

**Oak Park and River Forest High School
201 N. Scoville
Oak Park, Illinois 60302**

**BOARD POLICY, EVALUATION AND GOALS COMMITTEE MEETING
Thursday, November 11, 2010
Immediately Following Instruction Committee Meeting
Board Room
AGENDA**

I. Approval of Minutes Sharon Patchak-Layman/Dr. Dietra D. Millard

II. Consideration of Policies for First Reading

- A. Policy 3910, Identity Protection Policy
- B. Policy 5144, Food Allergy Management Program

III. Consideration of Policies for Discussion

- A. Policy 2125, Administrative Vacation

IV. Additional Matters for PEG Committee Information/Deliberation

Docket:

- 1. Classification of Non-Affiliated Employees
- 2. Board Policy Manual Evaluation

C: Board Members, Dr. Dietra D. Millard and Sharon Patchak-Layman, Co-Chairs, DLT & BLT

Oak Park and River Forest High School
201 N. Scoville
Oak Park, IL 60302

Policy, Evaluation and Goals (PEG) Committee
Thursday, October 14, 2010
Minutes
Board Room

A Policy, Evaluation and Goals Committee meeting was held on Thursday, October 14, 2010, in the Board Room. Co-chair Dr. Millard opened the meeting at 10:46 a.m. Committee members present were John C. Allen, Terry Finnegan, Dr. Ralph H. Lee, Amy McCormack, Dr. Dietra D. Millard, and Sharon Patchak-Layman. Also present were: Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; Lauren M. Smith, Director of Human Resources; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Visitors: Kay Foran, Communications and Community Relations Coordinator; James Paul Hunter, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair; Dr. Allan Alson of SchoolExec Connect.

Minutes

It was the consensus of the Policy Committee members to accept the minutes of the September 16, 2010 meeting, as presented.

Policy 3535, Cafeteria and Bookstore

The Board of Education had some discussion previously about possibility increasing the pay of Food Service employees. The budget for the cafeteria is in compliance with Policy 3535. Should the Board of Education want to recommend any changes regarding pay, it may require a review and/or change of this policy. Ms. Smith provided comparative information from other districts relative to these rates and the District's range of salaries for these positions. The Board of Education should also consider that an increase in the number of students qualifying for the Free and Reduced Lunch Program would be a cost factor to the high school. Generally, Food Service employees who are hired as servers and cashiers start at minimum wage and receive salary increases based on longevity. Monetary increases are given rather than percent increases. In order for Food Service to be self sustaining, as the policy dictates, one must consider 1) salaries, 2) the contract with District 97, and 3) anticipated food costs. Last year, Food Service had a surplus of just \$1,000.

Ms. Patchak-Layman placed value on the adults working in Food Service and she did not want personnel and the minimum wage to be the pivotal factors when considering a pay raise. In her mind, \$10 per hour would be more appropriate for new employees, noting that babysitters sometimes receive more than that per hour. She also did not want students to suffer by increasing the meal cost or serve less healthy food in order to be self sustaining.

Ms. Smith stated that the Human Resources Department receives a requisition form for each position in the building, other than students, and it goes through a process of approval. Information regarding student workers is being gathered as to who and how they are hired.

Dr. Lee preferred to have this discussion with both the Director of Food Service, Ms. Piekarski, and the Chief Financial Officer, Ms. Witham, present. He also wanted to see a proposal before further discussion occurred. Mr. Finnegan suggested leaving the policy as is and the salary work to the administrators; they knew the Board of Education's desire and it was inappropriate for the Board of Education to discuss the logistics of it. Dr. Millard was unsure if \$10 per hour would allow Food Service to be self sustaining and self-sustaining was appropriate to continue until more information was received. Ms. McCormack felt that if the District was not violating the policy, it should stand. While politically she was on the same page with minimum wage, she asked how the District could live within CPI if it does not make tough choices.

Ms. Patchak-Layman remembered that three Board of Education members begrudgingly approved the personnel recommendations because of the salaries being offered to the cashiers; the salaries cannot be increased until the policy is changed.

