

June 28, 2012

The regular Board meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on Thursday, June 28, 2012, in the Board Room of the OPRFHS.

Call to Order

President Finnegan called the meeting to order at 6:37 p.m. A roll call indicated the following Board of Education members were present: Terry Finnegan, Dr. Ralph H. Lee, Amy Leafe McCormack, Sharon Patchak-Layman, and John Phelan. Also present were Dr. Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; Michael Carioscio, Chief Information Officer; Dr. Tina Halliman, Director of Special Education; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; Lauren M. Smith, Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources; Cheryl L. Witham, Assistant Superintendent for Finance and Operations and Treasurer; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Closed Session

At 6:39 p.m., on Thursday, June 28, 2012, Mr. Finnegan moved to enter closed session for the purposes 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; 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); 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 Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

The Board of Education reconvened its open session at 7:37 p.m.

Visitors

The Board of Education welcomed the following visitors: OPRFHS Katie O’Keefe, Peter Nixon, and Janel Bishop; Terry Dean of the Wednesday Journal; John Bokum, Christine Ogden Raino, Ron Orzel, and Karin Sullivan community members; Dr. Todd Bloom of Blueprint Educational Group (arrived electronically at 7:54 p.m. and departed at 8:30 p.m., and Mr. Bronson of Legal Architects.

Public Comments

John Bokum, resident of 629 South Home Oak Park, asked the Board of Education to consider freezing the Tax Levy. He volunteered to be a part of the community involvement group with regard to the strategic plan. He also questioned why there was nothing in the packet with regard to administrative compensation. He learned that everything would be transparent at the appropriate time.

Board Comments

Ms. Patchak-Layman referenced a presentation made at the April 26, 2012 Board of Education meeting on the Special Education Department. Comments were made as to how students were to be selected for REI classes. On May 12, 2012, public comment was received that only Special Education students, not college prep curriculum students, would be enrolled in REI classes. While she had asked questions of the administration, she felt some of the answers were incomplete and she was asking them again so that the community was aware.

- 1) Were the students who had been successful with REI courses and were being removed from them being offered something else?
- 2) Were students registered for REI classes being notified of this fact so that parents could begin to make decisions?

She did not believe this information was known by students and parents in the College Prep curriculum or students and parents in regular education. REI co-taught classes are now considered a third level RtI. If this was a successful program with college prep classes, the Board of Education should be appraised of that and the District should re-evaluate its decision.

Dr. Lee reminded the Board of Education members to observe its own procedures of not responding to visitor comments.

FOIA Status

Mr. Finnegan reported that there had been two FOIA requests received and two resolved.

Faculty Senate

Mr. Hunter hoped that discussion about students and how the District could help them would occur as soon as possible. He stated that Ms. Hardin would be at the July meeting and he wished everyone a good summer.

Superintendent's Report

Dr. Isoye commented that District 97's Board of Education had endorsed work towards the implementation of the International Baccalaureate (IB) middle years' program. The high school has been exploring that program. Dr. Isoye anticipated that the high school would need to be respond to questions about whether it will or will not implement all or some of that program after receipt of additional information. The IB program is for students from Kindergarten to 10th grade; 11th and 12th grades lead to the IB Diploma.

Dr. Isoye reported that the summer school schedule was modified in order to accommodate this year's construction projects. Summer school has 1093 students enrolled in 1420 classes. Summer School Director Dale Craft states that teachers are reporting positively on student progress, both academically and behaviorally. Parents, students, and teachers will be surveyed about the modified schedule in which teachers are engaging students in the four-hour classes. Dr. Isoye thanked the teachers and staff who are making summer school a success. When summer school is complete, more areas will become construction sites.

Dr. Isoye stated that approximately 50 teachers and administrators attended two executive functioning skill workshops last week led by Dr. Georgia Bozeday of the Rush Neurobehavioral Center.

Dr. Isoye stated that the Wednesday evening 8 to 9 summer program continues. Parents and students listened to a variety of topics.

Dr. Isoye reported that the new teachers and new administrators met for the past two days to learn about the school's culture and community. More introductory meetings will occur in August. Dr. Isoye welcomed them to the District.

Strategic Plan

Mr. Todd Bloom, founder of Blueprint Education Organization apologized for not being unable to be present at the June 14 2012 Board of Education meeting.

