The regular Board meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on Thursday evening, September 15, 2011, in the Board Room.

Call to Order
President Millard called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. The following Board of Education members were present: Valerie J. Fisher, 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; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum & Instruction; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Closed Session
At 6:31 p.m., on September 15, 2011, Dr. Millard moved to enter closed session for the purposes of discussing the appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of specific employees of the District or legal counsel for the District, including hearing testimony on a complaint lodged against an employee or against legal counsel for the District to determine its validity. 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(1), as amended by PA.93—57; 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.

The Board of Education reconvened its open session at 7:33 p.m.

Joining the meeting were: Michael Carioscio, Chief Financial Officer; Amy Hill, Director of Assessment and Research; Dr. Tina Halliman, Director of Special Education; James Paul Hunter, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair; Jack Hendrix, Student Council Board of Education liaison also joined the meeting.

Visitors
The Board of Education welcomed the following visitors: Kay Foran, Communications and Community Relations Coordinator; Cindy Milojevic, Assistant Principal for Student Activities; Nancy Leavy of the League of Women Voters; Mark Woods, and Brendan Lee, OPRFHS faculty members; Students Aaron Herman, Lauren Frost, Maddie Hoepf, Emma Johnson; John Bokum, community member, Bill Dwyer of the Pioneer Press, Terry Dean of the Wednesday Journal; James Jaworski of the Chicago Tribune, Wyanetta Johnson and Burcy Hines of APPLE; Carolyn Newberry Schwartz and Diana Rosenbrook of the Collaboration of Early Childhood Education and Care.

Public Comments
Burcy Hines, resident of Oak Park, read a letter authored by Mark Vance and addressed to Wyanetta Johnson about his not being renewed as the B.O.S.S. sponsor. Ms. Hines asked the Board of Education to consider providing OPRFHS employees with sensitivity training as it relates to culture to the school community.

John Bokum, resident of 629 S. Home, Oak Park, asked the status of TIF and if a person for an interventionist position had been hired. The administration will respond to him.

Introduction
Student Council—Jack Hendrix reported that Student Council was working on Homecoming and Spirit Week. Its membership is growing weekly with a current membership of 92. The themes of the individual days of Spirit Week are:
Monday—Lounge Day (flannels, sweats, and slippers)
Tuesday—Throw Back Day (old school attire)
Wednesday—Class Color’s Day
Thursday—Hollywood Day (favorite celebrity)
Friday—Huskie Day (orange and blue)
Saturday—Homecoming (Theme—Old Hollywood)

Superintendent Report

Dr. Isoye asked Mr. Rouse to give a special report on the modified closed campus (MCC). Mr. Rouse highlighted the following:

1) 92% of eligible juniors and seniors have maintained the privilege of Open Campus Lunch. The criteria for retaining this privilege currently includes parent permission, no more than one unauthorized absence, less than 5 tardies, and no Class III disciplinary infractions. Weekly eligibility reports will be run to determine which juniors and seniors are eligible based upon the criteria;

2) Of the 1,694 Juniors and Seniors, 1,289 have parental permission, and 1,190 meet the all criteria;

3) Grades will become an additional criteria for Open Campus Lunch, e.g., students must be passing all classes, etc.;

4) Tardies and unauthorized absence counts will be reset after the first 4 ½ weeks of the quarter, so those who may have lost their privilege are eligible for it again;

5) Students with open campus privileges have access to the mall area;

6) Students have never had the ability to take trays from the cafeteria to the mall;

7) Students are permitted to leave the cafeteria to go see teachers, counselors, or resource managers as long as they have pre-approved passes;

8) Students can also request a pass from a Safety and Support Monitor to go to the tutoring center or to the library.

