

November 15, 2012

The regular Board meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on Thursday, November 15, 2012, in the Board Room of the OPRFHS.

Call to Order

President Pro-tempore and Vice President Phelan called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. A roll call indicated the following Board of Education members were present: Terry Finnegan (arrived at 7:43 p.m. telephonically, and in person at 8:30 p.m.,) Valerie Fisher, Dr. Ralph H. Lee, Dr. Dietra D. Millard, Amy Leafe McCormack, Sharon Patchak-Layman, and John Phelan. Also present were Dr. Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; 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 6:31 p.m. on Thursday, November 15, 2012, Mr. Phelan 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 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 Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

At 6:59 p.m., the Board of Education adjourned its open session and resumed its open session at 7:30 p.m.

Joining the Session were: Michael Carioscio, Chief Information Officer, Dr. Tina Halliman, Assistant Superintendent for Pupil Support Services; Amy Hill, Director of Assessment and Research; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; Karin Sullivan, Communications and/or Community Relations Coordinator, James Paul Hunter, Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and Lauren Richardson, Student Council Liaison.

Visitors

The Board of Education welcomed the following visitors: Sheree Johnson, Julie MacCarthy, John Bokum, Dr. Barbara Langer, Virginia Thomas, and Melanie McQueen, community members; Nancy Leavy of the League of Women Voters; Elizabeth Hennessey of William Blair; and Vernecia Davis, University of Illinois intern; and Dr. Allan Alson, Educational Consultant.

Public Comments

John Bokum, resident of 629 S. Home Avenue, Oak Park, asked the Board of Education to freeze the Tax Levy. He complimented Ms. Witham on the outstanding job of cutting costs where necessary in order to accumulate over \$100 million. She will continue to say it is beneficial to continue to pass Levees, but the Board of Education, as the District's stewards, will send the wrong message to the taxpayers. He hoped that the Board of Education would freeze the taxes in both communities.

Dr. Barbara Langer, resident of River Forest, asked the Board of Education to extend the input deadline on the strategic planning survey until the end of the year to enable all District 200 residents to respond. She also asked the Board of Education to publish

the total number of District 200 registered voters who had responded by the November 12 deadlines.

Dr. Langer strongly objected to the 2.5% property tax increase. She requested that the Board of Education table any and all property tax increases and levies for as long as the District had cash and investments exceeding the state minimum days of cash on hand. She stated that the District's annual financial report for Fiscal 2012 was 4.5 months late. She asked that it be immediately published. She asked the District cut the salary of every administrator and teacher, terminate cost of living increases for all employees; and reduce benefits and other D200 costs. Dr. Langer asked any Board of Education members who would decide to run for reelection in April if they could win if the levy were approved. She asked the Board of Education to consider whether to replace the high school with higher-performing, lower-cost charter school.

**Board Member
Comments**

Ms. Patchak-Layman viewed Board of Education comments as a vehicle to let other Board of Education members and community members know of what she was considering. This week she noted the variances in taxes on homes in Elmwood Park, LaGrange Park, and Oak Park for under \$100,000 listed in the media. The taxes for the Oak Park homes were significantly higher at \$6,000 versus \$2,500 for the others. She was concerned and noted it was one of the difficulties with the tax levy and how it is structured.

The District does not provide demographic information to the Board of Education in reports as to where students reside. She felt it would be beneficial to have that information in order to get a baseline as to what things were different in a student's education before they came to the high school in order to plan for their time here.

Ms. Patchak-Layman reported that the course of study, Project Scholar, had provided additional support to approximately 100 students per year to help them achieve and enroll in Honors courses for the past eight years. Both parents and students were happy with the support they had received, as it allowed the students to move to a higher-level class. She apologized to the community as she had encouraged parents and students to look at this program not knowing that the school did not intend to continue with it. At one point, it was so highly thought of that the addition of a sophomore program was being considered. She, as a Board of Education member, apologized for giving misinformation to people in the community. She hoped that the District would correct this situation in the future.

