

May 26, 2011

The regular Board meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on Thursday evening, May 26, 2011, in the Board Room.

Call to Order President Millard called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. The following Board of Education members were present: Jacques A. Conway, Terry Finnegan, Dr. Ralph H. Lee, Amy Leafe McCormack, Dr. Dietra D. Millard, Sharon Patchak-Layman, and John Phelan. Also present were: Dr. Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; Amy Hill, Director of Assessment and Research; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum & Instruction; Lauren M. Smith, Director of Human Resources; Cheryl L. Witham, Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer; Katrina Vogel and Jack Hendrix, Student Council Board of Education Liaison Representatives; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Visitors The Board of Education welcomed the following visitors: Kay Foran, Director of Community Relations and Communications; OPRFHS faculty and staff, community members, and students: Catherine Rison, Mamie, Andry, Mary & Emily Austin, John Bokum, Jr., Jamil & Ramie Bousaab, Connie Coleman, Jesse & Bill Cornman, John Costopoulos, Terry Dean, Rachel Dranoff, Bill Dwyer of the Pioneer Press, Wendy Epstein, Valerie Fisher, Sue & Jim Gill, Landi Gu, Maria Gutierrez, Dr. Tina Halliman, M. and James Hanley, Sheila Hardin, T. and Will Hardwicke, Nyshie Howrey, Robert Hurst, James Jaworski of the Chicago Tribune, Wyanetta Johnson, Jasmina Jones, Beth and Tom Jozefowicz, Debra Kadin of Patch.com; Paul Keller and Ellen Emery of Ancel Glink, Nancy Leavy, Mike Lennox, Lisa & Cary Lowry, Ben Middleman, R. and Ian Parks, Kristine Raino-Ogden, Terrie Rayburn, Natalie Richardson, John Rigas, Elliott Rouse, Aaron Rowe, Mimi Skapek, Roma Steinke, Bill Sullivan, Norb Teclaw, John Thorne, Dat Tran, Louisa Vasquez, Edward Vaughn, and Lauren Webb.

Student Recognition The Board of Education honored the members, their parents, and their coaches as follows:

- Hanna Srajer, placed 4th in the Manningham National competition and 2nd in the Oak Park Writers' Group's 2011 High School Poetry Contest in the freshman/ sophomore category, and Raven Hogue placed 1st and Sherry Reuter placed 2nd and 3rd in its junior/senior category, mentor Peter Kahn;
- Alexandra Frisch, competed in the 3rd Annual OPRFHS Shakespeare Monologue Competition, was the Chicago Regional Champion, and performed Cleopatra at the Lincoln Center in New York, mentor James Bell;
- Will Hardwicke and James Hanley participated in the Tournament of Champions Debate Competition at the University of Kentucky, head coach David Gobberdiel and Co-sponsor Jeff Mertz;
- Ben Mildenhall and Greg Ramel, placed 2nd in the Junior/Senior Two-Person IHSA State Math competition, Head Coach Sheila Hardin, other coaches Kay Moran, Joe Kostal and Larry Prystalski;
- Northern Illinois Scholastic Press Association awards went to Sydney Wilcox and Abby Vogt for their Trapeze editorial, to Abby Vogt for ad

design, and contributor Rachel Dranoff for editorial cartooning; sponsor Liz Fox;

- Emily Austin, Jesse Cornman, Landi Gu, Tom Jozefowicz, Ian Parks, Aaron Rowe and Luisa Vasquez, Robotic Club students, won 1st place in the state at the Exploratory/Engineer Division at Illinois State University's High School Research Symposium and 1st place at the Percy Julian Science Symposium, advisors were Dat Tran, President, DatCom Systems, Elliott Rouse, Biomedical Engineer, Northwestern University, Robert Parks, President, Communications Programming, Inc., Norb Teclaw, John Costopoulos, and Bill Grosser; and
- Ramie Bou-Saab, placed 3rd in the Midwest Chinese Teachers Alliance's Midwest Chinese Speech Contest, mentor AiLein Hung;

Agenda Changes

It was the consensus of the Board of Education members to 1) remove Item No. D, Summer Construction, from the consent agenda, and 2) move Human Resources Item A to Executive Session.

Public Comments

Greg Lowry, 741 Woodbine, Oak Park, is the parent of two high school students, wanted to think that all decisions were made based on best practices, but he had not seen any evidence-based information about the benefits of an open campus. He was not concerned about implementing a change because the majority of schools in the conference closed campuses. He believed that through the combined efforts of the administration, the faculty, and the staff, it could happen and students would get used to it. The impetus for talking about closing the campus originally had to do with the risk of drug and alcohol abuse. An open campus allows this and it allows students to race to get into their cars, rush back to school after lunch. More students are tardy to class after this time. In his opinion, no argument given supported keeping the campus open nor did it override the benefits of a closed campus.

Roma Steinke, Oak Park, thanked the Board of Education for having the courage to address the open campus policy. She reported that she had received an email from an Oak Park father that addressed having an open campus. While she supported a closed campus, his freshman son, an honors student, a musician, and a two-season athlete, did not. Since starting high school, his son has become a regular drug user. While his parents had always monitored his whereabouts and had enforced a weekend curfew, he uses drugs during the week. He started in the fall after realizing that freshmen could walk by security at lunchtime. Drug dealers offered him a sample and before long, he was buying and using drugs. She noted that often athletes are off their high by the time they go to sports practice.