Dr. Millard proposed retaining the policy as is and informing the Chief Financial Officer and Director of Human Resources that the Board of Education would like to take into consideration its concern in future hiring and the types of limitations to put in place. Mr. Isoye noted that sustainability can be done in any model, but if expenditures go up, so must revenue. Mr. Finnegan concurred with Dr. Millard and he appreciated the methodology that when something no longer fits the policy, the policy must be changed.

Mr. Allen had not intended to change the policy. He wanted to give some Food Service employees more while maintaining self-sustainability. He asked that the District review the wages and give more, if possible.

Ms. Patchak-Layman agreed that more information was necessary and suggested tabling this discussion at this time. She raised the issue of salaries to be more respectful to humans and their jobs. If with additional information, it is impossible to raise salaries, the Board of Education must reconsider this policy.

Curriculum/Instruction Policy Discussion

Because there is no self-contained curriculum policy, parts are reflected in Policies 20, 100, 104, 2120, 3700, 4370, 5125, 6130, and 6134, the Committee discussed whether the Board of Education should have a specific policy on curriculum.

Ms. Patchak-Layman brought this forward because the Board of Education is the policymaker for the school and what happens in the school should reflect the policies. She asked how the Board of Education could make a change in curriculum, e.g., introduce, or eliminate a program, etc., noting that three Board of Education members have suggested adding a writing course. How would the community interact with the school? Nothing in the policies gives that direction regarding curriculum, either theoretically or specifically. Many other school districts have self-contained curriculum policies.

Dr. Lee felt the Board of Education should define what it wants in curriculum, i.e., encompassing all it wants to happen in a student's four years. Enrolling in a string of courses and receiving grades for them is not the same as having an adequate education. He wanted policies that would rule out de facto policies, such as the District does not teach reading, etc... He wanted to see reading across all curriculums, not just Special Education.

Mr. Finnegan wanted ninth graders to understand it is the goal of the District for them to have the ability to enter a four-year university. He wanted to see other districts' policies on curriculum. Again, the Board of Education's role is the strategic picture. He supported an overarching statement which will allow the professionals to bring initiatives that will satisfy the Board of Education's goals.

Dr. Millard interpreted this as being the requirements for graduation and what a diploma meant. She wanted to know what the expectations would be for a curriculum policy and how would that be accomplished.

Ms. McCormack suggested that any Board of Education could bring a draft policy to start a conversation.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if this work needed to be done. Mr. Isoye stated that the discussion began with Ms. Patchak-Layman and Dr. Millard as an opportunity for Dr. Alson to talk about governance. He viewed the discussions about curriculum, instruction, and graduation to be weighty.

Mr. Prale noted that curriculum is a moving and permeable topic; assessment can come from different angles. The District should know what it wants to talk about; graduation requirements are a specific discussion. Ms. McCormack concurred, noting that course proposals allow the larger community to give input. Mr. Rouse asked how a curriculum policy would govern or alter what is currently being done. Is there a feeling that the District is not asking the community to be part of curriculum and instruction? Mr. Prale felt the District was attentive to the process. While the Philosophy of Grading Policy is thin, more can be added if necessary. He continued that if the work being done is positive for the community, then he did not know what more was needed. If the Board of Education wanted to put all students in honor classes in order for them to experience that rigor because it was the desire of the larger community, Ms. Patchak-Layman asked where that would happen. Where would that change be made in policy?

Mr. Hunter stated that the purpose of the Board of Education is to create policy, not to be involved in the day-to-day operations. He felt some Board of Education members wanted to be administrators.

Dr. Lee wanted the Board of Education to have a mechanism for changing those policies which are accepted but do not appear e.g., reading, etc. The idea of a "super policy" is not questioned. He believed that if there were an auditing process of how the District spends money, it would find that more money is spent on meeting the needs of students with above average academic ability than on those students with lower-academic ability. He believed the District believes that students with behavior problems and lower test scores should not be in the same classrooms with

students with higher test scores. Mr. Finnegan felt the term “belief system” would better used rather than “super policy.”