**Status of FOIA
Reports**

Mr. Phelan reported that one FOIA request had been received and it was unresolved.

**Student Council
Liaison Report**

Ms. Richardson reported on student complaints/suggestions that had been added to her Facebook page, e.g., tardy policy, PE policy regarding the number of unexcused absences to be carried over to the next quarter, locked doors in the morning, etc. Board of Education members asked for further information about the student Facebook page.

Student Council was very happy that many students participated in the blood drive. A second one is planned for April. Student Council is volunteering at First United and United Lutheran Churches and will be delivering gifts and food baskets. The Tradition of Excellence Convocations and Brunch will be held November 30 honoring recipients will be Linda Brubaker, Diane Jordan, and Jeff Mauro.

Faculty Senate

Mr. Hunter reported that the Parent/Teacher Conferences had concluded. The participation was huge. He noted a disconnect between the parents and the students and the public about what is being done for students. Parents are always impressed how well teachers know their children. Having finals early this year has put pressure on both the students and teachers and he awaited the reactions to the ramifications of the schedule change.

Superintendent Comments

Dr. Isoye congratulated student athletes Kyle Patnode and Nick Kowalczyk, who had signed with the Division I schools.

He also congratulated the following sport teams on their achievements:

- Field Hockey—4th Place in State
- Football—IHSA Class 8A Playoffs (2nd round)
- Girls' X-Country, Erin Schrobilgen and Hayley Thompson, State Qualifiers;
- Boys' Soccer IHSA Regional Champions;
- Boys' Golf, Pat Murphy, State Qualifier;
- Girls' Tennis-IHSA Sectional Champions-Tess Trinko and Taylor Arends, 6th place in State Doubles

The Girls' Swimming/Diving Team is competing in the State Finals on Friday/Saturday at Evanston.

Dr. Isoye also reported that 50 mentor students worked with the incoming eighth-graders during the past week as well as helped at presentation to the parents of 8th grade students.

Dr. Isoye reported on activities for the Huskie Palooza included 20 different bands, dodge ball, badminton, and 3-on-3 basketball;

Dr. Isoye reported that the Spoken Word Showcase was a sold-out event at which sponsors Jay Lind and David Gilmer performed

Dr. Isoye reported that the Black Leaders Union (BLU) student group, led by Jessica Stovall and Tia Marr, formerly known as B.O.S.S., would lead a take-back-the-school initiative on November 16 to promote positivity and better avenues for conflict resolution amongst students. They will wear RESPECT T-shirts that day and recruit other clubs and activities to join them in encouraging respect amongst the student body; the Football team will link arms with these students, as a sign of unity and respect

Dr. Isoye reported that two teachers attended the Heather Sass workshops on curriculum mapping and common core with CTE courses, sponsored by the DVR.

Dr. Isoye reported that Avi Lessing is now Dr. Lessing.

Dr. Isoye reported that OPRFHS is party to a \$1.2 million National Science Foundation multi-year grant for promoting research across the eight high schools of the DVR.

Dr. Isoye reported that over 1,868 parents signed up for parent/teacher conferences and 9,311 conferences were scheduled. On the first day, 1,151 parents signed up and 6,447 conferences were scheduled.

Dr. Isoye reported that several board members, administrators, and a few faculty members attended a presentation by Dr. James Heckman from the University of Chicago., hosted by the Early Childhood Collaboration.

Strategic Plan Update Dr. Allan Alson, facilitator of the Strategic Plan, acknowledged publically the level of involvement and commitment within the school committee to the Strategic Plan Steering Committee. The membership's effort has been commendable.

