

A special meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on Tuesday, July 12, 2011, in the Board Room of the high school.

**Call to Order**

President Millard called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m. A roll call indicated the following members were present: Valerie J. Fisher, Terry Finnegan, Dr. Ralph H. Lee, Amy Leafe McCormack (arrived at 6:11 p.m.), Dr. Dietra D. Millard, Sharon Patchak-Layman, and John Phelan. Also present was Dr. Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; Cheryl L. Witham, Assistant Superintendent for Finance and Operations and Treasurer; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board of Education and FOIA Officer.

**Visitors**

Kay Foran, Communications and Community Relations Director; Sheila Hardin, OPRFHS Faculty Senate Representative; Justin Petrarca of Scariano Himes & Petrarca; Jay Greening of Miller, Hall & Triggs LLC; Paul Keller of Ancel Glink (arrived at 9:15 p.m.), Lee Brown of Teska Associates (arrived at 9:20 p.m.); Wyanetta Johnson and Burcy Hines of APPLE; Robert Evans, intern; and Terry Dean of the Wednesday Journal.

**Personnel Recommendations**

Dr. Millard moved to approve the Personnel Recommendations, as presented attached to and made a part of the minutes of this meeting; seconded by Mr. Finnegan. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Ms. Patchak-Layman requested the demographics with each of the hires as well as the demographics of the divisions.

**Check Distribution List**

Dr. Millard moved to approval the Check Distribution List dated July 12, 2011, as presented (attached to and made a part of the minutes of this meeting); seconded by Mr. Phelan. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

**WI-FI Phase II Bid**

Mr. Finnegan moved to approve the new hardware amount of \$83,221.20 to CDW-G; seconded by Ms. Fisher. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

While the Board of Education approved the bid for WIFI hardware at its May 26 meeting, after reviewing the details of the implementation, the District determined an alternative configuration for the wireless controller would provide the District with a lower total cost of ownership. As a result, the cost increased from \$66,777.83 to \$83,221. The projected cost had been \$110,507.

Legal counsel determined that the Board of Education is within its right to approve the new amount without rebidding the project.

**Renewal of E2 Services**

Dr. Millard moved to approve the three-year contract with E2 Services, as presented; seconded by Ms. McCormack. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

District 200 utilizes managed services for its technology infrastructure, which includes local and wide area networks, all serves, and the systems software required to manage

and run its environment. E2 Services is being contracted again for another 3-year period.

Mr. Finnegan was appreciative of the work in checking with other vendors to insure that the District received a competitive price.

**TAMES Health**

Dr. Millard moved to approve the contract with TAMES Health Resource Service Management, as presented; seconded by Mr. Finnegan. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

TAMES offers a web-based program, iTames, that will allow psychologists, social workers, speech therapists, occupational therapists, physical therapists, and nurses to accurately record services provided to students.

Because this contract is for specialized service, it was not put out to bid. The Director of Special Education was familiar with this company and made contact with it when the company that was previously used closed. All District procedures were followed. With contracts such as this, the appropriate administrator makes the contact and forwards the contract to Ms. Witham. In the past, the District has used individuals and the Comprehensive Group for PT and OT services. Special Education is sensitive to who is hired as this is about the person or persons being hired and the District follow its lead. This is a \$7,000 contract.

**Comprehensive Group**

Dr. Millard moved to approve the contract with Comprehensive Group in order to provide evaluations and therapy services to students per their Individual Education Plans; seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

The Comprehensive Group is an Illinois provider of rehabilitation therapy service in physical, occupational, and speech and language therapy to schools and other institutions. OPRFHS has several students who receive direct and indirect occupational, physical, and speech therapy.

Travel time is billed when the therapists travels to and from the high school to another location, e.g., the CITE program. Legal counsel has reviewed these contracts.

**Modified Campus**

Dr. Millard moved to approve the modified campus budget for personnel, technology, security, and incidentals, as presented, and \$50,000 for architectural consultation; seconded by Mr. Phelan. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Mr. Rouse had provided the Board of Education with the areas in which staff was working, e.g., personnel, technology, security, incidentals, and facilities relative to a modified closed campus. He explained that the District was exploring its facilities, especially the cafeteria, the Student Center, the Upper Balcony, the mall, and moving its tutoring locations. After conferring with the architects, he stated that they estimated it would take \$1.8 million or more to allow changes to be made, both in the short term and in the long term.

With regard to additional clerical personnel and security, Mr. Rouse stated that additional clerical support was needed in order to manage the incentives. The increased security (3-3.5 hour positions) was due to a re-evaluation of the security needs in the building and modified campus and to check on whether those students leaving the building had the privilege to do so. The District had explored using an I-

PASS-type system, but found that to be even more expensive. Mr. Rouse will provide the Board of Education with a list of incentives.

Dr. Lee questioned whether the Board of Education should re-evaluate whether 1) spending \$1.8 million immediately and \$500,000 annually, as prescribed in the document, and 2) the time and effort by the staff to put this in place, was worth it. He asked if the District would have something to compare in two or three years (the Illinois Youth Survey) and if the taxpayers would be interested in knowing the cost of this. Ms. McCormack felt more importantly the measurables would be improving student achievement, building security, as well as the impact on drug and alcohol for others. Mr. Rouse stated that the task force would determine what evaluative measures would be used. Mr. Finnegan suggested a Board of Education member be a member of that task force.