Mimi Skapek, 210 N. Elmwood, Oak Park, thanked the Board of Education for the attention it gave to the open/closed campus issues. She also thanked the Board of Education for facilitating the conversation among different stakeholder groups so that an informed decision could be made. Almost a year ago, the high school brought forward the Illinois Youth Survey Study that indicated that OPRFHS had exceptionally high use of illegal substances. Over the past year, it has become clear to her that the issues reach far beyond those of drugs and alcohol. The school must close the campus, not only to reduce the opportunity, but also to provide a more positive learning environment that meets the mission of OPRFHS. A key goal that has come up in the Policy, Evaluation, and Goals (PEG) meetings is that of positively engaging students during the lunch period. It is not now positive. Ultimately, a healthy lunchtime environment would be established to support the mission of all students, so that all are comfortable eating lunch here. Blueprint reported that, "At the center of the persistent achievement gap are engagement gaps." This is an opportunity to affect positively the

achievement gap during the day, every day. Because the lunch period is 48 minutes in length, it is more vital for the adults to ensure that students are engaged during that time. Implementation is not easy. She attended the PEG meetings and she knew that while there were many issues to address in closing the campus, she believed it was the right thing to do for all students as well as being an opportunity to reach out to those students. She strongly encouraged increasing security and fixing the failed ID system. She applauded the administration's effort in these areas, e.g., security, monitoring doors IDs, etc., and considering the cost. The biggest part will be focusing on the learning environment during the lunch. How can a spot be created that is different from the long tables in the cafeteria? Study groups? These things will take time to develop. She hoped the decision would meet the goal of engaging students positively in the learning environment. If that would require a phase-in, then she suggested the school do that to make this successful.

Wyannetta Johnson, 929 S. Oak Park Avenue, Oak Park, has spoken many times for those who were not happy with the idea of closing the school. She felt the parents should have the right to make a choice for their children. She said that while parents say they would rally for all children, most are really fighting for only their children. She spoke of how well her children and grandchildren were doing at the school and they did not use drugs. She asked the school to stop the fighting.

John Bokum, 629 N. Home, Oak Park, was happy to know that this decision was being made a month earlier than originally thought. He supported closing the campus. Other schools in the West Suburban Conference also have closed campuses. He read that Marge Bristow, who deals with alcohol and drug issues of students at the high school, decided to leave. Considering her caseload, he was surprised that her salary through Thrive was only \$34,000. In the private sector, she would be making three times that amount. When he was campaigning for the Board of Education election, he talked about identifying someone for intervention and prevention and Ms. Bristow indicated she wanted to continue in that way. He hoped the school would find someone to step into that position to address that. He also suggested jamming cell phones internally from 8 a.m. to 3 p.m. to thwart drug deals. He thanked and applauded the Board of Education for moving forward on this.

Jim Gill, 835 N. Kenilworth, Oak Park, is the father of a senior, Lucy Gill, and he opposed closing the campus. While he was sympathetic to any parent having a child with substance problems, he felt collectively, punishing the students who are not using during the day would not answer that issue. He agreed that there seemed to be an engagement gap. Those who have a substance abuse issue have an engagement gap issue. History shows that collective punishment does not work. His biggest concern was that the Board of Education would close the campus without a plan to do so. The Principal has predicted that friction (violence) will increase in the school. To him, closing the campus would be similar to when NCLB was enacted, i.e., a strong directive was given with no clear implementation plan or funding. A clear plan for a safe implementation is necessary.

Bill Sullivan, 624 S. Harvey, Alumni Association, reported that a group of alumni published a 300-page oral biography in tribute to the former head of OPRFHS Theatre Department Jim Eitrheim., who passed recently. The book contains an extraordinary amount of information about the man and the effect that performing and fine arts has had on hundreds of lives. He presented every Board of Education member with a copy

of this book. If there is ever a question about where the heart of the school is, know that the Fine and Performing Arts is the pulse that keeps OPRFHS going.

Lauren Webb and Nyshie Howrey, OPRFHS sophomores, spoke in favor of keeping the campus open otherwise more friction would occur within the building. They also believed that students knew when to say no and it was unfair to punish the students who do not use drugs.

John Rigas, 221 Keystone, River Forest, reiterated that he supported closing the campus. He thought this was a simple decision. He suggested that the Board of Education listen closely to what Mr. Conway had to say about this subject because of his knowledge. He credited Mr. Conway's insight into students at OPRFHS is ahead of everyone else. When Mr. Conway offered his opinion about student behavior, it swayed Mr. Rigas greatly. He is a former police sergeant, police/school resource officer, a leader in the community, and he knows what is right for this community. He thanked him for all service to the community and reiterated that Mr. Conway knew what was occurring with the students.

Status of FOIA Requests

Dr. Millard reported that five FOIA requests were received and resolved.

Board of Education Comments

John Phelan directed his comments to the book that Bill Sullivan distributed. He had the opportunity to get an advanced copy and he was touched by the fact that the alumni honored the life of someone who made such a difference to them.

Dr. Lee recognized the board of The Institute of Science Education and Technology for soliciting various corporations to get the money donated for the prizes awarded in the daylong session of presentations at Percy Julian Symposium. It is due primarily to its work over the last fifteen years that this event grew to this point. He thanked Norb Teclaw for his involvement in that organization.

