

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

**Policy, Evaluation and Goals (PEG) Committee
Tuesday, January 24, 2012
Minutes
Board Room**

A Policy, Evaluation and Goals Committee meeting was held on Tuesday, January 24, 2012, in the Board Room. Co-chair Phelan opened the meeting 6:42 p.m. A roll call included the following members: Terry Finnegan, Amy McCormack, Dr. Dietra D. Millard, Sharon Patchak-Layman, and John Phelan. Also present were: Dr. Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; Lauren M. Smith, Director of Human Resources Cheryl L. Witham, Chief Financial Officer; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Visitors: Kay Foran, Communications and Community Relations Coordinator; Laurel DiPrima and Brian Zumpt, Policy Consultants of IASB's Policy Services; Kevin Florey of Robbins & Schwartz

Review of Policy Manual

Policy 1410

At the previous meeting, the Board of Education was advised to have its lawyer review Policy 1410, Rental Facilities. Having done so, Mr. Florey made the following comments/recommendations:

- 1) About 90% of the present policy would be typically classified as administrative procedures. The policy advises the staff as to what to do and the procedures for implementing the policy are developed by the administration.
- 2) Many school procedural manuals are online, as they are public guidelines.
- 3) While generally boards do not approve the procedures, they may approve the initial procedures with only reviewing subsequent changes. Note: Often the employee and student handbooks contain the procedures. It is the intent of OPRFHS to work with IASB to develop a procedural manual.
- 4) One must be aware of discrimination in favor of or against a group. What is done for one group must be done for another. The Board of Education should consider how feeder groups fit into the general broad areas of commercial and for-profit.
- 5) Criteria or tools that could be used to determine a group's eligibility to use the high school's facilities might include: 1) resident vs. nonresident; 2) for profit versus nonprofit; 3) limits of insurance and ratings of insurance. The Board of Education's goal is to set up a goal and for the staff to attain that goal without having constitutional problems. A distinction between commercial versus for profit should be made. For profit organizations could be restricted from using the high school's facilities for commercial purposes.
- 6) The term "feeder groups" needs further definition if they receive a preference on cost and facilities. Note: The Board of Education's intention is to refine this definition at a later date, even though it is clearly defined under Class VII. The District should look what groups are eligible users of the high school's facilities and then that becomes the criteria, rather than naming a specific group. However, the names of groups can be added to a list because they met the requirements. Class V, second paragraph should apply to all groups and those groups should be approved each year.
- 7) Item 15 should be included in the policy as it is a major resource for the high school.
- 8) The Board of Education has to make a decision if it wants anyone in the building who does not carry appropriate insurance.

It was the consensus of the Committee members for the District to work with Mr. Florey on the policy and procedures and the criteria or mechanisms for what can be legally distinguished as feeder versus non feeder

groups. When revised it will carry the same number as proposed 8:20 with procedures being 8:20 AP. Legal references will be part of the policy.

The committee continued its review of the Policy Manual with IASB representatives Laurel DiPrima and Brian Zumpt.

Section 4

Ms. DiPrima thanked the administration for making the recommendations it did to the Board of Education.

Policy	Comments
4:10	Discussion ensued about including the following in this policy: 1) tax levy process as it relates to the budget process; 2) timeline for budget approval; and 3) the IASBO Meritorious Budget Award. Number 1 concern was addressed in No. 3. Because state law allows the budget to be approved by a certain date, it was recommended that the policy follow state law. The Planning section will include language that the Board of Education will receive a budget report that meets IASBO’s criteria for its Meritorious Award.
4:15	Discussion ensued about being more restrictive in the policy than just protecting other information that has the same sensitivity as social security numbers. In the HR section, there are policies outlining adherence to HIPPA, including personal identifiable information. Employees receive training every year on this and if a violation occurs, they can be prohibited from working with schools for 3 years. One additional issue to consider is Direct Deposit. This policy will be reviewed again after a review of the HR section and before completion of the manual.
4:2	The District will write this as a policy and present it to the Board of Education. The ISBE will not adopt GASB 54 and it says that districts do not have to adopt it.
4:30	Combination of 3110 and 3450. Delete policy 3450 and wording changes. Amendments: Page 1, Para 2, Line 1: Replace “Superintendent” with “Board of Education” Throughout policy: Replace “Chief Investment Officer” with “Treasurer” for a two-year term per the School Code. Discussion ensued about whether to remove Page 4, Section Controls and Report, 3 rd Para as it is not the Board of Education who determines which fund is in most need of interest income. Each fund earns its own interest unless Board of Education votes to transfer that interest under one of two reasons and the Board of Education adopts a resolution to do so. This is scheduled for presentation to the Board of Education on the District’s internal calendar. The present language does not state that it is done annually and that a conversation occurs on which fund would receive the funds. Some districts are exploring borrowing or loaning money to other school districts in order to save on transaction fees. This is not permissible under the District’s present policy. The benefit to do so would be for the District with the cash to get higher interest rates, as long as they were comfortable with the ratings, and for the ones borrowing to receive lower interest rates. This will be discussed further under the Finance Agenda at a Board of Education meeting.
4:40	No change
4:45	OK permissible but not required.
4:50	Strike “first” from 2 nd line and change “meeting” to “meetings.” Omit third paragraph, as the District has more control with its present system. Add \$8000 limit for petty cash total in the building as in present policy 3361. Change CFO to Assistant Superintendent for Finance and Operations in that policy as well.
4:55	The IASB will check with its general counsel about incorporating less specific language in items 3 through 10. These items must be addressed in policy.
4:60	Include H & J from policy 3310. Change “Chief Finance Officer” to “Board of Education” in H.

	The IASB will explore statute on 2/3 votes for leases. Is an RPF or RFQ covered in the state law bidding procedures, i.e., for architects, land surveys, etc. Yes, there is a separate policy for those groups. This will be noted. A contract must note information about prevailing wage.
4:70	Policy 4:70 is language out of legislation. The procedures for current policy 3820 will be added to the AP. Clarification was sought that the District would achieve a 50% reduction in the amount of solid waste that is generated by the District between 2008 and before July 1, 2020.
4:80	<p>Meld Policy 3551 including Disposition of District Property in the procedures. Page 2, Control Requirement for Checks, 3rd line: Delete “except that checks from an...by the respective account custodian.”</p> <p>Preparing comprehensive annual financial reports, in addition to the state’s annual report form will help keep the District’s higher credit rating.</p> <p>Auditors audit the numbers and test internal controls. Staff within the District do the auditing but there is no formal internal audit and the result is not reported to the Board of Education. Ms. Witham and Ms. DiPrima will review whether this could be eliminated as there is no requirement to do so.</p>

Ms. DiPrima notified the Committee that she would work with Ms. Kalmerton to reschedule the February 28 PEG Committee Meeting, as she could not make that date.

Adjournment

At 9:24 p.m., the PEG Committee adjourned.

Amy McCormack
Secretary