Dr. Alson spoke about what had been accomplished, plans, and the process. Only one Steering Committee meeting had taken place when he last reported to the Board of Education. Since then, three additional meetings have occurred and three more will take place. The three meetings thus far, plus the meeting on November 19, focused on providing data that provided all members with the same knowledge base about the current state of OPRFHS. The composition of the Steering Committee members is administrators, faculty, staff, students, and community members of OPRFHS, who represent a wide variety of knowledge levels and opinions depending on their involvement with the school and/or the community. Dr. Alson complimented Ms. Hill on presenting the academic data, which included college and university enrollment rates, degree completion rates, where students went to post secondary schools, college graduation rates, enrollment in AP Classes and standardized test results. He also complimented Ms. Witham on presenting the financial data including the 5-year financial plans, enrollment projections, facility planning, and the work of the Finance Advisory Committee. Questions were raised about facilities, deployment of staff, etc., because of increased enrollment.

At the November 19 meeting, the following data will be shared: school climate, student discipline, Illinois Youth Survey information, and statistics on extracurricular participation. It will be disaggregated by grade level and race.

Dr. Alson planned to provide the results of the survey to the Steering Committee at its December 3 meeting. He and his associate, Pat Maunsell, are doing many focus groups and will continue to do so. The focus groups are for students, faculty, staff, and community. An additional focus group will be scheduled for December 3.

After the Steering Committee goes through an exercise to analyze and prioritize the District's strengths, weaknesses, threats and opportunities, it will launch into building a plan. The idea is to identify what the committee believes are the core values for going forward for the next five years? How can those core values embrace the core vision, tweak it, or define a new one? In the vision statement, what will OPRFHS look like in five years when the plan is launched? He expected there to be four to five goals.

While he values a large array of stakeholders being involved in the building of a plan and the Board of Education embraces it, it means there are many different opinions, many views of the process, many worries, and many questions about how to build the plan. It is normal for people be anxious.

Discussion ensued. The survey deadline had been extended to November 19. The survey results will be made available. The survey will be posted on line. Anyone one who wants to take the survey and does not have an access code may call or email Ms. Kalmerton to receive one.

Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that there was an article about school size in a recent IASB magazine. She questioned why no questions appeared on the survey about school size, preference for a unit district or a consolidated district, etc. She asked when that type of conversation would be generated. Dr. Alson noted that conversations at the Steering Committee tables have been about transitioning from early childhood into the two elementary districts and from the elementary districts to the high school and the degrees of operations and he imagined that piece would be discussed. He believed the focus groups would be one entry for these types of feelings or opinions as well as the when the Committee breaks into groups to do its SWAT analysis. It will be at that point that committee members will be able to raise other issues that they have not heard.

Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that a Steering Committee member, representing APPLAUSE, began a discussion at its last meeting and as a result, APPLAUSE is putting together an adhoc committee for parents from that organization to think about how to add interest in the performing arts.

Dr. Lee asked if the Steering Committee had discussed the issue of how the District would deal with the questions that cannot be solved in five years. Dr. Alson thought that the issue of how does a five-year plan lead into an immediate future as well as bridge it to a longer future was important, but the Committee had not yet discussed that. A way to do this may be to structure, identify the issues, and catalog them as a conclusion or addendum to the report.

**Discussion of
Board of Education
Comments**

Discussion continued about whether to keep the section on Board of Education comments on its regular meeting agenda. Dr. Lee believed it was important for Board of Education members to be able to make their feelings known to the rest of the Board, whether their comments were welcome or not, as it was more direct and honest. Board of Education members could make themselves heard in other venues, but he did not believe it would be in the best interest of the District or the most productive way to do it. Policy allows Board of Education members to make a request of the president to put things on an agenda. Dr. Lee has heard that the president has never refused to do so, but there is nothing in policy that gives him the right to put something on the agenda. Dr. Lee believed that people elected by the public have the right to make comments on Board of Education business.

Ms. Fisher noted that Board of Education could always speak on agenda items, which is why the elected Board of Education members were there.

Ms. McCormack stated that the comment section has been used to give comments on things that were not on the public agenda and that it violates the spirit of the Open Meetings Act. The damage being done by Board of Education comments outweighed the good.