Mr. Finnegan thanked all the communities for voicing their opinions during the discussions on the open and closed campus. He commended Citizens' Council and the various subcommittees for their tireless work to foster knowledge and discussion for the safest environment and improved atmosphere. While ideas have been generated, the role of Citizens' Council had just begun. He commended the faculty and staff for their supervisory time and he asked those who had not done so to do so as well. He commented on the real enthusiasm to fill the need. Whatever decision is made, everyone must be on board to implement it fairly and consistently. He asked those who had commented to be ready to back up their words...

Mr. Conway announced that the Oak Park library would host a photo exhibition on the second floor about the Oak Park Police Department beginning June 1, with a reception planned for that day from 6 to 8:00 p.m.

Mr. Conway read the following letter to the Board of Education stating that he would retire from the Board of Education effective at the end of the May 26 meeting.

“Effective this date, May 26, 2011, at the conclusion of the regular school board meeting of Oak Park and River Forest High School District 200, I, Jacques A. Conway, submit a resignation as a member of the Board of Education.

“I would like to thank the citizens of both villages for electing me twice to serve as an advocate for their children and a voice of reason for our school communities. I have served the public for 33 years, 6 years on this board and it is my hope that I have somehow left behind a distinct and legitimate purpose for having been so called to serve.

“It was important to resign at the beginning of this school year, 2010-2011, due to two very important reasons. The first reason was in February 2010, when myself and thousands other Park National Bank employees were fired by US Bank, after its takeover of Park National Bank. In July of 2010, I was hired as the Executive Director of Teamwork Englewood, New Community Program organization, funded by LISC/McArthur, which operates in the Englewood community and located on the Southside of Chicago. I was one of the original founders of this community organization in 2003, along with Park National Bank and St. Bernard’s Hospital. As a newly hired director of an organization involved leading the way in improving the quality of life of Englewood residents, I knew it would be difficult to be fully engaged in the duties of a Board member for Oak Park and River Forest High School. I was persuaded to remain on the board by my fellow board members with the understanding that there would be numerous day meetings that I would be unable to attend. I agreed with the understanding that after this past election and before the conclusion of this school year, I would resign and allow the Board of Education to fill my position with someone able to be fully engaged and willing to serve on this board. I recommend John Allen to replace me because he is both informed and willing to continue to serve on this board. In addition, after coming in fourth in the last election, his vote total was evident that the public valued his gifts and would approve of his appointment.

“The second reason I must resign is also related to US Bank. My wife and I pledged our primary residence in River Forest and other real estate we own as collateral for a commercial loan on a building located on the Southside of Chicago, our childhood community. This commercial building was purchased by a non-for-profit organization my wife and I started to help bring new job development and commercial business to the community in need of both. The building was originally purchased in cash and a short-term loan was taken out on the property, financed by Park National Bank, for the purpose of building improvements. Several months before Park National Bank was taken over by FDIC and before the paperwork for the new loan was completed and submitted to Park Bank’s owner, US Bank called for full payment of the loan. At the time of the demand for full payment on this loan was made, all of our loans were current. My wife and I were not in a position to write a six-figure check to US Bank. I was then threatened with foreclosure of all of our real estate, including our home. I appealed to the Chairman/CEO of US Bank, Mr. Richard Davis in Minnesota. I asked Mr. Davis how this bank could within several months of firing an employee, and then threaten to make the same unemployed person and his family homeless.

“US Bank responded with a new deal and that included allowing us time to sell all of our real estate holdings, including our River Forest home, at a cost US Bank

would set. We obliged and listed all of our properties. Fearing that my youngest son, an incoming junior at OPRFHS at the time, upon the sale of our home, would have to transfer to a new high school in his senior year, it forced my wife to accept a new position in her field, out of state, and my son was then enrolled in a high school in that same city. This unfortunate but necessary move helped our family, two of which are college students, cope with a very stressful situation.

With all of that said, my family and I decided together that it would be best to resign from this Board of Education.

“In closing, I thank both communities for the faith and trust given to me and my prayers and my heart will also be with Oak Park and River Forest High School.”

He also had five suggestions for a better and effective school:

- 1) Require all incoming freshmen to complete applications for three universities or colleges before graduation for the purpose of better understanding the various requirements for entrance into these institutions.
- 2) Require all seniors to serve a predetermined number of community service hours as a requirement for graduation. These hours could be used to tutor their fellow high school students in subjects in which they excel. They could assist the elderly or others in need. The opportunities are numerous and it will teach a life-long-lesson about giving back and not always being on the receiving end. I believe service builds character and teaches what life is truly about.
- 3) Put struggling minority students and other struggling students with teachers who are known as teachers who can teach them. Some teachers are better at that than others are. How are these teachers identified? One way is by self-selection. Another way is by seeking the opinion of minority students who have graduated from OPRFHS. Lastly, look at data. In which classes did black students gain the most? In which classes did black students earn the highest grades relative to their white counterparts?
- 4) Have a supported peer review of teachers. Look at a more robust peer review in comparison to the division head evaluations. Is it too hard to have students do an evaluation of their class and teacher?
- 5) Spend money by rewarding the struggling students with employment, stipends, and/or scholarships, for improving their grades and working to become better students and citizens.