Planning of November Board of Education Retreat

Discussion ensued about what the Board of Education members wanted to cover at its November 23 retreat. Comments were made that while the Board of Education has had high level discussions, more respect should be shown for the process and the institution and the Board of Education should not feel like it had to overanalyze every aspect of a conversation, how will the members remind themselves of the efficiency goals and parameters that are set. Others appreciated an expanded conversation, as the benefit is that it brings added value.

Dr. Lee felt the Board of Education continued to review the same territory because it had not agreed on the basic structural foundation on which to build. He asked if the Board of Education wanted a strategic plan, as the discussion earlier was indicative of that. Dr. Alson concluded that the Board of Education wanted to talk about efficiency and governance issues and consider whether a strategic plan should be embarked on and what the precursors to that would be.

The Board of Education members were assigned to read the last chapter of the book *Leading for Equity* which was written by a Harvard professor about the Montgomery Public School System. It takes real life cases and analyzes them, from resource to time management. Mr. Alson stated that Harvard University added a doctoral program in Education Administration, a collaboration between its Business School, the Kennedy School of Government, and the Education School, as it relies on case management. Dr. Lee commented that respected the Montgomery Public School System more than almost any other district on problem solving.

The Board of Education members were invited to contact either Mr. Alson or Dr. Hanson prior to the retreat about any further suggestions.

Adjournment

The Policy Evaluation and Goals Committee adjourned at 12:26 p.m.

POLICY 3910, Identity Protection

This policy is enacted in compliance with the Illinois Identity Protection Act, 5 ILCS 179/1 et seq. (the "Act"), which requires all local government agencies to draft and approve an identity-protection policy.

The Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School District hereby adopts the following policy, in conformance with the provisions of said Act:

1. All employees who have access to social security numbers in the course of performing their duties shall be required to attend training on the protection of confidentiality of social security numbers. The training will include instructions on the proper handling of information that contains social security numbers from the time of collection through the destruction of the information.
2. Only employees who are required to use or handle information or documents that contain social security numbers may access such information or documents.
3. Any request for social security numbers from individuals shall be done in a manner that allows the social security number to be easily redacted if a document is required to be released as part of a public records request.
4. Any request for social security numbers from individuals shall include a statement of the purpose or purposes for which the social security number is being collected and used.
5. A written copy of this policy shall be filed with and maintained on file by the Board of Education of the School District.
6. This policy shall be made available to any member of the public upon request.
7. Any amendment to this policy after its initial adoption shall be filed with the Board of Education and a copy of the amended policy shall be made available to School District employees.

Violation of the provisions of this policy by employees of the School District shall be grounds for discipline up to and including dismissal.

Amended Date(s):

Adopted Date:

Review Date:

Law Reference: Illinois Identity Protection Act, 5 ILCS 179/1

Related Policies:

Related Instructions

And Guidelines:

Cross Ref.:

Identity Protection Agreement

I have read and understand the provisions of Policy 3910, Identity-Protection, as follows:

1. All employees who have access to social security numbers in the course of performing their duties shall be required to attend training on the protection of confidentiality of social security numbers. The training will include instructions on the proper handling of information that contains social security numbers from the time of collection through the destruction of the information.
2. Only employees who are required to use or handle information or documents that contain social security numbers may access such information or documents.
3. Any request for social security numbers from individuals shall be done in a manner that allows the social security number to be easily redacted if a document is required to be released as part of a public records request.
4. Any request for social security numbers from individuals shall include a statement of the purpose or purposes for which the social security number is being collected and used.
5. A written copy of this policy shall be filed with and maintained on file by the Board of Education of the School District.
6. This policy shall be made available to any member of the public upon request.
7. Any amendment to this policy after its initial adoption shall be filed with the Board of Education and a copy of the amended policy shall be made available to School District employees.

Violation of the provisions of this policy by employees of the School District shall be grounds for discipline up to and including dismissal.

