

September 27, 2011

The regular Board meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on Tuesday evening, September 27, 2011, in the Board Room.

**Call to Order**

President Millard called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. The following Board of Education members were present: Valerie J. Fisher, Terry Finnegan, Dr. Ralph H. Lee, Amy Leafe McCormack, Dr. Dietra D. Millard, Sharon Patchak-Layman, and John Phelan. Also present were Dr. Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; Cheryl L. Witham, Assistant Superintendent for Finance and Operations and Treasurer; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

**Closed Session**

At 6:31 p.m., on September 27, 2011, Dr. Millard moved to enter closed session for the purpose of 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; Collective negotiating matters between the District and its employees or their representatives or deliberations concerning salary schedules for one or more classes of employees. 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(2); 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 Mr. Finnegan. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

The Board of Education reconvened its open session at 7:33 p.m.

Joining the meeting were: Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum & Instruction; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; Michael Carioscio, Chief Information Officer; Amy Hill, Director of Assessment and Research; Dr. Tina Halliman, Director of Special Education; James Paul Hunter, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair; and Jack Hendrix, Student Council Board of Education Liaison.

**Visitors**

The Board of Education welcomed the following visitors: Kay Foran, Communications and Community Relations Coordinator; Doug Wiley, Supervisor of Finance; Tim Keeley, Director of Purchasing; Robert Zummallen, Director of Buildings and Grounds; Richard Mertz, History Division Head; Johan Walsh of the League of Women Voters; Terrie Raeburn of Parents 4 Student Success; John Bokum, Sue and James Gill, Catherine Rison, and Vince Bray, community members; Robert Wroggle of Legat Architects; Bill Dwyer of the *Pioneer Press*; and James Jaworski of the *Chicago Tribune*.

**Public Comments**

James Gill, parent of a sophomore and resident of 835 N. Kenilworth, Oak Park, addressed the Board of Education about the modified closed campus (MCC). He commented on a letter written by a student to the editor of the *Wednesday Journal* that had a demoralizing tone to it, which he felt his daughter demonstrated as well. The Board of Education voted on a plan for MCC that had no buy in and he warned

that collective punishment never creates buy in. He felt the Board of Education had been inept in voting for something that had no implementation plan.

Vince Bray, resident of 808 S. Grove, Oak Park, addressed the Board of Education about the busing of Special Education students this year. He reported that families are struggling with the new bus service. Many parents feel things are not right, e.g., the children are not safe, they are not secure, or they are not getting what they need on the bus. His own interaction with the bus drivers left him cold and he did not believe he was dealing professionals in the office. He will attempt to get a fact-based update from other parents for the next meeting, as this is an urgent matter.

Catherine Rison, resident of 947 Forest Avenue in Oak Park, is a parent of two juniors, and she is disappointed that they cannot move around the school to see their teachers at lunch. They have to wait 10 minutes even to go to the library. She appreciated the fact that there was a serious rodent issue at the school but she wanted the Board of Education and administration to assure her that this situation would be resolved. Food is fuel for the students and she hoped for less restriction on students moving within the school.

**Board of Education  
Comments**

Ms. Patchak-Layman was pleased to hear the comments from the community as she shared those same concerns for the lunchroom. She did not believe change was happening quickly enough to allow students to use the Student Center and to have worthwhile activities during lunch. Collective punishment is a concern she has and she urged the District to start looking at Restorative Justice programs rather than having an authoritarian rule. Teachers must help students learn to be involved by 1) working on their own behaviors and 2) understanding behaviors of others in order to move forward in a positive way. Restorative Justice emphasizes values of empathy, respect, honesty, acceptance, responsibility, and accountability. It also offers ways to 1) address behaviors in other complex areas in the school, 2) build a supportive environment that can improve safety, and 3) have alternatives to suspensions and expulsions, which is the end result of increasing infractions. Ms. Patchak-Layman felt that the Task Force's job, as well as that of the school's Joint Discipline Committee, must be to look at how the school can help students.

**FOIA Requests**

Dr. Millard reported that three FOIA requests had been received and two had been resolved.