Mr. Conway would be greatly missed, as he has a unique and irreplaceable perspective. Dr. Millard knew of no one who could fill his seat as his judgment is very much respected by the Board of Education as he advocated for students in a very unusual manner. She was grateful to know him.

Student Council

Ms. Vogel introduced Jack Hendrix who had been elected to serve as the Student Council's liaison to the Board of Education, her replacement. The new officers were elected this past week and they are:

President, Heather Zurowski
Vice President, Katie Murray
Board Representative, Jack Hendrix
Service Project Coordinator, Steven Piper

Secretary/Treasurer, Renee Pedigo
Public Relations, Justin Atkins

Lunch Hour Model

Dr. Millard reported that the Policy Evaluation and Goal committee agreed that it did not want to the current policy of only freshman remaining in the school during lunch hours to continue and that the Board of Education would decide on an alternative model for next year.

In order to structure the conversation, Ms. Patchak-Layman moved to approve a two-year process for closing the campus:

Phase I.

1. District 200 will implement a modified closed campus for the 2011-2012 school year. Juniors and seniors with parental permission may be allowed to leave campus at lunchtime.
2. By the tart of 2011-12, District 200 will refine the current security infrastructure to tighten the in/out policy; fix inadequacies of the ID program; implement a monitoring system to know who is in/out of the building at any given time.
3. The administration will increase adult presence in the cafeterias to meet recommended adult to student ratios.

Phase 2

1. During the 2011-2012 school year, District 200 will plan with students, staff, and faculty to create a lunchtime environment that supports the educational goals of this high school and promotes the social, emotional, and physical health of students. Dollars will be made available for any necessary construction, furnishings, and supplies. Opportunities for faculty and staff to expand connections with students during the lunchtime will be explored and included in the planning process.
2. Implementation of this plan will take place in the 2012-2013 school year.
3. For the 2012-2013 school year, seniors with parental permission may be allowed to leave campus at lunchtime;

seconded by Dr. Lee. Discussion ensued.

In this motion, Ms. Patchak-Layman attempted to address some of the concerns involving the implementation of this model including what would happen next year to students who remained in the building. Parents have an overriding concern to be involved in the decision-making for their own students. The parent has the first and best understanding of their student in addressing issues such as allergies, bullying, etc. She was unwilling to have students come to school without first addressing the cafeteria issue. As long as students had a choice, it was unnecessary to look at the cafeteria. However, it does take on more importance when students do not have the option of leaving for lunch. How can the District accommodate more students wanting to eat in smaller groups? A range of options and opportunities can be explored with the faculty and staff to create an environment in which students will make them want to stay in the building. She wanted more adults in the picture so that what the District is offering is considered positive, not punishment. If the District closes the campus, it would be seen as a punishment because the cafeteria is not worthy of OPRFHS. It needs to be used as a learning environment in order to model behaviors outside of the building.

While Mr. Finnegan thanked her for her thoughtfulness and the detail, he noted that nothing had been included about earned privileges. She responded that the word “may” is a combination of activities. Parental permission is the first component, but if there are reservations about a student leaving campus, it provides an opportunity to have a dialogue with the family about those concerns. Alignment with the Code of Conduct will be necessary. Beginning day one students would start with a clean slate. Mr. Finnegan wanted a conversation with the community about what guidelines should be used to earn off campus privileges. Ms. Patchak-Layman stated that this was a planning document, a work-in-progress, as there are many unanswered questions, e.g., security, etc. When security has been addressed, a new picture will occur and students will want to stay within the building. The District is discussing what would be good to work on within the next couple of years. The planning process would allow the community to be more engaged in possibilities to create a cafeteria and lunchtime environment that students want to partake.

Mr. Conway wanted clarification as to what the Board of Education was trying to accomplish in closing the campus. Citizens have said that the problem is because there is an open campus, e.g., students are involved in illegal activities, etc. The Board of Education says it wants to change the lunch in this building but give permission to leave campus, allowing the students to continue in the way they always have. Is this a safety issue? There are more illegal activities inside the building than outside.

Ms. Patchak-Layman did not believe the District could close the campus and accommodate all the students with the present lunch times. In addition, more security would be needed. The District has the responsibility for students to be able to eat comfortably. Overcrowding now exists and closing the campus with the present situation in cafeteria is untenable and it is unable to be fixed between now and September.

Dr. Millard noted other schools with closed campuses use more than the cafeterias, e.g., music rooms, gyms, empty classrooms, hallways, etc. She trusted the administration to sort through that and do it quickly. The cafeteria was not the key factor that would limit her from supporting a closed campus, with the ultimate goal of closing it to all but seniors.

Dr. Lee addressed Mr. Conway’s question about goals. He did not believe the Board of Education could talk about the goals without talking about the concerns expressed by a large numbers of Oak Park and River Forest residents. He did not believe the Board of Education was pursuing a simple set of goals and that was the reason he sent out a questionnaire to 1,000 people with a 25% response rate. What impressed him was the depth of feeling of the respondents on the various sides of the issue. There is parent dissatisfaction and Board of Education dissatisfaction with the current system. The current system says freshmen cannot go out but those that want to can. No one wants to have everyone free to go outside for lunch. He did not leave that as a choice in the questionnaire, but he did leave room for comments. The choices were closing the campus for everyone and then various levels for closing the campus. Of the 250 responses, 100 would choose to close the campus completely (40%) and the other 60% were scattered among various degrees of closing the campus to various groups. He felt all of the respondents expressed their convictions honestly and with a deep conviction. He had not seen scientific that would confirm a connection between confining students