9) Students may access the restrooms across the hall from the cafeterias;

10) The school is now enforcing its long-standing procedure of not allowing students to leave the classroom until after the first 10 minutes, unless unusual circumstances exist. After 10 minutes, and at the discretion of their teachers, students are given passes to their requested destinations;

11) Students in the halls after the bell rings are given a Tardy Slip that permits them into class. Because there were 54,000 period absences last year, accurate attendance records must be kept and students must be accounted for at all times. Students in the hallways after the bell rings are engaged by staff members and directed/escorted to their destinations. The number of cafeteria tables, custodians, and lunchroom supervisors were increased this year. In an effort to effectively gauge if the District could provide lunch, seating, and supervision within the cafeterias based upon the potential for approximately 3,000 students eating lunch during three lunch periods, the administration made the determination that limiting access to the Student Center would provide the best opportunity to see if the capacities in the cafeterias would uphold. The administration had been concerned about the volume of students sitting and lying on the stairs, a fire hazard, and a contributor to the lack of cleanliness and pest control issues. It also created unintended distraction for students having difficulties to focus on their education. The Oak Park Fire Department determined that the cafeterias were in compliance. While crowded, they were not overcrowded.

12) The Modified Closed Campus Task force will be composed of students, Assistant Principal, Division Head, Board of Education, Principal, two parents,
a custodian, Dean, and a cafeteria worker. Its short-term goal will be to address opportunities to utilize the Student Center and Mall space differently and to measure the effectiveness of the current MCC procedures. The first meeting will occur Friday, September 23 after school. Once recommendations are made, the District will as rapidly as possible determine what additional supervision is necessary to monitor the Student Center and the mall and will make the necessary adjustments. Mr. Rouse has been communicating with students about this.

13) Unexcused Absences are down 32% from this time last year. (2880 to 1971)
14) Disciplinary Infractions are down 48% from this time last year (279 to 135)

Ms. Patchak-Layman questioned why the Student Center could not be opened during lunch. Mr. Rouse reiterated that there were security concerns. Ms. McCormack reported she has also asked her why they cannot use the Student Center. She did not understand that closing the Student Center was part of the Board discussion on modified closed campus. Mr. Phelan reminded the Board of Education that it passed its May 25 meeting when enacting a modified closed campus: “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.” The other motion approved was: “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.” He felt there was a misunderstanding as to what the Board of Education approved. While the Board of Education supported the administration in its good efforts and intentions and appreciated the statistics, he, Ms. Patchak-Layman and Ms. McCormack wanted students to be able to go to the Student Center as soon as possible. Ms. Patchak-Layman commented that fewer students are going to the teachers’ rooms, the band room, etc. One club is not functioning this year. The situation is compounded by the intensity of what happens in the lunchroom. Dr. Millard supported this decision as she had a rather scary situation and actually fell because of students running in front of her.

Dr. Isoye thanked the teachers and staff for their work to make Open House a success. He had only heard compliments about the school, the teachers, and the staff. The turnout was great.

Dr. Isoye reported on the Institute Day stating that faculty received updates from the Building Leadership Team as well as the Finance Advisory Committee. Teachers also met in their divisions and in teacher collaboration teams.

Dr. Isoye reported that he, Ms. Witham, Mr. Prale, Dr. Halliman and several members of the Special Education Department toured potential Cite II locations, as the administration is looking for a permanent home for the program. He suggested that a recommendation would come forward to the Board of Education meeting soon.

Dr. Isoye met with the neighbors to talk about shared concerns. Several new residents attended and they were directed to a variety of resources. The MCC has
diminished activity around the neighborhood and the administration was informed of any areas of concern.

Dr. Isoye and Dr. Millard attended the Oak Park Council of Governance meeting, which focused on technology and the work being done at the various governmental agencies.

The ISBE committee that Dr. Isoye serves on is in high gear as it works to finish the administrative rules and aspects of the state’s default evaluation plan. The focus remains on the rules, which will go to review in the very near future. These rules will give the guidelines for schools to begin to develop their evaluation plans based on state legislation.

A breakfast was held in honor of the National Merit and National Achievement Semi-finalists on September 13, 2011.

For more information on the Pioneering Healthier Communities Committee’s conference scheduled for October 12 (pre-conference) and October 13, go to greentownconference.com.

Dr. Isoye thanked the faculty for their combined efforts to work with the changes due to the MCC.