**Faculty Senate Report**

Mr. Hunter felt the year was good. He expressed frustration about the way the *Wednesday Journal* represented the high school. Having reviewed his son's scrapbook and being reminded of a conversation he had with a parent about this, he stated that the *Wednesday Journal* never says anything good about the high school. He would like to see more celebration of the high school and the students in that paper.

**Superintendent  
Report**

Dr. Isoye asked Mr. Rouse to give a report on the MCC Task Force. Principal Rouse was appreciative of the 17 students who participated in the Lunch Hour Task Force as well as the faculty, staff, and parents, totaling 29 members. The Committee will continue to meet weekly to resolve issues in the short-term and to be a part of the long-term solutions. The members of the Task Force will work on four subcommittees: cafeteria, facilities, communication, and data collection. The students were challenged to find "quick-fix" solutions on the utilization of space.

Legat Architects will also speak to the group to talk about space usage—the students welcomed that opportunity. Ms. McCormack, as the Board of Education representative on this task force, noted that the students had been candid and articulated their concerns clearly. There was open communication about the reasons for some of the rules and the brainstorming was very constructive. While she too wanted to find immediate solutions to some of the pressing issues, it may take longer than anticipated. She reiterated that the number of disciplinary infractions had decreased significantly, which translates to fewer students missing class. There are positives to the MCC.

Discussion ensued about the school's need to eradicate the pest problem, which was separate from MCC. As a result of designating the 14 eating areas in the school and increasing the pest control service from bimonthly to weekly, Mr. Zummallen, Director of Buildings and Grounds (B&G), stated that calls from teachers about rodent issues have decreased significantly this year compared with last year. Students are restricted to eating in the cafeteria. This policy will stand as its implementation protects all who work in and visit the building by enforcing the procedures that were already been in place. Students who bring their lunches from home generally carry them on their persons throughout the day and then eat their lunches in the cafeteria. Coaches and activity sponsors should petition either the Athletic Director or the Assistant Principal for Student Activities for additional eating areas, but they are working on communicating with the coaches and sponsors on the procedures. Individuals with food after school should eat in the designated areas. Unless Food Service cannot accommodate a request for an evening activity, all food should be ordered from Food Service. This allows better awareness by B&G. Instances in the past have occurred when food has not been disposed of for a couple of days because B&G was unaware of it. If Food Service is not able to accommodate an evening activity, then food can be ordered from an outside source, but B&G must be made aware of that through a work order. Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that saying one had to clean up as if it were a campsite was different from saying relationships could not be built between students and staff because they could not have food in the classroom. The District has taken the approach that it will not honor the relationships students have had with teachers during lunch.

Board of Education members were hearing that many parents were confused about the 10-minute rule, etc. The District will respond to the community as to what were the Board of Education's actions versus what were the administration's actions and the rules concerning the MCC lunch hour.

The Student Center has been used approximately five times for such things as 1) career and activity fairs, 2) a DJ relative to homecoming, etc. Students suggested other ways to use it as well, i.e., having friendly competition amongst the classes as to the number of tardies and unexcused absences. The class with the least tardies and unexcused absences would be allowed to use the Student Center.

Mr. Rouse stated that juniors and seniors have had access to the mall from the first day of school, as they are allowed to leave campus. By spring, the administration hopes to look at the mall structure and the staffing necessary to be able to oversee freshmen and sophomores.

Regarding Homecoming, Mr. Rouse thanked tour guides Pat Cheney and Tom Tarrant for helping to welcome alumni classes beginning in 1943. He was reminded when meeting with the Class of 1961 of how thankful he is to be principal of this high school and how thankful students should be that they are attending this high school, as previous students had put OPRFHS in a wonderful light. Mr. Rouse announced that he had received a check from Mr. & Mrs. Levey for \$5,000 to use for students.

Dr. Isoye reported that the Pacific Education Group had changed their dates for Courageous Conversations About Race trainings and, as such, the Board of Education will not meet October 4. The issue of personalized stories in open session remains for the Board as the PEG sessions will not be able to go to closed session. It is possible to have the Board continue to participate by governing racial equity through Board Goal #1 through meetings with Pacific Education Group. He asked that Board of Education members continue to hold the October 4 meeting date, however.

