensued.

Closed Session

At 10:05 p.m., on Thursday, September 27, 2007, Dr. Lee moved to go into closed session for the purpose of 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; Student disciplinary cases 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(10); The placement of individual students in special education programs and other matters relating to individual students 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(11); 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 Mr. Allen. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

At 11:55 p.m. on Thursday, September 27, 2007, the Board of Education reconvened its open session.

Student Discipline

Mr. Rigas moved to expel Student 09/27/07-01, as of September 27, 2007 for the remainder of the 2007-08 school year, but to hold the expulsion in abeyance contingent upon completion of the enrollment and regular attendance at an alternative placement for the remainder of the 2007-08 school year, ongoing counseling, drug and alcohol counseling, and verification and maintenance of residency in the District; seconded by Mr. Allen. A roll call vote resulted in five ayes. Ms. Patchak-Layman had departed. Motion carried.

Adjournment

At 11:59 p.m. on Thursday, September 27, 2007, Mr. Allen moved to adjourn the Board of Education meeting; seconded by Dr. Millard. A roll call vote resulted in five yeas. Ms. Patchak-Layman had departed. Motion carried.

Jacques A. Conway
President

John P. Rigas
Secretary