Referencing the needs assessment that Blueprint did several years ago, he stated that strategic plans stem from assessments. The Board of Education, staff, and community looked forward to focusing as to where the work is done at ORPFHS. The prior process is similar to that of one for a strategic plan—trying to discover the needs and opportunities for improvement and then finding ways to make the improvement. The strategic plan is a process that has no end and that should not be the sole focus of the document. It focuses a five-year target with one-year operational plans; it is updated each year and adjusted every six months. He recommended the use of a scorecard.

The process would include:

- Formulating a leadership group and holding a full day meeting regarding the outcome, its role, the timeline, what needs to be completed. The size of the leadership either could enhance or impeded the group's work. Fifteen or more people could be unwieldy. From a process management perspective, being open to the public could be inefficient.
- Reviewing underlying vision, values, and beliefs with all stakeholders.
- Scheduling 45-minute focus groups (open to all).
- Scheduling a 2-hour session to create a survey (open to all) and to implement a needs assessment via online and paper in July/August and then another two-hour session to analyze the survey in order to send back to the leadership team. The survey results would be shared with those that participated. A prioritization of those responses would occur.
- Providing monthly updates to the Board of Education.
- Providing a report to the Board of Education in January/February.
- Instilling a management structure for incorporating the strategic plan into the departmental and individual in March.
- The facilitator writing the report, including the deliverables.

The District's responsibility would include coordination, providing contact information for the focus groups, email addresses for every employee in the District, etc. The writing and the facilitation of difficult conversations is the work of the consultant.

The cost would be between \$55,000 and \$65,000 and include face-to face meetings, group facilitation, and Board of Education presentations. He would do as much as he could virtually so not to incur travel costs. He anticipated being in the District three days each month during the needs assessment, development of the plan, and feedback of the plan from July through February/March or a total of 24 days. He anticipated travel costs to be \$10,400. In addition, he advocated for quarterly meetings going forward with the team and scheduling half days to check the scorecard. This would require data gathering and planning for the meeting to assess the progress of the one-year goals.

Mr. Bloom thanked the Board of Education for this opportunity to present.

The Board of Education will make a decision on the facilitator for the strategic plan at is July 12 meeting. A review of the information presented by the facilitators will be provided.

**Policy 4360
& 5160**

It was the consensus of the Board of Education members to amend polices 4360, and 5160, as presented under the Action portion of the agenda.

When asked if Faculty Senate had any comment, the response was that it had not.

**Board of Education
Goals**

The discussion of the goals will be delayed until the July meeting. Board of Education members should be send their comments to Ms. Kalmerton who will collate them and provide them to all Board of Education members. The discussion at the last meeting focused on student achievement and reducing systemic inhibitors of success to all students.

**Follow up
Discussion on
Joint Committee
Report**

Mr. Nixen provided the Board of Education with information about how colleges and universities interpreted “Yes” responses to the following questions on the Common Application, which are used by more select colleges. Mr. Nixen offered to provide additional comments if the Board of Education so desired.

1. Have you ever been found responsible for a disciplinary violation at any educational institution you have attended from the 9th grade (or the international equivalent) forward, whether related to academic misconduct or behavioral misconduct that resulted in a disciplinary action? These actions could include, but are not limited to probation, suspension, removal, dismissal, or expulsion from the institution. The response would be Yes or No.
2. Have you ever been adjudicated guilty or convicted of a misdemeanor, felony, or other crime?” The response would be either Yes/No and if “yes”, one could provide an explanation if the criminal adjudication or conviction has been expunged, sealed, annulled, pardoned, destroyed, erased, impounded, or otherwise ordered by a court to be kept confidential.

Additional instructions to the students is that they do not have to answer yes to this question or to provide an explanation, if he criminal adjudication or conviction has been expunged, sealed, annulled, pardoned, destroyed, erased, impounded, or otherwise ordered by a court to be kept confidential. If the answer is yes to either or both questions, students are asked that gives the approximate date of each incident, explains the circumstances and reflects on what they learned from the experience. And, applicants are expected to notify immediately the institutions to which they are applying should there be any changes to the information requested in this application, including disciplinary history.

OPRFHS has a sticker that it has used in the past on paper applications that states “School policy prevents me from responding.” To the question as to whether the school had knowledge of the applicant being adjudicated guilty or convicted of a misdemeanor, felony, or other crime, OPRFHS uses the same sticker. An exception could occur upon express written consent from the parent to discuss the discipline issue in recommendation letter. All of Mr. Nixen’s students, who have self-reported a discipline incident to the college to which he or she sought admission—and had a reasonable expectation to be enrolled, matriculated to the school in question.

In some years, the Pomona College Supplement is required to the Common Application.