**Summer School Graduates**

It was the consensus of the Board of Education members to certify the seven 2011 Summer School Graduates under the Consent portion of the agenda, as presented.

These students will be allowed to participate in the 2012 commencement ceremony.

**2011-12 Foreign Exchange Students**

Mr. Rouse reported that six foreign exchange students were attending OPRFHS this year. Two were from Germany, and each of the following countries had one student: Switzerland, Norway, Spain, and Denmark.

**Summer Field Experiences**

Students from two summer field trips spoke about their experiences. Ms. Milojevic reported that one trip was an accredited geology class and the other was a trip to Ireland where students spent time at the James Joyce Institute.

Mark Woods, science teacher, reported that the last trip to Mt. Rainer and to Mt. St. Helens was in 2005. Although a great opportunity to see a diverse area, it was much different trip than the trip in 2005, as Mt. Rainer had 900 inches of snow this year and the most direct road to St. Helens had been blocked by snow. Mr. Woods commented on the stellar group of 14 students who participated. Student participant Aaron Herman attested to the impressiveness of the sites, rough water kayaking, and seeing an Indian reservation.

Brendan Lee introduced three of the ten students who participated in an 11-day trip to Ireland during which time they attended the annual James Joyce Institute at the University of Dublin at Neumann House, across from Stevens Green. Because of Mr. Lee’s relationship with the school and the quality of students who can engage at this level, OPRFHS is the only high school that has been allowed to participate
in this program. Afterwards they traveled to the countryside. These students can write an essay and receive three college credits.

Student Lauren Frost noted that many renowned persons have taken classes at the James Joyce Summer School. The students participated in lectures every morning and attended seminars on James Joyce’s works in the afternoons. The teachers encouraged students to come up with their own interpretations of his writings. It was a stimulating experience. They also stayed in the new dorms.

Student Maddie Hoepf spoke about the city of Dublin and since they had bus access to the city, they took their lunch breaks there. Most students would sit in Stevens Green, which is a central park in Dublin, picnicking, experiencing the tourist side of Dublin, and shopping on Grafton Street, etc.

Student Emma Johnson talked about their countryside experienced where they stayed in a bed and breakfast, climbed Kilpatrick (a six-hour, intense hike), and took a ferry to Claire Island where they rode bikes. During this time, the group was able to reflect on the trip and get to know each other better. She felt everyone would agree that this was had been a great experience.

Ms. McCormack thanked them for their comments.

Collaboration for Early Childhood Care and Education

Ms. Newberry-Schwartz and Ms. Rosenbrock noted that ORPFHS was integral to the start of the Collaboration for Early Childhood Care and Education and she offered to talk with any new board members to help them gain an understanding of the work of the Collaboration. A year ago this past May, the Collaboration asked District 200 for a 2-year contract and an increase in support to help fund the implementation of a strategic plan. Mr. Pral sat on that committee. Dr. Isoye invited her to give an update on what had been accomplished this past year. She stated that Ms. Rosenbrock works part-time with proprietary day care centers.

- The Collaboration provided hearing and vision screening to 1,073 preschool-aged children. Of those children, 51 were referred for additional screening. The Collaboration achieved an 82% follow-up completion rate for children referred, well above the norm of 50%-60% statewide.
- The 2010 Symposium, Raising Ready Readers: Early Childhood Literacy was held February 20, 2010, at Percy Julian Middle School with more than 350 early childhood educators, care providers and community members attending. Child-care workers, preschool teachers, and classroom aides were able to receive up to five hours of in-service credits toward the 15-hour requirement by the Department of Children and Family Services for licensed programs.
- One hundred and four staff members at eleven childcare and preschool sites participated in the On-Site Training Program, which consisted of six, one-hour Foundations in Literacy workshops developed by the Collaboration based on best practices in early childhood education.
- The Collaboration provided up to four hours of training and follow-up technical assistance to directors at eight centers on parent engagement and communication.
• The Collaboration helped 83 staff members create individual professional development plans and 12 center directors create center professional development plans based on the individual staff plans - a first for all.
• The Collaboration revised the Early Childhood Resource Directory and printed 15,000 copies of the 2010 edition for distribution throughout Oak Park, River Forest, and Forest Park.