Dr. Isoye also reported that he met with the Class of 1951 alumni for its 60<sup>th</sup> reunion. They had many questions about the high school of today and understanding the life of a teenager with technology, etc.

**Hearing on  
Fiscal Year 2011-  
12 Budget**

At 8:16 p.m., Ms. Patchak-Layman called the public hearing to order on the 2011-12 District 200 budget. It has been on display for 30 days. Having receiving no oral or written comments, Ms. Patchak-Layman closed the hearing at 8:17 p.m.

**Treasurer's Report**

It was the consensus of the Board of Education members to approve the August Treasurer's Report under the Consent Agenda.

**Construction Update**

Mr. Zummallen presented the list of construction projects that the Board of Education had approved last year, noting that they would go out for bid in January 2012.

**Feeder Group Fees**

The Board of Education considered the administration's recommendation that the District collect \$10 per participant from each feeder group for practice while continuing to charge for actual personnel presence and waiving the hourly rental charges for events other than practices, as well as a revised hourly facility rental charge. The reason for doing so is 1) to increase student participation and 2) to respect the facilities/equipment and the nonprofit organizations. Discussions occurred with individuals to consider the different aspects in how the District is impacted. Much information was gathered because each sport has its own impact. Through discovery, the District found a national survey of a 1,000 school districts and compared the results to the local level. Dr. Millard was surprised at the detail and the effort that was expended to find out what other schools do in this regard. Mr. Phelan suggested doing an analysis for a future policy versus what the other 1,000 school districts were doing, which is the majority of the information that was provided. Ms. McCormack too noted a longer-term solution might be needed.

Ms. Witham noted that conversations have occurred with the feeder groups about the pricing presented. The District appreciated their difficulties and respected their requests for a participant fee. Most of the feeder groups were fine with the participant fee and the actual costs of staff that have to be present. This amount

was compared to other school districts and the impact on the facilities; this cost is well below costs for an urban setting. This minds the District's finances, meets the needs of different groups and addresses. Mr. Phelan requested the District can go beyond estimating the cost and look at the actual data. Ms. Fisher commended the District for being very responsive and it was directly en point in terms of giving information related to the Board of Education's goal. This recommendation reflects the District's consideration of 1) the reason for having feeder groups, and 2) treating the high school as a community asset—it is there for the communities' use and the students' use. The District determined that the recovery cost was actually in the \$18-19 range and then recommended the smaller dollar amount of \$10, which would still encourage the feeder groups to use the facilities. The District did a great job of coming to this solution and she appreciated the information.

When asked if there was a line item within the budget to say what the income and the activity cost is, the response was that, in the case of Triton, the District has collected revenue for the expenses for actual security, custodial, and parking. For all other kinds of rentals, the funds collected are deposited first into revenue and then into utilities. Insurance is paid from the Tort Fund and that is reflected in several places within the budget. The District has one full-time, 12-month person scheduling the facilities and even that manpower struggles to keep pace with the requests. This person also works with the B&G setup and cleanup crew.

The \$10 per student fee is per student, per sport, per season, no matter how many hours the season is. The total cost to the District is \$79,000. Thus, with 1,300 students paying a \$10 participation fee, the District will collect \$13,000 plus actual personnel costs, which amount to approximately \$15,000 per year.

Ms. Patchak-Layman reported that the Park District has an agreement with District 97 for the use of its facilities. The Park District has its own formula for the dollar amount and credits the organization for the volunteer work they would do. This process could have value at the high school as well. She felt a conversation with all governmental groups should occur about how the fields are used, as the Board of Education valued having as many students participate in cocurriculars at the high school as possible and feeder groups are the entryway to being able to do high school sports. Ms. McCormack added that the Board of Education had learned that students who were not engaged in cocurricular activities by seventh grade were unlikely to do so. Mr. Phelan stated that this survey matches the Blueprint analysis that many students go through the building without having a relationship with an adult in the building. He concurred with the formula used for the 2012 year. He also hoped that the District would continue to talk about fees retroactively, as feeder groups do not have the money to buy the things that help unengaged students. Mr. Finnegan concurred. Dr. Isoye noted that whatever the Board of Education determined to be the fee for this year would be retroactive for last year.