Responses to the following are required if the high school uses its own Secondary School or Counselor Report form. In requesting this reference, the student has authorized full disclosure of this information and has provided a written release on the front of this form. The student's application will be considered incomplete without responses to these questions.

1. Is there a broader context in which the college/university should consider the candidate's performance and involvements? Yes/No
2. Some examples include particularities of family situation or responsibilities, after-school work obligations, sibling childcare or other circumstances, either positive or negative. If yes, please explain in the space provided.
3. Are there any observed problematic behaviors, (e.g., discipline problems, violence, intolerance or anti-social behavior in interactions with peers or teachers), perhaps separable from academic performance, which should be explored further by the College? If yes, please explain in the space provided.
4. To the best of the high school's knowledge, has the student ever been suspended or subjected to any school-related or legal disciplinary action? If yes, please explain in the space provided.

The Common Application's purpose of the Discipline Language is to protect students on campus. Mr. Nixen contacted several admissions officers and noted their responses below.

Martha Merrill, Dean of Admissions at Connecticut College, President, and Secretary of the Common Application Board of Directors, felt that counselors should send letters or emails with respect to reporting a student's disciplinary action after an application has been submitted.

Scott Anderson, Common Application Director of Outreach, responded that the discipline question on the Common Application focuses on school responses to student actions rather than the actions themselves. His school's philosophy has been to rely on the school's response as a proxy for the severity of a violation, even if the school itself has a policy that prohibits disclosure. He continued that his school trusts the high school to make the right decisions for their students in the context of their community – but if any of those decisions fall into this category, the school wanted to hear about it from the school and the students. The intent of the question is clear. If a student (or parent) decided to hide behind the precise language on the application, then Mr. Anderson would question whether the individual would be forthright even if the question were amended. If schools elect to refrain from reporting discipline violations, and/or if they elect not to sanction a student for a violation, and if students elect to withhold this information despite all good counsel, then it seemed to him that the student has created an ethical dilemma for which there is no good solution.

Mr. Anderson stated that the grey area of what constitutes a significant discipline violation is vast: under-age drinking after a school dance, calling a classmate racial, sexist, or homophobic taunts [online or in person on an ongoing basis], texting while testing [not necessarily about a specific answer on an exam], throwing the second punch in self-defense in a schoolyard fight, being repeatedly warned [but not cited] by

police for curfew violations after a school football game, inappropriate [but not necessarily illegal] possession of a controlled substance. Mr. Nixen provided examples of the national debate as to what sorts of behavior merit a school discipline notation. Headline grabbing youth behavior is abundant in recent days:

- A bullied bus monitor in an upstate New York school district now has a vacation fund of \$650,000 from people who empathized with this monitor's plight.
- Brooklyn students on a school trip to the National September 11 Memorial and Museum were evicted from memorial site after hurling trash into the fountains with the student explanation that "it didn't seem like a big deal; no one was disrespecting."
- A Stuyvesant High School student took pictures of a Regents Spanish exam last week with his phone during the exam and distributed the question to 50 other test-takers. His phone allegedly also had pictures of the statewide physics and English exams as well. He was told to leave the school permanently.
- Last autumn, in September 2001, authorities in New York uncovered and prosecuted a comprehensive cheating ring on Long Island where six students paid a student thousands of dollars to take the SATs in their stead.
- Cyberbaiting: Students irritate a teacher to the point that the teacher breaks down; that teacher's reaction is then captured in photos or video to post online.
- Students have created websites and blogs against teachers and administrators such as when a student in South Florida created a Facebook page called, "Ms. Sarah Phelps is the worst teacher I've ever met"! The student encouraged others to "express your feelings of hatred." The ACLU sued the school when it suspended the student for three days. The parties settled for \$15,000 to cover the student's legal fees and had the suspension wiped from her record.
- This month, MN's Supreme Court upheld the discipline of a former University of MN student for Facebook comments.
- In Texas, 11th grade honors student recently spent a night in jail for accumulating more than 10 unexcused absences in six months. As a local Texas Superintendent explains, "If a student tells a teacher to go F themselves, calls them a B, or throws chairs, or fights in the classroom, those are all typical offenses" that could land the student in jail for a misdemeanor offense.
- Similarly, Texas parents can receive tickets or potential jail time for failing to pay the ticket for a child who misses more than ten days of school.
- In addition, the Chicago Board of Education was to have met to vet a revised Code of Conduct that lightens up suspensions and targets bullying.