Dr. Millard shared the concern that the public should know what is going to be discussed. It should be a conversation that allows everyone to participate. She believed the structure in place to bring something forward was good. No president has denied anything being placed on the agenda for 15 years. She felt there was some soapboxing occurring.

Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that this issue was before the Board of Education because she makes comments. The Board of Education established rules about allowing a member to make comments, i.e., the member had to inform the president at least 48 hours prior to the meeting of the wish to make comment. She felt it was important to have a place to bring forward the community's comments. The agendas of the Park District, the Village of Oak Park, and District 97 included comments. She brings things that have come to her or things that she is considering. She wanted people to know her thought process when she is talking about the Board of Education policies and activities. Sometimes it may fit with an agenda item. She felt Board of Education members should hear her thoughts at the table rather than in the newspaper. It may spark comments and someone else may want to take up the conversation. Dr. Lee has shared comments he has written on issues, she has listened to other Board of Education member comments when they had heard a comment that sparked an issue. It is difficult to do that when there is a 48-hour notice, but one can reserve a place to do that.

Ms. McCormack noted that a consideration must be given to the length of the meetings, as they can last 6 to 8 hours.

Ms. Fisher noted that the comment section was put on the agenda by then president Barry Greenwald that all liaison reports were made in an agenda item. Only in the past couple of years has the Board of Education's comment section changed to allow Board of Education members to put forth their opinions on non-agenda items. She believed that the public was misled when a Board of Education member brought up the idea that the high school could offer space to host District 97's offices. That kind of individualized comment on non-agenda items is not needed. Every Board of Education member can speak and if there is no agenda item, they can add it. The way to discuss things with the Board of Education is to have a full discussion in which everyone participates. Individual comments do not allow that opportunity.

Mr. Phelan did not feel Board of Education comments facilitated the Board of Education working together. He supported putting an idea on an agenda so that Board of Education members would be prepared in order to have an informed discussion. No one had information about the ability of the District to host District 97's administrative offices. As a result, he agreed that the utility of the comments has been outweighed by the downside.

It was the consensus of the majority of the Board of Education members present to remove Board of Education comments from the agenda going forward. Mr. Phelan will inform Mr. Finnegan of this direction.

Course Proposals For 2013-14

Mr. Prale reported this was the third opportunity for the Board of Education to review the course proposals for the 2013-14 school year. He highlighted the changes listed in the packet. No changes will be made to the math sequence for next year. A list of the courses to be deleted was included in the packet. One section of the catalog would be reorganized. Special Education support classes will appear along side courses in reading program, etc.

The Academic Catalog will be available online only. People will be able to print a PDF copy if desired. Counselors were made aware of this information.

One parent, opposed to identifying a set of strategies that occurs outside of the classroom, felt those skills should be embed in content area courses. The Administration discussed the current practice and how to insure it would continue. The answer was literacy coaching, soft skills (time management, perseverance, etc.) and how they are infused.

Discussion ensued about having a prerequisite of an extracurricular activity for a class. Ms. Patchak-Layman's concern was about the prerequisite for the strength training class. Of the varsity athletes who would qualify for this class, 70% are white and 25% are nonwhite. She did not believe this a good precedent. Many students are in competitive activities outside of school and would not meet this prerequisite because they are not varsity athletes. Mr. Rouse stated that the IHSA has set the rules that only juniors and seniors at the IHSA varsity level may receive PE waivers.

Library Grant Application

Annually the District applies for a Illinois School District Library Grant. As part of the application process, the Board of Education must certify and attest to the statements set forth in the signature page. The District expects to receive approximately \$2,400 from this grant. The funds will support the purchase of Library Materials: Print and Non-Print to be housed in the library for use by faculty and students. It was the consensus of the Board of Education to certify and attest to the statements under the consent portion of the agenda.

Change in Agenda

It was the consensus of the Board of Education members to remove the adoption of the Preliminary Levy, the Supplemental Levy and the Course Proposals from the Consent portion of the agenda and take individual action.