A request was made to see the original costs of the components that were proposed to enhance campus life as compared to this. While the Board of Education had been asked to earmark \$1.8 million for the redesign of the Student Center, the main entrance, etc., enabling the District to work with the architect on plans, the specific work would be brought to the Board of Education for approval. The proposed task force would be shown different areas that might be considered, giving them the parameters, which is the work that would be undertaken with the architect in advance. Ms. Patchak-Layman suggested asking for a request for members help to serve on the task force so that parents could be included. Both Ms. Fisher and Mr. Phalen were more comfortable with approving monies for facility changes when the specifics are known. The Board of Education asked that the task force evaluate the opportunities and for the administration to bring more detail as soon as possible relative to facilities costs.

### **Preliminary Budget**

Ms. Witham presented the Board of Education with a copy of the preliminary budget. The Board of Education will be asked to approve this at its regular August 25 meeting. Ms. Witham attempted to align the budget with the Board of Education's goals with regard to staff, technology, and instruction, and the Pacific Education Group contract, the proceeds from the River Forest TIF. The District will embark on a new budgeting model next year as well. Cost containment this year included:

- 1) a reduction in the rate paid to substitute teachers,
- 2) a reduction to certified staff through sectioning process,
- 3) the administrative staffing and technology department was reconfigured,
- 4) the restructuring of the textbook purchase program because of the elimination of state aid,
- 5) Because of fewer medical claims, a smaller than anticipated health insurance premium increase;
- 6) Reduction in transportation costs
- 7) A satisfactory rebid of the construction architect and management (\$50,000 less).

On the revenue side, the ARRA funds are set to sunset, local and state funding may increase because the federal percentage will be less, the CPI was 1.5%, more EAV should be received because Resurrection Hospital was sold to a for profit organization, the River Forest TIF funds were paid, and the Village of Oak Park made catch-up payments on the Oak Park TIF.

Ms. Witham reviewed the revenue and expenditures of each fund with the Board of Education.

Ms. Witham noted that in the fall the District brings to the Board of Education a tentative budget. She felt that the ALT would make recommendations to the Board of Education via the Superintendent, but she would continue to make her recommendations/projections if that was the desire of the Board of Education. The composition of the ALT includes three community members, two Faculty Senate members, the Superintendent, the ASHR, the ASFB, two SEIU representatives, one Division Head, and the Principal. The crossovers from the FAC are Dr. Isoye, Ms. Witham, and Ed Kras. The list of names will be provided to the Board of Education.

Ms. Witham explained that most of the funding in TORT was for insurance (property, liability, casualty, workers' comp, unemployment insurance, settlement or other kind of loss, vandalism, safety inspections (bleachers, pool), safety repairs to sports equipment, cameras, etc.

**GASB 54**

Dr. Millard moved to approve the Resolution about GASB 54, as recommended by the Crowe Horwath auditors; seconded by Ms. Fisher. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Ms. Witham stated that passing this resolution would allow the auditors to align the District's CFAR with the ISBE Annual Financial Report as was explained in the written material. The reporting requirements have not changed. This is an accounting practice. The District's CFAR helped the District obtain an AAA rating on its bonds.

Part of ALT's work will be to review the financial policies and make appropriate recommendations.

Currently, fund balances are classified as either "reserved" or "unreserved". Unreserved fund balances may be further allocated into designated and undesignated. Almost everything in the General Fund would be unassigned. Grants are restricted.

**Committee Chair Responsibilities**

It was the consensus of the Board of Education that the Finance Chair should have no relationship between the position of committee chair and the actual composition of the negotiation team. The positions function separately.

**Board Meeting Times & Dates**

Dr. Millard moved to approve the dates of the regular Board of Education meetings for the 2011-12 school year to start at 6:30 p.m. with a closed session and an open session beginning at 7:30 p.m.; seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried. Should any of these dates conflict with a major religious holiday, they will be moved to an appropriate alternative time.

Thursday, August 25, 2011  
Thursday, September 15, 2011 (tentative)  
Thursday, September 29, 2011 (tent.)  
Thursday, October 13, 2011  
Thursday, October 27, 2011  
Thursday, November 17, 2011  
Thurs., December 8, 2011

Wednesday, December 21, 2011  
Tuesday, January 10, 2012 (possibly a Tri-board meeting)  
Thursday, January 19, 2012  
Thursday, February 9, 2012  
Thursday, February 23, 2012  
Thursday, March 8, 2012  
Thursday, March 22, 2012  
Thursday, April 12, 2012

Thursday, April 26, 2012  
Thursday, May 10, 2012  
Thursday, May 24, 2012

Thursday, June 14, 2012  
Thursday, June 28, 2012

The Board of Education also discussed the suggested new format to its meetings, which was included in the packet. It was the consensus to start the meeting with a closed session at 6:30 p.m., followed by the open session at 7:30 p.m.