With regard to the question as to what colleges really think about reporting of student discipline, Ben Adams, an admissions officer at Duck University (where 13 OPRFHS students have been admitted since 2006, stated that while admissions committees do hear from bitter parents and rivals about prospective applicants, the admissions committee would prefer to hear about the incident from the student directly. More specifically, the admission committee asks, "does this student pose a threat to everyone else if we bring this student to campus"? The admissions committee actively explores whether the incident in question is reflective of poor character, or is it instead, a teachable moment that fortifies strong character.

Mr. Adams continued that by saying that fundamentally, Duke first turns to the school counselor to obtain a more specific understanding of the context of the incident. Specifically, with regard to alcohol use, which is a typical issue that can arise on school-related trips, it is a case-by-case basis. Students who can explain what they have learned from the incident tend to fare better than those who do not. When an incident comes to the attention of the admissions committee from a third party, the admissions committee “can’t help but wonder why a school didn’t report the issue. The credibility of the high school is at stake. Non-report creates a sense of doubt. It remains in the best interest of a student to be as candid as possible.” Obviously, Duke expects the student to be completely truthful in reporting, but there is a greater motivation for a student to do so knowing that the school would do so as well.” He expects advocacy in general from schools and recommenders, and a somewhat balanced perspective. His assumption is that schools that are unwilling to provide disciplinary information will be giving, in general, a less balanced perspective, meaning overall that the school’s recommendations will be less credible in terms of giving an honest assessment of all of the students who are applying.

Mr. Nixen reported that OPRFHS does not report a student’s discipline record, but that does not prevent the student from self-reporting. All of his students who have self-reported an incident have matriculated to the school because that student stands out because his/her good character showing through. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if students were encouraged to say yes if they had a disciplinary infraction. Mr. Nixen responded that students having an OSS because they did not serve detentions would not be kept out of the school. He encourages students to self-report. If the intent of the student had been to do harm, colleges and/or universities may look negatively on that fact.

Mr. Finnegan stated that OPRFHS’s counselors stand out in terms of writing and that has much to do with why students are being enrolled in colleges. Mr. Nixen stated that many qualified people worldwide apply for safety schools. Some schools, such as Georgetown University, do not use the common application but go through its own process. For those that do use the Common Application, the number of students applying has increased dramatically and it causes more work for these schools. There may be an adverse feeling about using the common application for some schools because they may not want to be added to the “club.”

Mr. Nixen’s experience is that colleges and universities want to hear about any discipline infractions from the applicant and each institution makes his/her own decision. They will not accept a student who is unsafe.

Mr. Rouse had met with representatives from the IMPACT organization and they were pleased with the direction the school was moving to and they posed further questions because the communities are relaxing consequences relative to drugs. He explored the options with legal counsel regarding utilizing suspension reduction programs throughout the Code of Conduct. For students who committed their first offense with regarding to substance, could the school have the option of the infractions in the Code of Conduct or random drug testing with mandated counseling? Legal Counsel stated that as long as the incident occurred first and the school was attempting to change a behavior, the school could pursue this option. He noted that in the City of Chicago in areas of schools and around persons 17 or younger, the police would arrest those 17 or younger and give adults tickets.

The District will allow the use of cellphones during passing periods. There have been positive experiences with this during summer school.

Ms. McCormack asked if the District had considered expungement with respect to disciplinary actions, i.e., expungment after 1 semester, and, based on college application, would preclude them from self-reporting. Mr. Rouse responded that the Committee could review that and it would cause a shift to the matrix.

Based on the information Dr. Lee had read, he thought the failure to serve detentions was the most common infraction and he asked if the overall strategy was to find a way to do away with giving detentions. Dr. Lee wanted to take concrete steps to determine a definition of how far was too far.

Mr. Rouse stated that if a student is not connected to the school and does not participate in extracurricular activities, social probation does not mean anything to them. The school has to create something that will get the students' attention. Mr. Rouse will provide to the Board of Education in the future with the number of students who are on social probation and when they decided to serve. Mr. Phelan noted too that students who were on the fence about school could be driven to become even more disconnected.