to the campus and things such as drug curtailment, politeness, study habits. Thus, it is about feelings. The primary goal of the Board of Education is to find a way to serve a community whose beliefs are diverse. If the motion that is before the Board of Education passes, it will not satisfy a majority of residents, only the majority of the Board of Education. No other motion would satisfy the majority of the residents in Oak Park & River Forest. The Board of Education has the job of changing the culture to some extent, i.e. the thinking of major segments of the community, which is impossible to do by September. Even creating a plan for that is not possible in that timeframe. He supported Ms. Patchak-Layman's motion because this needs development. He did not believe anyone could change the beliefs and feelings of this large of a group of people with a plan that developed in 2 or 3 months. His involvement in changing behaviors and feelings with large groups of people has shown him that it cannot be done in a short time. While he supported it, as it could be tweaked, he did not want to leave here with the public having the idea that it will work, as it would be setting the Superintendent and Principal up for failure. What would a reasonable punishment be the first time a student violated a rule? Getting students to wear ID's was a big deal and a major change to the culture of OPRFHS. This subject is about a clash of values among OPRFHS and people have to reach compromises in three months.

Dr. Millard met with the person who was the principal of Highland Park when it closed the campus overnight because of a car accident that left a student with serious mental disabilities. Dr. Millard had faith in the administration that it could make the changes soon. She wanted to give the administration that direction and suggested Phase I, #1 and Phase 2.

Ms. Patchak-Layman points hit the heart of why Ms. McCormack supported a closed campus. She wanted to change the mindset of the students who believed that privilege is on the outside rather than the inside the building. Expelled students recognize the privilege of being in the building. The Board of Education must do this right and in a way that serves the students. She felt both freshmen and sophomores should be prohibited from leaving for lunch, acknowledging that parental permissions would require a lot of work. Can the school do this and do it right? She wanted to close the campus positively for students and she had many ideas on that topic.

Dr. Isoye stated that if the Board of Education decided to close the campus next year, the effort would be put into closing the campus, setting up the cafeteria to feed all of the students, change schedules, e.g., split lunch, etc. The activities will evolve over time as it is infused with the culture of the school, e.g., how students are engaged from the time they come to school to the time they leave. It will require the school to shift the culture. The reality of this discussion is about closing the campus and consequently there are logistics that need to be made to make this happen.

Mr. Finnegan stated that it was useful to go back to Mr. Conway's question. Mr. Finnegan has learned through the multiple mornings, evenings and emails from people, comes down to the safety of the students, the learning environment, and a student maturation process. He wanted to see positive impact on each of those issues. He learned that the ID system was not working, it needs to be enforced, and that a door monitoring system needs to be implemented and people need to monitor them. The learning environment is key to everything and it must be impacted positively. With regard to student maturation, it is about earned privileges. He supported juniors and

seniors having this privilege and he also supported only seniors having that privilege, as they need to understand that they are moving outside of the building and into a bigger world overnight. He believed the most difficult system to implement is the earned privilege system. Changing the culture is not something that is done overnight and it has to be implemented by the adults in the building. He was disappointed that the lanyard system has not been enforced and looked to more help from the faculty and staff in that regard.

Mr. Conway noted that it was improper to call a system closed if it allowed juniors and seniors to scan out of the building. He questioned giving parental waivers, as he did not know what would be produced or who would follow up on the waivers. He felt that making the area around the school a “no loitering” zone would alleviate some of the neighborhood problems but he was surprised that the police had not substantiated or denied the reports of what was occurring. How many arrests have been made? How many 911 calls have been received? Allowing juniors and seniors to have the privilege of leaving campus would not address what has been said to occur in the community. The Board of Education will have to address that issue.

Mr. Conway continued that both junior highs require their students stay in the cafeterias and there is no outcry that they are bad places. The cafeterias are only bad when the students get to high school. OPRFHS is a high school, not a college. While his own two boys did not feel it was necessary to leave the building to go out for lunch, his daughter did. She was late for class and had two suspensions because she drove too fast. Would she have had the same problems in a closed campus scenario? This is a safety issue. Until students are at the age of majority, it is responsibility of the high school to make sure they are safe. He was distrustful that all adults would offer privilege in the same way. Closing the campus would allow everyone to be treated in the same way and allow the school will manage the lunch hours the same.

Mr. Phalen felt Mr. Conway’s question about the purpose of this discussion would determine the Board of Education’s decision. Safety is important to everyone. The original discussion was about substance abuse and had evolved into a discussion of safety. He has heard that the school will be safer and more secure because of the technology that will be in place. It will be important to administer this carefully and not just create another unenforced policy. If a new system does not have the parental consent component, the school will be in a worse spot. The key issue is the IYS and the use of drug and alcohol use by students. The hiring of a substance abuse counselor may address this as well as developing a plan that could include an opt-in drug testing process in order to distinguish between those using and those who are not. A modified lunch hour may give the administration the tools to develop an incentive system to help students remain in good standing. He supported only juniors and seniors being allowed to leave the campus. If parents were unwilling for the students to opt-in for random drug testing, then their children should not be allowed to go off campus for lunch. That will be something that PEG will need to address. The Board of Education does not need to have a closed campus to change the lunchtime activities.