Ms. Patchak-Layman saw this as a temporary measure. It was a reaction to the feeder groups informing the Board of Education about the difficulty they had in paying the fees. The Board of Education had not expected that consequence and she questioned whether there would be other consequences. She felt a total change would be premature, as the administration had not talked with the other governmental entities yet. She also wanted to consider varying scales within the

feeder groups to allow the maximum number of student to participate. More participation occurs when everyone is allowed to participate. Mr. Phelan, too, did not want these programs to carry on with the uncertainty of a policy change; however, making one change now did prohibit further changes to the policy. He favored endorsing this recommendation and monitoring her concerns. Dr. Lee suggested approving the policy for a period of two years with a review to start after one and a half years. He was also uncomfortable with the \$10 fee per participant.

At the Board of Education's direction, Dr. Isoye will schedule a meeting with the cochairs of the Policy, Evaluation and Goals Committee and bring this back to the Board of Education for a first read at its October 13 meeting.

**Update on 5-Year Plan** Ms. Witham presented an update on the five-year plan. She noted that the Advisory Leadership Team, a new group would review the District's assumptions. The model used includes projections for all staff, step on salary range, retirement dates (hiring new FTE at MA 5), and a CPI increase. Teachers' salaries, increase at a faster rate in the early years of their career. The projections are average increases of 4.6%, 4.3%, 4.92%, and 4.22% for all groups within the building. Ms. Witham suggested the book *Stretching the School Dollar*, as it is important to have an understanding of school finance.

Discussion ensued about these projections. Was this a "picture" or was the Board of Education saying this is where it wanted to be in five years? Some Board of Education members felt the discussion should be about where the Board of Education wanted to be in five years, instead of just using historical projections. Ms. Witham noted that the District is working on a new model to address the Board of Education's most desirable outcome. Dr. Isoye stated that the Board of Education requested that as many stakeholders as possible be part of the solution to push out a referendum. Ms. Patchak-Layman hoped to be educated just as the ALT members were in order to understand its future report.

**Charter Contract  
Amendment &  
Transportation  
Agreement**

Ms. Witham explained that over the past two weeks, the District experienced several late or missed athletic trips due to bus company staffing and equipment availability issues. On September 15, the District staff met with executives at Illinois Central Bus Company (Illinois Central) to address these issues and they admitted to not having the work force to meet the contractual needs of the District in the short-term. Both parties mutually agreed to seek remedy that would best suit the needs of the students. Legal counsel was consulted.

R&D Bus Company, the District's former charter bus contract holder, agreed to assume the assignment of the charter contract for the remainder of the school year. The District is fortunate that the aforementioned equipment and work force at R&D have not been committed to any non-curriculum obligations and it was fully available to provide relief to this contract as of the September 15 meeting with Illinois Central. R&D's rate of service will exceed the original contract amount with Illinois Central. The charter contract amendment, signed by Illinois Central, states that the District will withhold any and all additional costs associated with this remedy, inclusive of legal fees borne out of this process, from the currently valid Special Education Transportation Contract in place with Illinois Central. Mr. Witham acknowledged the work of Mr. Tim Keeley and Dr. Halliman. Illinois Central was the lowest qualified bidder but it has been a rocky beginning; a

common problem this year with other school districts' bus services. As concerns come to the administration, they are being documented. While service has improved dramatically, it is still not at the desired level. Dr. Halliman continues to work with Illinois Central and she has sent two communications to the parents, a third will be sent the next day. Carol Gilbert compiles a daily report of parental concerns. Mr. Keeley said Illinois Central was too aggressive in its bidding and not prepared for the challenges. Special Education transportation continues to struggle.

Ms. Witham reported that the staff has been very good at documenting, holding the bus company accountable, and getting involved. Rather than disrupt Special Education students any further, the District is trying to work this out with Illinois Central.

Mr. Rouse thanked Mr. Keeley, Dr. Halliman, Mr. Wiley, and Ms. Witham for attempting to rectify this situation. Mr. Keeley was actually riding on the buses on the student routes. Mr. Keeley stated that the District has a solution for the charters, but not for Special Education students. The original agreement is being confirmed. If the District loses more confidence, it will go out for bid on transportation for Special Education students. The District's attorneys are working with other school districts that are having similar issues, they are talking with the executives, and the District trusts the attorney's judgment on this. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked for bimonthly updates on this. Approval of this amendment and agreement will take place under the Action agenda.