Consent Items

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

- Check Disbursements and Financial Resolutions dated Thursday, November 15, 2012
- The Treasurer's Report
- the Monthly Treasurer's Report
- Gifts & Donations
- Library Grant Application

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

Preliminary Levy

Mr. Phelan moved to approve the adoption of the Preliminary Levy and approve for display; seconded by Ms. McCormack. Discussion ensued.

Q: What is the difference between a Preliminary Levy and the Supplemental Levy?

A: The Preliminary Levy is the operating levy for operating funds and it is limited yearly by CPI or 5%, whichever is less. The Supplemental Levy is specific to the debt and specific to the refinancing of debt done a year ago.

Q: If the Board of Education does not pass the Supplement Levy, would the District not be able pay off certain bonds early?

A: The District would not be able to pay at the time the installment is due. Ms. Hennessy stated that the Supplemental Levy allows the District to access the

CPI increase on its debt service extension base, which it is non-referendum bonding power. When the District refinanced its bonds in 2009, it accelerated its debt payments under the tax caps so that the debt payments would go up by CPI as well and shortened its debt by a whole year savings over \$500,000 in interest costs to the taxpayers. In 2009, the District only knew what the 2009 CPI was which was only .1%. Each year the Board of Education entertains the Supplemental Levy to extend the additional amount allowed under the tax cap, which last year was 1.5% for 2011 Levy and this year it is 3%. One can only extend to the debt service that has to pay. The Board of Education made the conservative assumption that CPI would only be 1.5% and it has been more than that. The Supplemental Levy debt service for 2012 is an additional \$3,138. If the District did not get that money, the District would still have to pay the debt service and without additional levy the District would be going into the debt service fund balance and if not sufficient funds there, transfer to from other operation funds.

Q: Why approve a levy when the District can pay it?

A: The Supplemental Levy is \$3,000 for 2012, because the Levy is compounded. Because it is 3% in 2012, it translates to \$24,000 for the 2013 year and \$74,000 for the 2014 year. The Supplemental Levy does impact those levy years also. If the District did not get amount, the District would have to dip into existing fund level to get that amount. Counsel does not trust Cook County to make the calculation every year under the amount of the CPI and thus has made the District access the money under the cap. This would impact the second and the third year also.

Q: Are these are dollars collected from the taxpayers?

A: Yes.

Ms. Patchak-Layman did not understand why the taxpayers would be asked for this money when the District has a fund balance to pay them. She believed that anything put out for public comment should be the amount wanted to proceed, with no expectation that only at the time the final vote that changes would be made, unless something else comes to focus. She believed the high school had too much fund balance. She stated that the District could adjust the levy, starting with the Working Cash Fund. Nothing has been spent from this fund in at least six years. Fund balances were as follows:

- 20 months in Education Fund
- 26 months in Liabilities Fund
- 17 months in Operations & Maintenance Fund
- 27 months in Transportation Fund
- 15 months in IMRF & Social Security Fund
- 3 months in Life Safety Fund
- \$10 million in Working Cash Fund

The Board of Education received information on November 6 the importance of a fund balance and a spreadsheet. Even though the state says the fund balance should cover six months, Ms. Witham said nine months, the District exceeds that amount in every category. She felt the levy needed changing so that the District was not adding to all

present fund balances. While community members are glad to pay their taxes, the District's savings account is too much. The levy must be changed.

Mr. Phelan made the following statement:

“District 200's reserve can be thought of as our combined checking and savings account.

“The Property Tax Extension Limitation Law (“PTELL”) was passed in the 1990's to control skyrocketing property taxes. In simplistic form, it prohibits school districts from levying more in a given year than the amount it levied the prior year plus the lesser of 5% or CPI.

“District expenses, such as collectively bargained salaries and benefits, routinely exceed CPI. This year, for example, CPI was 3% but medical benefits, even with careful management and cooperation with the District's employees, increased by 7%.