Dr. Millard agreed that safety and security were extremely important. She concurred that the District should work with the Village of Oak Park to get an ordinance that would make it illegal to loiter around the school. The District is trying to create an environment that is safe and stimulating for the students; that they would rather be here somewhere else. She had faith that the administration could create opportunities for

them. She wanted all students to go to college, to become capable, responsible adults. The District has to provide opportunities for them to learn adjustment. She wanted a transitional year, allowing seniors the opportunities to allow them to experience a less restrictive environment just as they would at either a college or vocational school. She applauded Ms. Patchak-Layman's efforts to put this in writing. She would support a two-year process, but she had wanted the exception to be only seniors with parental permission and in good standing. What would be the criteria for a student to be in good standing? Attendance? Tardies? She felt academic criteria should be minimal.

Dr. Lee felt the District could do better than one-size fits all. Many students need to be in a closed campus environment and many students need an open campus environment. He believed that Ms. Patchak-Layman's motion showed that there was disagreement among Board of Education members, except for Phase I, #1. Ms. Patchak-Layman stated that the details would involve infrastructure and the Board of Education's expectations. It will involve working on a plan and the goals over the next two years to create a lunchtime environment that supports the educational goals of this high school.

Mr. Rouse asked if the community would support closing the building overnight, enforcing the wearing of IDs, etc.? He has learned that this community prides itself on being different. The school will have to address safety for everyone and he asked, "Do we want to address safety for everyone? When someone does not receive an incentive, will the Community support it?" The school's Code of Conduct may mean one thing to some parents and another to other parents.

A roll call vote resulted in two ayes and five nays. Ms. Patchak-Layman and Mr. Conway voted aye. Motion failed.

Amendment

Mr. Phelan moved to amend Phase I, #1 by adding "in good standing as defined by the administration" after the word "seniors" in the second sentence; seconded by Mr. Finnegan. A roll call vote resulted in four ayes and three nays. Ms. McCormack, Ms. Patchak-Layman, and Mr. Conway voted nay. Motion carried.

Ms. McCormack had not supported because she desired having positive ways to change the culture by providing a lunch period that best serves the students and their academic lives.

Discussion ensued. While Mr. Phelan thought that the Board of Education needed to take action on Phase I, No. 1, he had not thought about what the Board of Education would do in the future. The administration would do what it had to do and the Board of Education did not need to be part of the vote. The administration needed the Board of Education's decision on a lunch hour model. He did not want to address any further details.

Ms. Patchak-Layman suggested that one could do Phase I if the mechanisms were in place with security and IDs so that it is known who is and who is not in the building. If that is not present, then it cannot do that. Without the other statements, there are no benchmarks to show the community that this has been addressed. It was noted that the administration would have many things it must do in this modification.

Approval

Mr. Phelan then moved to approve the statement "District 200 will implement a modified closed campus for the 2011-2012 school year. Juniors and seniors in good

standing as defined by the administration with parental permission may be allowed to leave campus at lunchtime;" seconded by Mr. Finnegan. A roll call vote resulted in 4 ayes and 3 nays. Ms. McCormack, Ms. Patchak-Layman, and Mr. Conway voted nay. Motion carried.

Dr. Millard moved to accept Phase II, No. 3, For the 2012-2013 school year, seniors with parental permission may be allowed to leave campus at lunchtime; seconded by Ms. McCormack.

Ms. McCormack was sad to see the District spend some much time, energy and money on finding ways for students to leave the building during the school day and building a better learning environment. Mr. Phelan opposed, the money, as the money would be spent anyway on the technology to make the building secure, i.e., scanners. His goal is to address the drug and alcohol problem and keep it open for those students who have not caused a problem. He, Mr. Finnegan, and Dr. Lee did not believe that the Board of Education needed to make a decision this year for next year. Mr. Phelan was moved by an African-American female university student's comments that she would not have made it through OPRFHS if she had not been able to get away from bullying. He did not expect that adults would be able to observe all areas of the building all of the time and the school did not need a one-size fits all model. Any parent who wants his/her child of any age can have that. He did not want to penalize other students.

Ms. McCormack's goal was a closed campus, but she understood having a long-term, phase-in goal. The only way for things noted to happen was for the Board of Education to take the next step for a phase in so that the school will take seriously how to affect a positive culture. The goal is to focus on students in the building. Ms. Patchak-Layman's reservation was the wording "in good standing as defined by the administration." That is a conversation with regard to the District's Code of Conduct. Much of the communities' conversation has changed over the past year and the community has challenged the District to think differently. Anytime the District moves to do something without the community, it is a missed opportunity for community contribution.

Dr. Millard believed the current administration has been good at incorporating the wider community in those discussions and she challenged it to incorporate input from a wide variety of stakeholders before defining what it means to be in good standing. She hoped it was not just the IHSA standards.

Dr. Millard did not want to allow just seniors to leave the campus and Ms. McCormack concurred. Thus, she and Ms. McCormack with drew the motion.

Ms. McCormack moved to approve Phase II, #1 as follows: During the 2011-2012 school year, District 200 will plan with students, staff, and faculty to create a lunchtime environment that supports the educational goals of this high school and promotes the social, emotional, and physical health of students; seconded by Mr. Phelan. Discussion ensued.