Board of Education members will propose new business under informational items for a limited time after having spoken to the Board of Education president, the Superintendent, and/or the committee chairs.

While it is the intent to bring forward informational items at one meeting and, if need be, approve them at the following meeting, there will be instances when approval will take place at the same meeting. The Board of Education also concurred with approving the vendor distribution list on the consent agenda of each meeting. It will be important for the committee chairs to consider carefully when items are placed on the agenda. While it was suggested that the Board of Education have a policy, a formal process, that any new item to be voted on at the same meeting would have an unanimous vote by those present, the Board of Education will evaluate this format after a couple of months before making a policy.

The Board of Education recessed at 8:00 p.m. and resumed at 8:40 p.m.

### **Negotiation Models**

Mr. Petrarca, a practicing lawyer for 32 years, was invited to present on the negotiating model of Interest-Based Bargaining (IBB). His background includes being a teacher, an administrator, including a building principal. He went to law school at night. His firm represents 130 school districts in the state and focuses only on educational law.

The genesis of IBB was a collaboration between Harvard's Business School and its School of Education. IBB reference materials include *Getting to Yes* and *Difficult Conversations*. It involves teams going to two, eight-hour days of training. Day one would involve getting to know each other and learning the successful skills in bargaining and team building. Day 2 would consist of formal presentations by Harvard using tapes, etc. Typically, 35 to 40 people receive this training, but not all are involved in the negotiating. Typically, a team has 6 to 9 members. He talked about some of the people who are usually involved in this type of training, e.g., Larry Pechtranuas and Lynn Alder of the IEA, as is he. The training is scheduled as close to the bargaining as possible or skills will be lost. No time constraints are placed on the ensuing negotiations. The actual process consists of preparing a list of topics that the District needs to resolve or declare a resolution. Whoever presents an issue is the explainer of the topic.

Mr. Greening spoke to the Board of Education about the traditional model of negotiation and extending the contract, meaning that a limited number of items by both parties would be agreed upon for a limited period. He agreed with the description of the IBB process as described. A distinction between the formats is the way the parties speak to each other. In the traditional model, typically there are spokespersons and the exchange of proposals. Many districts have a hybrid of the two models. It is important to use the IBB discussion no matter what format is utilized. He has used both formats and a hybrid for the past 11 years, 5 to 6 negotiations per

year. If a teambuilding approach is used and the parties bargain from interests rather than positions, the format is not as critical. Board and union teams talk individually as to what their interests are. While the different options can be weighed, ultimately it gets back to the major goal of improving state and labor relationships, building stakeholders.

Because of economic times, a bargaining unit may not want to lock in for a long period and it may want to “roll-over” the contract. One-year agreements are not attractive because the parties are continually bargaining. It can and should be a venue to improve the relationship and if it is done right, it is. However, it can wear people down. It is also not realistic to think state finances will improve in the short or medium term.

Mr. Greening noted that form is not a panacea. Better labor relations will not be achieved magically because of a particular format. The better the trust, the better the negotiations will go. He recommended utilizing parts of IBB to talk about everyone’s interest but ultimately the way it will resolve itself will be a back and forth discussion.

When asked about negotiating in either an open or closed setting, Mr. Greening responded that he had not participated in an open negotiation. However, his observation was that an open negotiation was done to embarrass the other side because the thought was that the other side was going to an extreme. Because the primary goal is to build trust and relationships, sometimes candid and critical comments need to be made and should not be made in an open session. He felt there were more negatives than positives to holding an open session. Relative to Board of Education involvement in the negotiations, it is not considered a meeting under the open meetings act, thus, the meetings do not have to be posted. He has worked on teams where no Board of Education members were present and as many as seven were present. He asked to Board of Education to remember that the more parties in the room, the harder it is to come to an agreement. There is a balance between stakeholder buy in and what is appropriate. There is an tension between efficiency and having enough stakeholders at the table.

**Board of Education Goals**

Dr. Millard reviewed with the Board of Education the five goal statements that Dr. Isoye created and action items under each statement because of input from some Board of Education members. Ms. Patchak-Layman had offered changes to the statement information. Dr. Isoye created a flow chart from the suggestions sent in and he has worked through that with his own DLT. It was the consensus of the Board of Education to discuss these at a PEG meeting scheduled for August 18 at 8:30 a.m.

**Closed Session**

At 9:30 p.m., Dr. Millard moved to enter to closed session for the purpose 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 probably 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); 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.

At 12:44 a.m., on Wednesday, July 13, 2011, the Board of Education resumed its open session.

**OPRFHS & B&G  
Letter of  
Agreement**

Dr. Millard moved to approve the Letter of Agreement between the District and the Buildings and Grounds Bargaining Unit; seconded by Mr. Phelan. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

**Adjournment**

At 12:46 a.m. on Wednesday, July 13, 2011, Dr. Millard moved to adjourn the Special Board Meeting; seconded by Mr. Phelan. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Amy McCormack  
Secretary

Gail Kalmerton  
Clerk of the Board