The Community Foundation’s CommunityWorks Program awarded its first grant to the Collaboration.

Initial funding from the Oak Park Township supported the development of an Information System to help the publicly funded preschool programs monitor the progress of the children in their programs and assess the long-term effects of the programs on children's learning throughout their elementary and secondary education. It is comprised of three components:

• A Child Population component that includes data on the number and location of Oak Park's at-risk, preschool-aged children;
• A Recruitment and Referral component that will track data to provide information about which recruitment and retention strategies are most effective amongst hardest to reach families; and
• An assessment component to track the impact of the programs.

The Collaboration is coordinating the outreach and connections for 20-at risk children. It is working with District 97 and the sites were held open for these students.

When asked about state funding, Ms. Newberry-Schwartz stated that when the Collaboration’s strategic plan was adopted in 2009, it was poised to receive funding from the state, especially for a parent education program, but that did not come to fruition. The Collaboration, not being optimistic that it will receive state funding, will continue to look for ways to raise funding, e.g., write grants, talk with policy makers about their level of support, launch individual giving program, etc. The Collaboration is concerned about infant care in the community and it is discussing viable strategies to use.

The River Forest Community Center Daycare is a targeted center and its entire staff was engaged in last year’s professional development training; it is now finishing its last piece. Each staff member will have 17 hours of training, two more than required by DCFS.

The Collaboration will send out press releases about centers that have a star rating from the state. That information will also be included in its directory. For every star a childcare center receives from the state, it will receive a 5% increase in its state subsidiary and, hopefully, that will raise the pay level of the workers, as they will have received more training. Because there are few 4-star centers, they are being pushed to engage in the process. The requirements necessary to obtain star ratings are rigorous.

**Testing Report**

Ms. Hill and Mr. Prale provided a report summarizing ACT data for the Class of 2011, PSAE data for the Class of 2012, and AP data for 2010-2011.
Table 1—Local, State, and National ACT Averages, Class of 2011
Table 2—Average CT Composite Scores, 2002-2011
Table 3—Average ACT Scores, OPRFHS Class Disaggregated by Race
Table 4—Average ACT Scores, OPRFHS Class Disaggregated by Special Education Status
Table 5—Average ACT Scores, OPRFHS Class Disaggregated by Free-Reduced Lunch Status
Table 6—Average OPRFHS ACT Composite, 2006-2011 Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity
Table 7—Percent of Students, Class of 2011, Achieving ACT College Readiness Benchmarks Local, State and National Comparison
Table 8—Percent of OPRFHS Students Achieving ACT College Readiness Benchmarks 2004-2011
Table 9—Percent of OPRFHS Students, Class of 2011, Achieving ACT College Readiness Benchmarks Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity
Table 10—Percent of OPRFHS Graduates Achieving ACT College Readiness Benchmarks in All Four Subjects, 2006-2011 Disaggregated by Race and Special Education
Table 11—Average National Growth in Achievement, 8th grade EXPLORE to ACT
Table 12—Average OPRFHS Growth in Achievement, 8th Grade EXPLORE to ACT
Table 13—Growth in English Scores by EXPLORE Scoring Range
Table 14—Growth in Math Scores by EXPLORE Scoring Range
Table 15—Growth in Reading Scores by EXPLORE Scoring Range
Table 16—Growth in Science Scores by EXPLORE Scoring Range
Table 17—PSAE Reading 2011 Number and Percent of Students at Each Performance Level by Subgroup
Table 18—PSAE Math 2011 Number and Percent of Students at Each Performance Level by Subgroup
Table 19—PSAE Science 2011 Number of Percent of Students at Each Performance Level by Subgroup
Table 20—2011 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Status Report
Table 21—AP Scores 5-Year Summary
Table 22—AP Score Distribution 5-Year Summary
Table 23—AP Exam Score by Year in School