Dr. Millard thought this was micromanaging the administration. Ms. McCormack disagreed. The Board of Education requires and expects it, it will spend money on it, money that will take away from academics, and it will be difficult to do. Mr. Phelan would support it because more students will be restricted to campus; it is really a broad

policy statement. Mr. Finnegan noted that each of his four boys graduated from OPRFHS and each handled lunch differently. His long-term goal was not to close the campus. He also felt the Board of Education was just giving general direction to the administration.

Dr. Isoye stated that with regard to Phase II and #1, environment and atmosphere, while that links with PBIS, it will help when talking about resources and students to be served. The assumption is that juniors and seniors will have the ability to leave. If in the following year, a change is made later in the year or the campus is closed, he hoped the Board of Education would know that there would be disappointment in the work of the group because it was doing the work in one scope. He suggested that this might be considered in two or three years. There is a framework in Phase I, #1. He wanted to make sure that no one was upset at the administration's work, some of which will be broad brushstrokes.

Dr. Lee had no opposition to the motion on the floor unless it jeopardized his concern. His primary goal is to produce students who are better able to make wise decisions in the area of risky behavior, e.g., drug behavior, alcohol, sexual, treatment of other students, etc., and improve the environment during the hours from 8 a.m. to 3 p.m., not just lunchtime. He opposed the Superintendent funneling resources into that part of the day because of this amendment. Ms. Patchak-Layman stated that what happens during lunch carries over to the rest of the day so she did not look at this as being narrowed to one period of time, but instead carrying over to all other periods. Her observation of the lunchroom was that it was not a welcoming place for adults and she wanted more of them to be involved, not just security. If the District is requiring students to stay in for lunch, then the environment must be better.

A roll call vote resulted in six ayes and one Nay. Dr. Millard voted nay. Motion carried.

No further motions were made.

Dr. Isoye stated that the key component is the Board of Education's direction with regard to a modified closed campus. The administration understands what needs to be done, e.g., security, staffing, cafeteria, etc. Phase 2, I is supported by PBIS. Should the Board of Education decide to close the campus entirely and believe that the school will have everything in place to do so, it may not. He asked the Board of Education to be mindful of that. The school is presently doing things from the social emotional standpoint and it is moving forward regardless of the model chosen. This will be discussed further in terms of the goals at the Board of Education's retreat. Ms. Patchak-Layman felt PBIS was not enough. Students across the board have said they want smaller arrangements, smaller places for eating lunch, quieter places, activities to do, etc. all of which are involved in the actual setting of the lunchroom and activities that go along with it. Mr. Rouse thanked the Board of Education for its direction and echoed Dr. Isoye's sentiments. He also challenged the notion that the cafeteria was not an inviting environment for adults.

At 10:23 a.m., the Board of Education recessed this meeting to move to the Board Room, Room 213 and resumed at 10:35 p.m.

Principal's report

Mr. Rouse reported the following: the Freshman/Sophomore Honors' Convocation was held Tuesday, May 17, where freshman and sophomore students who had done exceptional work were recognized. Jack Lanenga, who was retiring at the end of the year, provided some powerful words of encouragement to the students. Tuesday, May 24 was the annual Junior/Senior Honor's Convocation, at which time over 146 scholarships were presented to senior students, totaling more than \$186,000 dollars. The District thanked the OPRFHS Scholarship Foundations, the Community Foundation and the direct donors who were extremely generous and made these scholarships available to students. The Scholarship Cup Awards were also presented. This prestigious honor was first awarded in 1915 to the top scholar(s) of each graduating class based on Grade Point Average (GPA) at the end of the seventh semester as well as being an OPRFHS student for five of the seven semesters. This year, 16 Scholarship Awards Recipients were honored and will be on the stage at the June 12 graduation ceremony.

In order to involve more students in the graduation ceremony, commencement speech auditions were held in the Little Theatre on May 24 after school. The Scholarship Cup recipients who were interested in giving the commencement speech at graduation auditioned before their peers. Thus, the seniors who were present had an opportunity to contribute to the selection of the commencement speaker representing the class of 2011. The winner will be announced on May 27.

Mr. Rouse congratulated the retirees and wished them the best of luck in their future endeavors, noting that their institutional knowledge would be a great loss. The Memorial Day Assembly was canceled today due to rain, but was rescheduled for Friday, May 27.

BOOSTER—Ms. McCormack reported that the Boosters Dinner/Auction had been very successful.

Alumni Association—Ms. McCormack reported that the Alumni Association was finishing awards for summer scholarships and working on increasing membership and looking to having participating at the

APPLE—Dr. Lee reported that the main discussion at the last APPLE meeting was about closing the campus.

Citizens' Council—Dr. Isoye reported that Citizens' Council discussed 1) the OPRFHS Food Service department, its new products and its food service preparation and 2) communication with colleges.

Tradition of Excellence—Ms. Patchak-Layman reported that Student Council officers were newly elected and that the Tradition of Excellence meeting was scheduled June 7.

Concert Tour Association (CTA)—Ms. Patchak-Layman reported that CTA was discussing phase 1 of its strategic plan and planning for Phase II.

Superintendent

Dr. Isoye reported that he attended a joint meeting of the Oak Park & River Forest Council of Governments with the focus on Thrive Counseling Center's work.