Mr. Phelan appreciated Mr. Rouse contacting IMPACT to get thoughts on this subject. The District checked with lawyer about offenses, e.g., a student found with substance or under the influence. Could the school provide the option, instead of issuing ISS or OSS, an agreement that there could be randomized drug testing or counseling in lieu of the consequence. The response was yes because the infraction had already been committed and the school was providing an option for the family. Mr. Phelan asked if that would precluded offering that an option for families who agreed to participate in it. Mr. Rouse asked what the school would do if a student tested positive for drugs. Mr. Phelan responded that the student could be enrolled in a program. Mr. Finnegan stated that the school should be a support to families and if the drug testing were voluntary, the school would work with the family. He was nervous about the expense and the administration of tests. Mr. Finnegan stated that if the school looks at this he wanted a model that did not designate who was responsible and who monitored it. Ms. Patchak-Layman believed that substance, alcohol abuse was a mental health issue, and there were HIPPA issues involved about privacy. She was nervous about sending students to counseling, at what point is it just the student with HIPPA and privacy.

Dr. Isoye stated that through the discussion, many questions are being discovered on very important topics, e.g., expungment, voluntary drug testing, or others, etc. He asked if these were philosophical discussions, recognizing that more dialogue was needed. The administration has been discussing this subject as well and it believes that while these discussions need to take place, they questioned what could be accomplished before the start of the school year.

Ms. McCormack would not support the Handbook because she was uncomfortable with the Code of Conduct, as presented. While she appreciated Mr. Nixen's comments, she did not believe they were thorough enough and perhaps she did not agree with some of it. She reviewed the Common Application Director of Outreach's view that the school's response was a proxy for the severity and they trusted the District to make the

right decisions for the students in the context of community. She did not believe the District was using the lower range of consequences when mitigating consequences. That offended her sensibilities as an elected member of this Board of Education. She wanted to protect the students who made foolish mistakes in their freshman or sophomore years from not getting into the colleges of their choice. She disagreed that this does not make a difference, although she has no evidence and she will do some of the homework.

Mr. Phelan felt that many resources answered the questions discussed at this meeting and he had discovered much of this information from attending IMPACT meetings. He suggested thinking about the question and work back from the start of the school year. Dr. Lee did not believe a quick solution expected to accomplish something useful could be found in one month. Changing the Code of Conduct will take time and work. He suggested that additional discussions be about how the Code of Conduct would look next year.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked the status of PBIS for the entire school. It is a program that helps students know what positive behavior/appropriate behavior is and it offers some prescriptions for working with students on their behaviors. She felt that was important because she did not see much learning things on conduct in the school. There should be vehicles to learn from one's mistake. She suggested approving the Handbook without the Code of Conduct at this time and providing an appendix at the start of school. Mr. Rouse stated that while the District does not have PBIS throughout the building, it does provide informational feedback on behavior. Dr. Isoye stated that PBIS targets data and the District is now working with psychology interns, many of them may be coming with Loyola University, on how to interpret the data. The District does provide reward and recognition in many aspects but not yet others. He understood data and incentivizing of students and in many ways, the entire faculty and staff have to be on board with it in order to work with students in a common way. While some schools have opted to work on language, he did not see it distinctly.

Student Handbook Timeline Mr. Rouse provided the Board of Education with an update on the timing of the review, approval and distribution of the timeline of the Handbook.

Student Handbook Mr. Rouse highlighted the changes in the Handbook as highlighted in the packet. The Board of Education is required to take action on this. Mr. Finnegan thanked the faculty and staff and Board of Education members for moving the changes forward.

Certification of June Graduates It was the consensus of the Board of Education to certify the June 2012 Graduates under the action portion of the agenda.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked for breakdown of 95 non-graduates who were coming back for their fifth year.

OPRFHS Website Mr. Carioscio previewed the new website, which would be going "live" on July 1, 2012. A copy of the presentation had been included in the packet. Some of the new features of the website include:

- Utility menu
- Rolling pictures have text links
- Social media areas

- Mega Menus – 2 or 3 levels down
- Analytics–based on that redesign the page so most commonly accessed items are up front.
- Event information will be linked to the school calendar.

Facility Master Plan Ms. Witham explained that the administration had presented a proposal for the creation of a long-term facility planning committee in order to assess the teaching and learning environment of the building along with the infrastructure requirements and to identify the long-term needs, estimate the potential costs and develop a methodology for prioritizing and approving projects. This plan will save the District significant dollar amounts in the future, focus the District on priorities, and save valuable time.

The District architect of record is Legat Architects. The contract with Legat specifies agreed upon hourly rates for services. Legat provided a proposal outlining the anticipated time it will need to spend on the Facility Master Plan, participation on the committee and work with the stakeholder subgroups. Because of the time involvement with this project, it has revised their original cost proposal and offered a discount, reflected in Exhibit A of the proposal, and included donated time by the principal of Legat and AMSCO and a donation of profit on the other salaries. The estimated cost, net of Legat’s discounts, is \$71,563 and is reflected in the Capital Projects Fund. A comparison was made to the cost of the Wight master plan that was approved in 2004-05. That cost was \$80,000 and did not include the extra work and documentation. This is a more comprehensive and inclusive process.