Ms. Hill highlighted the following:

- Tables 1 and 2 provide ACT comparisons between Oak Park and River Forest High School students and their state and national peers in the Class of 2011. Scores for this student cohort follow typical patterns in that OPRFHS average scores continue to be well above the state and national averages.
- Average scores for White students range from 6.2 points to 8.1 points higher than scores for African American students.
- Tables 4 and 5 reveal disparities for students receiving special education services and students receiving free or reduced lunch.
- From 2006-2011, average scores for our two largest racial subgroups, White students and Black students, have edged up incrementally, and the disparity between them has fluctuated but has not closed (Table 6).
• In College Readiness benchmark data (Tables 7, 8, 9, and 10) compared to the nation and the alarmist that comes out of ACT, OPRF graduates compare favorably to counterparts in state and in country in each of the four subject areas and all four subject areas. The percentages have increased over time and among some of the subgroups. However, some subgroups are lower than desired. In Table 10, there is a slight upward tick showing improvement in the right direction.

• For 497 graduates of the Class of 2011, it is possible to match their 8th grade EXPLORE test scores with their ACT scores to determine how much their scores changed during their high school years. Because these data provide, as nearly as possible, “entry” and “exit” scores, they serve as a gauge of the student’s academic experience during high school. Tables 11 and 12, show the overall growth. Same pattern: significant higher achievement by Oak Park students compared to the national averages. Oak Park Students come in scoring higher and they grow more.

• Somewhat less obvious is the racial disparity in the predictability (from EXPLORE scores) of a student scoring high enough to meet or exceed state standards on the PSAE and/or achieve College Readiness Benchmarks (CRBs) on the ACT. For example, in reading, both White and Black students who scored 12 or below on the EXPLORE test were likely to fall below standards on the PSAE (a benchmark that requires an ACT score of roughly 20) and score below the CRB (21) on the ACT. However, among students scoring 13-15 in reading on the EXPLORE test, 78% of the White students met the CRB on the ACT, while only 28% of the Black students did. In science, White and Black students scoring below 15 on the EXPLORE test were at risk of not meeting the CRB (24); among students scoring 16-19, 54% of the White students achieved the science CRB on the ACT compared to 21% of Black students. Similar patterns hold for math.

• The PSAE test is a snapshot of a different cohort of student that does not aid in understanding how much the students may have grown. Both reading and math scores were higher in most every subgroup in meeting and exceeding than last year except for African American students. The percent of students meeting/exceeding standards in Science was incrementally lower for the aggregate group; some subgroups had a higher proportion of students whose performance levels were lower this year compared to last year.

• Table 20 summaries, it takes all PSAE data and Illinois Alternative Assessment (IAA). The minimum number AYP target rose to 85% meeting/exceeding standards, next year it is 95% and the following year 100%.

• OPRFHS did not make AYP in the aggregate.

• Just under 1600 Advanced Placement Exams were taken by students. The students’ performance was in line with the last 5 years in that 86% achieved/received a score of 3, 4, 5 and slightly more had a score of 5. Thirty-five students received setting accommodations. There was improvement in the test administration this year as well.

Ms. Hill had reviewed the recommendations that were made last year about mining data and targeting students with the greatest need. While the data system is cumbersome, the hiring of a data specialist has increased the capacity. The Reading 180 Program should help with the growth in reading. Discussions about professional development will continue. Of the approximately 100 students who
came in reading below grade level, three-quarters of them are enrolled in the Reading 180 Program. The students with the lowest reading level receive the most reading instruction.

Dr. Isoye stated that the District has much qualitative and quantitative data. It has focused and seen measurable change in a short amount of time. With regard to data in terms of achievement, the District is looking at backwards trend to understand students’ experiences, the programming, and what support students need, not just implementing programs to see what happens. The Board of Education has requested information about a scorecard and dashboard and because there is some difficulty with merging the databases, this work continues. It is critical to look at how to answer the questions and how to focus on the needs of the students. It is both a building and a district effort.