Employee Name

Signature

Date: _____

Policy 5144, Food Allergy Management Program

School attendance may increase a student's risk of exposure to allergens that could trigger a food-allergic reaction. A food allergy is an adverse reaction to a food protein mediated by the immune system which immediately reacts causing the release of histamine and other inflammatory chemicals and mediators. While it is not possible for the District to completely eliminate the risks of exposure to allergens when a student is at school, a Food Allergy Management Program using a cooperative effort among students' families, staff members, and students helps the District reduce these risks and provide accommodations and proper treatment for allergic reactions.

The Superintendent or designee shall develop and implement a Food Allergy Management Program that:

1. Fully implements the following goals established in The School Code: (a) identifying students with food allergies, (b) preventing exposure to known allergens, (c) responding to allergic reactions with prompt recognition of symptoms and treatment, and (d) educating and training all staff about management of students with food allergies, including administration of medication with an auto-injector, and providing an in-service training program for staff who work with students that is conducted by a person with expertise in anaphylactic reactions and management.
2. Follows and references the applicable best practices specific to the District's needs in the joint State Board of Education and Ill. Dept. of Public Health publication *Guidelines for Managing Life-Threatening Food Allergies in Schools*, available at: www.isbe.net/nutrition/pdf/food_allergy_guidelines.pdf.
3. Complies with State and federal law and is in alignment with Board policies.

Amended Date(s):

Adopted Date:

Review Date:

Law Reference: LEGAL REF.: 105 ILCS 5/2-3.149 and 5/10-22.39. *Guidelines for Managing Life-Threatening Food Allergies in Schools (Guidelines)*, jointly published by the State Board of Education and Ill. Dept. of Public Health.

Related Policies:

Related Instructions

And Guidelines:

Cross Ref.: Policy 5143, Administration of Medications

Administrative Procedures - Implementing a Food Allergy Management Program

The following procedure implements policy 7:285, *Food Allergy Management Program*, which is based upon the joint State Board of Education (ISBE) and Ill. Dept. of Public Health (IDPH) publication, *Guidelines for Managing Life-Threatening Food Allergies in Schools (ISBE/IDPH Guidelines)*, available at: www.isbe.net/nutrition/pdf/food_allergy_guidelines.pdf (105 ILCS 5/2-3.149(b), added by P.A. 96-349 and renumbered by P.A. 96-1000).

This administrative procedure contains three sections as follows:

1. Glossary of Terms
2. Food Allergy Management Program
3. Individual Food Allergy Management (Three Phases)
Phase One: Identification of Students with Food Allergies
Phase Two: Prevention of Exposure to Known Allergens
Phase Three: Response to Allergic Reactions

Glossary of Terms

Food Allergy Management Program (Program) - The overall process that the Superintendent and other District-level administrators use to implement policy 7:285, *Food Allergy Management Program*, which is based upon the *ISBE/IDPH Guidelines*.

Food Allergy Management Committee (Committee) – This Committee is a District-level team that the Superintendent creates to develop a Food Allergy Management Program.

Individual Food Allergy Management - The process at the building-level used to manage and prevent anaphylaxis. The process identifies: (a) students with allergies, (b) procedures to prevent exposure to known allergens, and (c) appropriate responses to allergic reactions. It is synonymous with the third section in this sample administrative procedure.

Emergency Action Plan - A document that outlines a food allergic student's needs, and at minimum, includes the precautions necessary for food allergen avoidance and emergency procedures and treatments. Its function is similar to a 504 Plan (see below). Important: Consult the Board Attorney about whether the Program should implement a 504 Plan or IHCP. This Program's procedures implement 504 Plans only. Insert IHCP in place of or in addition to 504 Plan in this document if the District will also implement IHCPs.

504 Plan - A document that outlines a food allergic student's needs, necessary accommodations, and individual staff member responsibilities. Its function is identical to an IHCP while also including procedural protections (see above). This Program's procedures implement 504 Plans only.

Important: Consult the Board Attorney about whether implementing only 504 Plans is the best method. Many attorneys agree that a 504 Plan is the best (although not universal) practice for a student with a diagnosis of an allergy.