“Because of PTELL limits, following a referendum districts levy well in excess of operating expenses in order to avoid annual referendums. Districts build reserves in early post-levy years, reach a breakeven point, and then draw on those reserves until the next referendum. Districts have different reserves based on where they are in the referendum cycle. Contrary to popular opinion, reserves are not an “asset” or a pool of money available for discretionary spending, but savings for a time in the near future when, due to the PTELL law, expenses will exceed revenues.

“Currently, District 200's reserves are \$119 million, and will continue to build until peaking in about 2017, at which point we will begin to draw down on our savings.

“State guidelines say school districts should maintain a minimum of 25% reserves. Some school finance experts recommend a minimum of 50% reserves. Our CFO recommends a minimum of 75% in reserve in order to avoid borrowing, earn interest on investments, self-insurance for property and medical insurance, maintain adequate cash flow and maintain a AAA bond rating for lower cost borrowing, all things that keep our overall expenses down and keep money from leaving the District at a faster rate than necessary. Thus, while our current reserves represent approximately 169% of our annual operating expenses, it is because we are at the peak of the referendum cycle.

“The past few years have been hard years for the country and our community. Many of us would like to offer relief to taxpayers through a levy reduction, returning to struggling taxpayers unexpected savings achieved through sound fiscal management. Because of the PTELL law, however, any levy reduction would be compounded year after year. One million dollars' worth of relief this year would become many millions foregone between now and the next referendum.

“In the context of these recommended reserves which result from the Illinois property tax system, we face the prospect of some extraordinary expenses looming on the horizon. Projections estimate increased enrollment over the next decade, from approximately 3,200 students to nearly 4,000. The legislature has been debating whether to shift pension obligations to local school districts. Last night's discussion of the importance of early childhood education is a precursor to a request that local taxing

bodies participate in early childhood education efforts to address the achievement gap in a more cost-effective way than recent remediation efforts.

“SB410, passed out of the Senate last year, would have allowed districts to make one time reductions in their levies that would not carry over in perpetuity. Unfortunately, the bill did not pass the house. If such legislation became law, the levy could be reduced surgically and responsibly during difficult times for taxpayers. Until then, I feel it is my responsibility to support the full levy.”

When asked if it were possible to abate dollars to taxpayers after one had collected the levy, by passing a resolution that says because of PTEL that says the District must keep these numbers on the books but recognize that the Board of Education has to look at the dollars and economic conditions in the community and do a rebate. Ms. Witham responded that the District could abate the debt amount or a part of it. In order to protect the PTEL limit into the future, pass the Levy, and then the Board of Education could choose to abate that dollar amount. In order to make a debt payment, The Board of Education would have to approve resolutions to make a transfer. Then the community would have to be ready to make that debt payment in the future and taxes will go up.

Ms. Fisher noted that the Board of Education had talked about this several times and asked for clarification of what is required in terms of notice and whether there have been additional discussions. Ms. Witham stated that the levy has been discussed several times and the even though a hearing is only required if the levy is over 5%, the Board of Education will have one on December 20, 2012. Ms. Fisher appreciated the explanation of the Supplemental Levy and the Preliminary Levy.

Dr. Millard applauded Mr. Phelan’s explanation, and noted that as a steward of the school and someone not planning to run for reelection, asked that as the Board of Education moves forward that it maintain the high quality of education with a goal toward improving it. The Board of Education must be carefully protective of the reserves it has in order to deal with the suggestions from strategic planning and the additional students expected to enroll, as monies are being requested by other organizations, i.e., a large aquatic center. She supported the levy. If there is a discussion about abatement, that will come later. The school is one of the biggest assets of the community.

Ms. McCormack added that was unclear as to how CPI or CPI-U was used as the measure of limitation as it did not translate to the expenses of the school. She hoped that the legislators doing something about the PTEL laws. CPI has been as low as .1 and there has never been a year where District costs have remained at CPI due to health care, electricity, etc.