Ms. McCormack observed as that as difficult as some of the things implemented as a result of MCC are to accept, both discipline and attendance impacts student achievement and she look at that data as being hopeful. Cocurriculars have been expanded to affect these numbers. In addition, CCAR is coming to a high point at the high school and that could make significant differences. She and other board members are noticing that some positive programs are coming to fruition. She wanted to see the District focus on behavior. As difficult and disturbing as this data is, she sees hopeful signs. Mr. Prale added that any student who had contact with the discipline system had a diminishing effect on his/her GPA, so the efforts around a different building environment are positive.

Ms. Patchak-Layman was astonished to see the high school in the same place in terms of AYP after eight years. She asked why the faculty was not motivated to move on this as quickly as it did with MCC. What will be the extra push that will be given to juniors and seniors to rectify their issues? One cannot say that OPRFHS is an excellent district or system when 30% or more of its students are not getting the best. Ms. Patchak-Layman was discouraged as this report says only four out of 10 students who are economically disadvantaged versus 8.5 out of 10 for white students meet the benchmarks. If a student has an OSS, he/she only receives one hour of tutoring per day, not the five hours they deserve. A one-to-one connection is needed in order to provide the services and the education these students need. She did not hold education hostage to student behavior. It was noted that factors exist outside of the school’s control and that it is a national problem. No one is satisfied with the local, state, or national numbers. Mr. Phelan stated that there has not been a lack of effort in trying to come up with solutions. Students who have been successful must be studied to learn about their experiences. Many organizations are addressing these issues. From Dr. Isoye’s perspective, having tutoring for students assigned to OSS is because of the desire of this Board of Education and the administration, as most schools do not provide it. That impressed him. It was suggested that ORPFHS ask questions of other schools who participate in the Minority Student Achievement Network about their successes.

**Board Meeting Procedures**

Dr. Lee presented a proposal on using one of four protocols during a meeting, depending on the circumstances. In addition to the written explanation, he presented a chart that reiterated this information. He continued that these protocols would not supersede Robert’s Rules of Order, which the Board of Education uses as its guidelines.
Protocol 1: Default or normal procedures protocol
Protocol 2: Adoption of specific language
Protocol 3: Reports to the Board of Education
Protocol 4: Unanticipated prolonged discussions or catchall

The single most radical change would be that a member would have a set number of minutes to express his/her opinion. Dr. Lee was not wedded to the initial three minutes, however. When those three minutes has expired, that person would make a motion continue talking. The Chair would have the obligation for an immediate vote, if the motion were seconded, by show of hands. If no consensus, then the conversation would end.

Board of Education members were appreciative of Dr. Lee’s work in the hopes that it could help the Board of Education control its use of time. Some were cautious about how it would work, however. One suggestion was that it be practiced in closed session, but Dr. Lee was confident that it could be practiced in open session. Board of Education members were asked to send specific questions about how this would work to Ms. Kalmerton and Dr. Lee and for discussion at the next Board of Education meeting. The Board of Education would consider whether to adopt these protocols.

Consent Items

Dr. Millard moved to approve the consent items as follows:
- the Check Disbursements and Financial Resolutions dated September 15, 2011; and
- Certification of 2011 Summer Graduates.

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

Personnel Recommendations

Mr. Finnegan moved to approve the personnel recommendations, as presented (attached to and made a part of the minutes of this meeting); seconded by Ms. McCormack. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Dr. Halliman reported that Special Education now has a full complement of staff, including teaching assistants but cautioned that as IEP meetings move forward and recommendations are made, the number of staff may increase or decrease depending on the recommendations.

Mr. Phelan wanted to acknowledge the retirement of Sam Carson as he thought very highly of him and he wished him well in his retirement.

Closed Session

At 10:02 p.m., the Board of Education reconvened its closed session. The Board of Education resumed its open session at 12:01 a.m.

Adjournment

At 12:02 a.m. on Thursday, September 15, 2011, Mr. Phelan moved to adjourn the Board of Education meeting; seconded by Ms. Fisher. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.