**FAC Update**

Ms. Witham reviewed the written Finance Advisory Committee update in the Board of Education packet. The ALT met for the first time that week with additional dates on the calendar and it should be timely with its recommendation to the Superintendent to kick off the budget cycle. Training of staff has begun, e.g., the District Leadership Team and a presentation to the faculty, etc. Mr. Carioscio and she are developing a budget project management tool to track the different components of the budgeting process. The Administrative Collaborative Team (ACT) consists of Division Heads, the Principal, and the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction. When asked about faculty's participation in the working group, Ms. Witham shared that Special Education members were excited to start and the other Division Heads had until October 31 to do so.

**Legat Contract Amendment**

Ms. Witham informed the Board of Education that Legat Architect was selected as the District's architect of record in FY 2011. Because the quality of work has been superior, the administration believed the District will receive additional benefit and cost savings by preparing the architectural drawings and bid packets in time for a December bid process. In order to do so, the work needs to be begin as soon as possible. Mr. Florey had reviewed the Contract Addendum Number 2, which would allow Legat Architects to continue to provide professional architectural services to the District for the 2012 Life Safety Improvements. It was the consensus of the Board of Education to approve the necessary documentation under the Action portion of this agenda, as presented. No change occurred in the fee structure from the previous agreement.

**History Division**

Mr. Mertz, Division Head for History, shared that the History Division is aligning

## Presentation

its divisional goals to the Board of Education goals and he is working with Chala Holland to develop goals based upon data, i.e., creating a goal for an actual need, etc. The department is committed to creating uniform assessment in order to have a baseline. One goal is to infuse literacy into the curriculum so that the students become proficient with historical content. They looked at reading data, AYP numbers, growth of students from the EXPLORE to the PLAN tests. Being successful with history content means understanding how to read, write, and think. He is meeting with Christine McKee to talk about literacy strategies. The TCT (World History CP, World History Honors, American History, Psychology, and History of Chicago) are the learning teams that meet every Monday to discuss commons learning targets and common formative assessments measurement to assess student growth in each course. Excellence leadership training occurred this summer and, consequently, the TCT groups are much more focused and productive this year.

Lessons will be taken to another level if there is collaboration on common assessments by the teachers in the History Division, as they are intelligent, hardworking, and committed to ORPFHS. They are highly motivated and educated teachers, fourteen (14) are involved in cocurricular activities; most recently, Mike Soffer became the debate coach. In addition, Matt Maloney is a head coach, Linda Burns directs school plays, and Toni Biasiello and Dan Greenstone run the English exchange. These are examples where adults have contact with students. While requirements for graduation include 2 years of history, most students take 3 ½ years.

Mr. Mertz talked about the courses listed in the Academic Catalog. Every student must take World and American History. Only five courses are tracked in the elective section. He teaches a law class this year that has both former AP students and students from his basic American History Class. He felt the District needed to create lanes and not tracks. He also noted that it was difficult to plan a four-year curriculum in History when there is only a two-year requirement.

Staff participate in various committees within the building as well, i.e., Faculty Senate, Technology, Modified Closed Campus, and the Coaches Advisory Committee. Their leadership is sought out both nationally and internationally. Steve Goldberg is working on a national high school curriculum in AP philosophy with the College Board; Jessica Young is nationally Board certified in history and works with the College Board as a test reader and test maker; Steve Schwarz attended a NEH seminar on JAZZ and Civil Rights; Anita North, is a docent for the Chicago Architectural Society; and Dan Greenstone who recently published the book, *The Theory of Great Men*, and was asked to be a keynote speaker in Singapore in May on student assessment.

In his opinion, both English and History should collaborate on solving the literacy problems at the school. English teaches students how to read fiction and History teaches students how to read nonfiction. His goal is similar to the Board of Education's goal of increasing the number of freshmen reading at grade level by 10%. When asked if Honors students also had a needed for increased literacy skills, he responded that an editorial in the *Wednesday Journal* said that ORPFHS only puts the good teachers in the Honors program. He was insulted at that because he always taught all curriculums.