The proposal included the Visioning of Educational Adequacy, Facility Assessment, Space Utilization and Capacity Study, Facilities Concepts and Options, and Master Plan Document. The project objective is to develop a long-term facility Master Plan that addresses facility needs and enhances learning environments in support of curriculum and culture, focused on the future. It will be guided by the Long-Term Facility Planning Committee. The types of meetings and planned activities were.

Discussion ensued. Mr. Bronson stated that the strategic vision is constantly being improved upon on a 3- to 5-year basis. This plan will have to be flexible enough to be adjusted on a 5-year basis to realign to the vision and the impact on the facilities, which in five years may be enrollment, graduation requirements, closed campus concepts, lunches, etc. The facility master plan updates can accommodate those as time goes on. It is about finding a balance between discussions with the stakeholders and the actual work to be accomplished. Legat is on campus two days per week. He had donated his personal time as the principal in order to make the proposal more palatable. Ms. Witham had offered staff time to help with the detail of assessment. There is a benefit to having a strong master plan that allows decision making to progress.

This will be brought for approval at the July 12, 2012 Board of Education meeting.

Consent Items

Mr. Finnegan moved to approve the consent item as follows:

- The check disbursements and financial resolutions dated June 28, 2012;
- Monthly Financials; and
- Monthly Treasurer’s Report;

seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

**Personnel
Recommendations**

Mr. Finnegan moved to approve the personnel recommendations, which included New Hires with the exception of the Special Education Division Director; seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

It was reported that one division head, one history teacher for first semester and one science teacher for second semester still needed to be hired. There are no additional openings.

Institute Day

Dr. Lee moved to approve the Institute Day Plans and Dates for the 2012-13 School Year as presented; seconded by Ms. McCormack. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

Student Handbook

Mr. Finnegan moved to approve the Student Handbook for the 2012-13 school year; seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in three ayes and two nays. Ms. McCormack and Ms. Patchak-Layman voted nay. Motion carried.

Property Liability

Dr. Lee moved to approve the July 1, 2012 Property and Casualty Liability Insurance Renewal with CLIC, as presented, for the 2012-13 school year; seconded by Ms. McCormack. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

**Worker's
Compensation**

Mr. Finnegan moved to approve the July 1, 2012 Worker's Compensation for Insurance renewal with CLIC as presented; seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Preliminary Budget

Mr. Finnegan moved to approve the Preliminary Budget for FY'13; seconded by Mr. Phelan. Discussion ensued.

When asked about the Working Cash fund, Ms. Witham explained that it was to insure that the District has enough funds to carry over if the County is late in providing tax collections. In addition, in the long-range financial model, reserves are accumulated but not in the Working Cash Fund, as one may transfer money from the Working Cash Fund to alternative funds that need it. Working Cash for the Levy is under the tax cap. This information is based on the previous Levy. The 2011 levy will be collected this spring and this fall. If the Board of Education wants to change the Levy, it would do so in December and it will affect the 2013/14 school year.

A roll call vote resulted in four ayes and one nay. Ms. Patchak-Layman voted nay.

**Special Education
Bus Services**

Mr. Finnegan moved to approve the renewal of bus service with Hillside Academy Education Systems; seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Policy 4360

Dr. Lee moved to amend Policy 4360, Access to Technology—Personnel, as presented; seconded by Ms. McCormack. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

- Policy 5160** Mr. Finnegan moved to amend Policy 5160, Access to Technology—Students, as presented; seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.
- District Reports** Mr. Finnegan will speak individual with Board of Education members about their appointment to committees and this will be reviewed at the July Board of Education meeting.
- Closed Session** At 12:42 p.m., on Friday, June 29, 2012, Mr. Finnegan moved to enter closed session for the purposes of discussing 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 Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.
- At 1:15 p.m., the Board of Education resumed its open session.
- Personnel Recommendations** Mr. Finnegan moved to approve the Special Education Division Director and the title change; seconded by Ms. Fisher. A roll call vote resulted in four ayes and one abstention. Motion carried.
- Adjournment** At 1:17 p.m. on Friday, June 29, 2012, Mr. Finnegan moved to adjourn this meeting; seconded by Dr. Lee. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

Amy McCormack
Secretary

Gail Kalmerton
Clerk of the Board