Dr. Lee had a conflict because he saw the Board of Education talked about the amount of the levy and the issue of the rebate. He opposed a rebate. He considered it was his responsibility to make sure the taxpayers get their money’s worth. The issue of how much the levy should be raised every time there is an opportunity is a separate issue. He was unsure what avenue to take and he wanted to give that more thought. The District is accumulating money now faster than the need, yet when the enrollment is projected to be between \$3800 and \$4000 and there is no way for the taxpayers to pay for that it does seem the District has to accumulate money in order to level things out in

the future. A commitment should be made to the taxpayers not to ask for another referendum. That is why he pushed for Board commitment to put off a referendum as far as possible. He wanted the Board of Education to lay out an understandable plan on how to deal with the accumulation of reserves. It is not something that can be done with one vote. It will take more serious effort. The Board of Education needs to be able to explain that to the public as well. It is for that reason, he would vote in favor of the proposed levy because he believed in being safer rather than sorry later, especially in face of increased enrollment.

Ms. Fisher understood that the Board of Education's commitment to not to go for a referendum was different from what Dr. Lee had said. She thought it was the driving force behind the five-year planning, the budgeting, virtually the District has done when talking about the graphs intersect at some point where the District starts to living off the reserve and push that point out. Everything that has been done has been with an eye toward pushing out a need for a referendum for as long as possible. When the last referendum was passed in 2002, she felt it would be on the same timeline that state law to which a school district was expected to adhere. The District has gone past that already and it is looking at a longer extension of the use of these funds through very careful and hard work on the administrators, finance consultants, etc. She felt the Board of Education always had this subject at its forefront all of the time.

Mr. Phelan added that the District has taken great care of the fund balance and the effort has been remarkable and he applauded everyone in the building, the faculty, the administration, the Board of Education, and the community members, who are help to stretch every dollar further. The District is in a cycle and the cycle will get worse over time.

Mr. Finnegan was very proud of the statements from all of the Board of Education members. The District has finite resources and an infinite number of places to put them. Conscious, informed decisions have been made to make the investments possible. He too applauded everyone in the building for looking at and nurturing the fund balance to help the students. The administration, faculty, and everyone were being prudent in their requests and understanding. He would support the levy.

Dr. Lee noted the reference to the 75% reserve figure being advocated and asked how that applied to the \$120 million fund balance. Mr. Phelan's calculation was about 168%, which had been advocated as a baseline minimum in order to reduce operating expenses, maintain the District's AAA rate and to be self-insured in terms of medical, etc. all of the efforts that the ALT took to reduce the money being paid outside the district to make everything go further.

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

Supplemental Levy

Mr. Phelan moved to approve the Supplemental Levy as presented; seconded by Ms. McCormack. A roll call vote resulted in six ayes and one nay. Ms. Patchak-Layman voted nay. Motion carried.

Course Proposals

Ms. Fisher moved to approve the course proposals for 2013-14, as presented. A roll call vote resulted in six ayes and one nay. Ms. Patchak-Layman voted nay. Motion carried.

**Personnel
Recommendations**

Ms. McCormack moved to approve the personnel recommendations (Resignation and Stipends); seconded by Mr. Phelan. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

**Open & Closed
Minutes**

Mr. Phelan moved to approve the open and closed minutes of October 16 (Policy), October 25, and November 6, 2012 (Finance, and Special); a Declaration that the Closed Session Audiotapes of December 2010 are destroyed and a declaration that the closed session minutes from January 1, 1987 through May 1, 2012 shall remain closed; seconded by Ms. Fisher. A roll call vote resulted in six ayes and one nay. Ms. Patchak-Layman voted nay. Motion carried.

Adjournment

At 9:45 p.m. on Thursday, November 15, 2012, Dr. Lee moved to adjourn this meeting; seconded by Ms. McCormack. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

John Phelan
Vice President and President Protempore

Amy McCormack
Secretary