When asked how one would know that literacy had been improved, Mr. Prale stated the District has purchased enough licenses of the Reading 180 Program so that every freshman will take, in September or October, a Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI). The District will receive an individual Lexi reading score for every freshman student, every freshman will take a posttest in May, and the District will be able to measure improvement across all levels of the 9<sup>th</sup> grade program. Mr. Mertz will receive a copy of the report for the students who are taking history. What is the experience of history on that reading score? The District will not have that causation because students receive reading instruction in the English and science courses, some have outside tutoring, different literacy environments exist, etc. There is no control group. The commitment is to track the reading level of every freshman student based on a Lexi score over the course of the first year. If there is no improvement, then something else can be tried. Typically, one-year' worth of growth occurs for all students. Last year a reading specialist was hired and the Reading 180 Program was implemented to help stimulate more than one-year's growth for students not reading at grade level.

Do students delay enrolling in World History because of their reading ability? Mr. Mertz responded that approximately 85% of freshmen take World History in their first year. When asked, he tells parents that their students should take science and history in their first year so that when coordinating reading across the curriculum in science, English, and history. It may be that the workload of four solids is inhibiting to students. That would be a question for counselors in how they make their recommendations. Mr. Rouse stated that during the eighth-grade orientation evenings, the Division Heads talk about their curriculum and it has been helpful to parents. Mr. Mertz stated that the number of overrides have also gone down because of the face-to-face contact.

Dr. Isoye thanked Mr. Mertz for providing a snapshot of the division and how it is supporting the Board of Education goals, literacy, and how the classes were forming. If further questions arise from the Board of Education, Dr. Isoye asked that they be sent to him and copied to Ms. Kalmerton in order to follow Board protocol.

**Substance Abuse  
Position**

Mr. Rouse reported on the work that that Dana Horowitz, the new Substance Abuse Prevention (SAP) Counselor, was doing in the building. Ms. Horowitz was selected by Thrive Counseling (Thrive) for the 2011-12 school year to replace Margo Bristow. While her hours are Mondays through Fridays, 7:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m., the contract allows the high school to use her services for after-school events, e.g., IMPACT meetings, MCC meetings, etc. Her responsibilities include proactive educational awareness measures to deter substance abuse for OPRF students. The position expectations, which were mutually created by the District and Thrive, were included with the written report. In addition to those expectations, she is also involved with other SAP coordinators to talk about what they are doing, etc.

She intends to meet weekly with teachers and counselors to talk about students who have drug issues or students whose family members may have substance abuse issues. He will introduce her to the Board of Education and she will attend the October 20 Citizens' Council meeting.

## **Board Protocols**

The Board of Education continued its discussion on board protocols that were presented at the September 15 meeting. Dr. Lee reiterated that this is not a replacement for Robert Rules of Orders, only how to use it in 3 specific ways, if the Board of Education decides to do it.

Ms. McCormack appreciated Dr. Lee's effort and she could support the protocols as written, but she feared that the complexity of the protocol could end up being spent on form over substance. She hoped the Board of Education could work within Protocol 1 the vast majority of the time, but differently, allowing the leader to lead, whoever that leader is. The Board of Education members have to be willing to accept someone's challenge about the conversation.

Ms. Fisher concurred with Ms. McCormack, but noted that Protocols 2, 3, and 4 are there for use if Protocol 1 is not working, as she described. She appreciated Dr. Lee's work and she supported it. Given that the Board of Education had changed the timing of its meetings, and the restructuring of the meetings, she supported this change.

Dr. Millard felt the Protocols would be difficult to implement.

Ms. Patchak-Layman felt the new procedures were not necessary and she suggested delaying the approval to see if the change was necessary. Some of the time considerations are alleviated by having committee and the Board of Education meetings together for a broad discussion. She wanted more time to work through the new structure in place.

Mr. Phelan also appreciated the effort that went into putting this together. He was interested in seeing how this would be implemented.

Ms. Fisher did not feel this was complicated. If someone feels the conversation has gone on too long, he/she would ask for the protocol to begin. It would relieve the Board of Education president from having to cut someone off from speaking.