Food Allergy Management Program

This section relies heavily upon District-level administrators to implement the Program even if the District has no students with food allergies (105 ILCS 5/2-3.149, added by P.A. 96-349 and renumbered by P.A. 96-1000). This is because identification of students at risk of anaphylaxis cannot be predicted, and it is possible that a student who has not been identified could have his or her first reaction at school (The Superintendent or his/her designee shall establish a Food Allergy Management Committee. The Committee will consist of the Superintendent, Director of Special Education, Assistant Principal for

Student Services, Principal, Food Service Director, and the Nurse. The Committee will convene at least once a year to update and review practices.

The Principal or his/her designee will inform the school community by providing the information to students and their parents/guardians. He/she will implement the Program in the building by meeting with the appropriate staff.

Individual Food Allergy Management

This section's procedures are implemented each time the school identifies a student with a food allergy. It relies heavily upon Principal and Nurse/Designated School Personnel (DSP) to identify the necessary accommodations for each student and determine which staff members are responsible to provide them. Accommodations are impacted by a number of factors, e.g., the student's age, the allergen(s) involved, the facilities in the building, etc.

Phase One: Identification of Students with Food Allergies

The Parent/Guardian will inform the Principal of the student's food allergy and complete Allergy History Form

For a student who is not already identified as disabled, a determination will be made as to whether a referral for an evaluation is warranted using the District's evaluation procedures for determining whether a student is a student with a disability within the meaning of IDEA or Section 504.

For a student with an existing IEP or Section 504 plan, or who qualifies for one on the basis of his or her food allergy, a determination will be made as to

1. Whether the student's food allergy requires *related services* to ensure the provision of a "free appropriate public education" (FAPE), and/or
2. Whether the student's food allergy requires appropriate *reasonable accommodations* for the student's disability.

If the answer to either of the above questions is negative, the parent/guardian will be notified in writing of the reasons for the denial and the right to appeal and any required procedural safeguard notices will be provided.

If the answer to either of the above questions is positive, the following steps will be taken:

1. Gather appropriate health information by using the completed Allergy History Form and Emergency Action Plan (EAP).
2. For accommodations beyond EAP, complete a 504 Plan.
3. Determine which staffing provides the identified accommodations. Remember that accidental exposures are more likely to happen when an unplanned event or non-routine event occurs and special care should be taken to address procedures for staff members who provide transportation, substitute teaching, coaching or other activities, field trips, and classroom celebrations.
4. Assign responsibilities to individual staff members for providing the identified accommodations. Inform absent staff members during the creation of the 504 Plan of their responsibilities
5. Identify willing 504 Team members trained in emergency response to respond to any allergic reactions the student may have.
6. Provide the required procedural safeguard notices.

Phase Two: Prevention of exposure to Known Allergens

The Principal (or his/her designee) and/or the Nurse/DSP will

- 1) convene a meeting to educate all the staff members who will provide the identified 504 Plan accommodations about their responsibilities.
- 2) ensure individual staff members perform their responsibilities and provide the necessary accommodations for the student's individual health needs.
- 3) facilitate the dissemination of accurate information in the building about the student's food allergy while respecting privacy rights.
- 4) provide information to parents/guardians. The communication should inform students and their parents/guardians about the importance of keeping their educational setting free of the food allergen.

Phase Three: Response to Allergic Reactions

The 504 Team will implement and follow all identified responsibilities in the 504 Plan. It will follow the student's 504 Plan and EAP.

If the student has no 504 Plan or EAP, the Nurse/DSP will provide the parent/guardian with the necessary papers to begin an assessment process.

LEGAL REF: 105 ILCS, 5/2-3.149.

POLICY 2125, VACATIONS

Administrative staff members on fiscal twelve-month contracts will be granted one week of the winter break and four additional weeks of vacation to be taken at the convenience of the school and with the approval of the Superintendent/Principal.

Unused vacation time cannot be accumulated. Vacation time must be taken prior to November 1 of the next fiscal year.

| | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| Amended: | October 24, 2002; March 15, 1979 |
| Adopted: | September 23, 1968 |
| Review Date: | |
| Law Reference: | |
| Related Policies: | |
| Related Instructions And Guidelines: | |
| Cross Ref.: | |