Dr. Isoye reported that approximately 84 parents, neighbors/or concerned citizens attended the Special Board meeting on May 4 about lunch hour options; others registered their written opinions. Dr. Isoye reported that on May 5, IMPACT held a forum where presentations were made on drugs and alcohol abuse by law enforcement, judges, counselors, social workers, rehabilitated drug users, and school personnel.

Dr. Isoye, Ms. Patchak-Layman, and participated in the Ethnic Day Parade on May 7.

Dr. Isoye participated in a Community Leadership Program Planning on May 12 and a panel on May 20 with Dr. Roberts, Dr. Hagerman, and Dr. Condon of Districts 97, 90 and Dominican University about educational leadership.

Dr. Isoye attended OPRFHS's Prom on May 14 at the Hyatt on Wacker in Chicago.

Dr. Isoye congratulated the retirees as well, especially Jack Lanenga who was a long-serving administrator and sat at the Board of Education table at one time.

Consent Items

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

- the Check Disbursements and Financial Resolutions dated May 26, 2011;
- the Treasurer's Report for March 2011;
- the Monthly Financials for March 2011;
- Award CDW-G the hardware contract;
- Award Ambassador bid for PE shorts and award Authentic Promo the bid for PE shirts;
- Textbooks, as presented; and
- Resolution for Prevailing Wage;

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

Summer Construction Ms. McCormack moved to approve the Summer 2012 Construction plans, as submitted; seconded by Mr. Finnegan. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Ms. Patchak-Layman wanted this removed from the Consent Agenda in case there were construction items to add to this list after the vote had been taking about the lunch hour models relative to activities around the lunchroom environment (physical changes, furnishings, or supplies). She felt that consideration might be given to not resurfacing the track or doing the press box renovations at this time as that money might be considered when talking about ideas for the lunchroom environment. She was looking for places for modifications in anticipation of spending dollars for lunchroom environment. Dr. Isoye noted that staffing and equipment to upgrade security cameras and the software would be needed. Ms. Witham reported that Legat Architects would begin to work with the high school on the north end of the building and she would add this to its list and listen to the community about the design and needs of the space and the timeframe. Everything on the present list is life safety: the air handlers are old and the press box needs immediate replacement. OPRFHS is fortunate to have a fund balance, but if the cafeteria needs remodeling the Board of Education may be asked to reduce that fund balance.

Public Hearing	At 10:55 p.m., Ms. McCormack called public hearing on the amendment of the budget for FY 2011. Hearing no oral or written comments, she closed the meeting at 10:56 p.m.
Adoption of Amended Budget FY 2011	Dr. Lee moved to adopt the FY 2011 Amended Budget, as presented; seconded by Dr. Millard. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.
Acceptance of Gifts	Mr. Finnegan moved to accept with gratitude the gifts and donations, as presented; seconded by Dr. Millard. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.
School Towel Service Contract	Dr. Millard moved to approve a one-year extension for the 2011-12 school year with National School Towel Service; seconded by Mr. Finnegan. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.
FAC Model	Mr. Finnegan moved to approve the recommended changes by FAC to the composition of the Quality Review Committees and the manner in which members are chosen; seconded by Mr. Phelan. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried. The intent of the amendment to the FAC model was to give the committees gathering information as much leeway as possible in order to have free conversations, etc. No limitations should be placed on the sharing of information. The QRC will determine if the recommendations would be in its final report.
Certified/Non-Certified Proposed FTE Summary	Mr. Finnegan moved to approve the proposed FTE for 2011/12, as presented, noting the exceptions, as presented; seconded by Mr. Phelan. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried. The Board of Education will be asked to approve funding of safety and security lunchroom positions should things change. Ms. Patchak-Layman requested a head count for FTE as well.
Ratification of CPA Contract	This item was removed from the agenda.
Minutes	Dr. Millard moved to approve the open and closed session minutes of April 26, 28, May 4, and 17, 2011 and declared that the Audiotapes of the closed sessions in August 2009 shall be destroyed; seconded by Mr. Finnegan. A roll call vote resulted in six ayes and one nay. Ms. Patchak-Layman voted nay.
TIF Indemnification	Dr. Millard moved to approve the TIF Indemnification Agreement for John Allen, as presented; seconded by Mr. Finnegan. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.
Non-agenda Items	Dr. Millard noted that Mr. Conway would be formally recognized for leaving a legacy at OPRFHS at the beginning of its regular June meeting and that he was leaving a legacy.
Closed Session	At 10:08 p.m., Dr. Millard moved to enter closed session for the purpose of Litigation, The appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance,

or dismissal of specific employees of the District or legal counsel for the District, including hearing testimony on a complaint lodged against an employee or against legal counsel for the District to determine its validity. 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(1), as amended by PA.93—57; Collective negotiating matters between the District and its employees or their representatives or deliberations concerning salary schedules for one or more classes of employees, 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(2); 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); seconded by Mr. Finnegan. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

**Personnel
Recommendations**

Dr. Millard moved to approve the personnel recommendations, as presented; seconded by Mr. Finnegan. A roll call vote resulted in five ayes and one nay. Ms. Patchak-Layman voted nay and Mr. Conway had departed. Motion carried.

Adjournment

At 1: 20 a.m. on Thursday, May 26, 2011, Dr. Lee moved to adjourn the Board of Education meeting; seconded by Ms. McCormack. A roll call vote resulted in six ayes. Mr. Allen had departed. Motion carried.

Dr. Dietra D. Millard
President

Amy McCormack
Secretary