Ms. McCormack felt the discussion on the agenda needed for further direction. From the outset, the Board of Education should know what it is trying to accomplish within a 10-minute timeframe. Dr. Isoye felt the cochairs of the various committees should make recommendations about the purpose of the reports being presented and if it might be just as appropriate to report the information out in a less formal way.

## **Adoption of Budget**

Dr. Millard moved to approve the Budget for the Fiscal Year 2011-12; seconded by Mr. Finnegan. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

## **Consent Items**

Dr. Millard moved to approve the consent items as follows:

- the Check Disbursements and Financial Resolutions dated September 27, 2011; and
- Monthly Treasurer's Report;

seconded by Ms. McCormack. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

## **Personnel**

Mr. Finnegan moved to approve the personnel recommendations, as presented

- Recommendations** (attached to and made a part of the minutes of this meeting); seconded by Ms. McCormack. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.
- Written Assurances** Dr. Millard moved to ratify and adopt the Special Education Procedures Assuring the Implementation of Comprehensive Programming for Children with Disabilities for the Oak Park & River Forest High School District 200; seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.
- Ms. Patchak-Layman expressed concern that this was not being presented to the community as a first and second reading. Dr. Halliman reported that the District’s attorney has reviewed this. The main portion of the document is the acknowledgement of *The School Code of Illinois* and IDEA. The last twenty pages are unique to OPRFHS in that it is a procedural plan for the Special Education Department. Approval is mandated by law and approval of it acknowledges that the District is in compliance. The regulations were last revamped in 2006. The category of “Cognitive” was changed to “Intellectual Development, at the federal level but not at the state level. Dr. Halliman stated that the District is working with IASB’s PRESS on the policy manual and she trusted that the IASB would bring forward all policies necessary for Special Education. In response to a question about visitations not being present in these assurances, Dr. Halliman responded that procedures had been put in place to address that requirement.
- It was suggested that further clarification about free and appropriate public education, facilities, and material fees concerning Special Education students was needed.
- Application for Recognition of Schools** Dr. Millard moved to approve the 2011-12 Application for Recognition of Schools; seconded by Mr. Phelan. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.
- Legat Contract Addendum** Mr. Finnegan moved to approve Addendum #2 to the Legal contract for summer 2012 construction as presented; seconded by Ms. Fisher. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.
- Reassignment of Bus Contract** Dr. Millard moved to approve the Charter Contract Amendment with Illinois Central Bus Co. and the transportation agreement with R&D Bus Company; seconded by Ms. McCormack. A roll call vote resulted in six ayes and one nay. Mr. Phelan voted nay. Motion carried.
- IASB Registrations** Dr. Millard moved to approve the registration fees for Board of Education members Millard and Patchak-Layman to attend the Illinois Association of School Boards Annual Conference in Chicago, November 17-19, 2011; seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.
- Board of Education Protocols** Dr. Millard moved to approve the protocols, as presented; seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in five ayes and two nays. Ms. Patchak-Layman and Mr. Phelan voted nay. Motion carried.
- Protocol 1: Default or normal procedures protocol  
 Protocol 2: Adoption of specific language  
 Protocol 3: Reports to the Board of Education

Protocol 4: Unanticipated prolonged discussions or catchall

**Minutes**

Dr. Millard moved to approve the open and closed session minutes of August 18 and 25, September 15 and 19, 2011 and to declare that the Audiotapes of November 2009 be destroyed; seconded by Ms. McCormack. A roll call vote resulted in six ayes and one nay. Ms. Patchak-Layman voted nay.

**Closed Session**

At 10:02 p.m., Dr. Millard moved to reconvene its closed session for the purposes 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 Collective negotiating matters between the District and its employees or their representatives or deliberations concerning salary schedules for one or more classes of employees. 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(2); seconded by Mr. Finnegan. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

The Board of Education resumed its open session at 12:01 a.m.

**Adjournment**

At 12:02 a.m. on Wednesday, September 28, 2011, moved to adjourn the Board of Education meeting; seconded by Ms. Fisher. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Amy McCormack  
Secretary

Gail Kalmerton  
Clerk of the Board