

January 28, 2010

The regular Board meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on Thursday evening, January 28, 2010, in the Board Room.

Call to Order President Protempore and Vice President Lee called the meeting to order at 7:15 p.m. The following Board of Education members were present: John C. Allen, IV, Jacques A. Conway, Terry Finnegan, Dr. Ralph H. Lee, Amy Leafe McCormack, Dr. Dietra D. Millard, and Sharon Patchak-Layman. Also present were: Dr. Attila J. Weninger, Superintendent; Jason Edgecombe, Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources, Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; Cheryl L. Witham, Chief Financial Officer; James Paul Hunter, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair; Elizabeth Turcek, Student Council Liaison Representative; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Visitors The Board of Education welcomed the following visitors: Kay Foran, OPRFHS Communications and Community Relations Coordinator; John Stelzer, Athletic Director; Bernie Heidcamp and Devon Alexander, OPRFHS faculty members; Peggy Swanson of the League of Women Voters; Iris Zaldivar, co-chair of Citizens' Council; *Trapeze* representative; John Bokum and Nancy Leavy, community members.

Visitor Comments: Nancy Leavy, Oak Park resident and former Board of Education member, addressed the Board of Education regarding the superintendent search. She had decided that she wanted to speak to the Board of Education after having participated in the focus group with Dr. Hanson of School Exec Connect. Having gone through the search process herself, she acknowledged that it was difficult and arduous. She shared the thoughts and questions she felt the present Board of Education should consider asking the candidates; she had asked the same questions of the candidates when she participated in a search for a superintendent. She felt they were important and reflected a large segment of the community. Carlotta Lucchesi had responded to Dr. Hanson's question as to what was the most important thing the Board of Education does in preparation for the search by saying that the Board of Education decides who and what is being sought. Ms. Leavy agreed with that response, as it was reflective of how the Board of Education comes together as a community, giving weight to its assets and its deficits. OPRFHS is a phenomenal institution with thousands of successful engaged students who participated in cocurriculars and sports. The school is well funded, well run, and supported by the community. It is an enormous asset in the community. The Board of Education must look for someone who is worthy of the school; the school does not need someone to rescue it. The Board of Education must acknowledge what this school is, what is terrific about it,

and what the Board of Education feels must be mitigated, albeit presented in the context of a positive framework. How the search is approached matters. Because the Board of Education is first the conservator of the school, she suggested asking the candidates the following questions.

1. Do you see the value and benefit of this large institution? When she heard words like “overwhelming,” “too many kids,” etc. from the candidates she interviewed, she knew that was not the person for OPRFHS.
2. Do you have a commitment to the differentiated curriculum in the school? Will you support philosophically having beginning algebra and AP Calculus?
3. What is your vision on how to motivate and how to strategize unmotivated students? Low achievement does not mean the same as non-achievement. Not all students perform in the same way. There is a cohort of underachieving, predominately male students, but why they underachieve is unique to each one of them. Some have the skills but do not achieve. Some are motivated but have physical or emotional issues. She hoped that the candidate would have some unique insights into this.

She thanked the Board of Education for hearing her perspective in this critical process.

Changes to the Agenda

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked that the continued discussion of Board Goals continue at the beginning of the meeting under non-agenda items and remove Item G from the consent agenda.

Status of FOIA Requests

Dr. Lee reported that there was one FOIA request but it was not yet resolved.

Board of Education Comments

Mr. Finnegan thanked the Board of Education members for the work they did via email in several areas. He was honored to be among this group and to see people using their skill sets. He noted that Ms. McCormack worked on a 30-year history of the PEG Committee’s accomplishments and compared it with the work that had been done these past two years. He suggested that perhaps the Board of Education did not have to continue at the rapid pace it has been going.

Acknowledging all of the hiring yet to be done, including the search for the superintendent, he appreciated Ms. Leavy’s concerns and he wanted to speak to that point and to the communities at large. It was the Board of Education’s decision to keep the names of the candidates confidential in order to get the best candidates possible. If the communities were not happy with that decision, they could vote their displeasure at future

elections. He noted a number of stakeholders would work confidentially with the Board of Education to meet the community demand.

Ms. McCormack, too, thanked Mrs. Leavy for her comments.

Ms. Patchak-Layman also thanked Ms. Leavy for her remarks and noted that she disagreed on what she wanted in a superintendent but that she hoped that the superintendent coming forward would be thankful for the breadth of input.

Ms. Patchak-Layman attended the Tri-District Institute Day, which focused on Response to Intervention (RtI). The speaker was Pat Quinn, not Governor Quinn, the expert on RtI. She was struck by one of the comments he made as it related to the Board of Education's goals of providing more instruction for students assigned in-school or out-of-school instruction. The recommendation was that discipline should not preclude a student receiving instruction. One of the Board of Education's goals this year was to make sure that students removed from the classroom had more instruction, as just providing tutoring did not make up for the missing classroom time. Instruction should continue even though there are discipline issues.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked that the proposed discussion item about the philosophy and beliefs on the administrative compensation system with the DLT members' involvement be held in open session. Should the Board of Education be asked to accept the recommendations, it would be public business. Dr. Lee noted that this would be discussed in open session under the section "Other."

Dr. Lee reported that a *Trapeze* newspaper reporter recently asked him what he believed was the reason for the Board of Education's dysfunctionality. His response was that there are seven individuals on the Board of Education, each of whom has his/her own thoughts, each of them do a great deal of thinking, none of whom feel obliged to follow someone else's line of thinking, and none of whom are not shy about disagreeing with each other. Having public disagreements, does not make this a dysfunctional board. A dysfunctional board would not be able to do the business of the District and this Board of Education does that and continues to do that effectively, albeit it might not be quiet and peaceful. The Board of Education has accomplished the business of this District and accomplished it well. He has no apologies to make for this Board of Education, as it reminded him of what life was like living with his brothers and sisters—it was not a peaceful place, but many things were accomplished.

Mr. Allen, a member of the Illinois State Bar Association, was asked to help with the High School's Mock Trial Invitational this past weekend. He reported that OPRFHS had a team that tied for first place and went to the state competitions. He reported that watching the students playing lawyers was very impressive and some of them were better prepared and more capable than some lawyers he knows. OPRFHS competed against Evanston Township High School. He complimented the coaches/faculty in the building for their involvement with these students, as they should be very proud. This is an example of how OPRFHS prepares its students.

Mr. Conway attended a District 209 board meeting where the topic was mass reduction of staff and programs. As a member of the audience hearing the frustration of students, teachers, faculty, staff, and parents, he was very grateful that OPRFHS has not had to face the hurdles others face in educating the children. The public is complacent on whom they elect and the funding of education for the students of Illinois. There has to be a movement to educate students. The United States is not spending the amount of dollars other countries are spending for education. Sitting at that board meeting saddened him because those students are already behind the eight-ball because of the zip code in which they live; they are right next door to this community. There has to be a push to make sure everyone is able to receive a quality education, because that is what is best.

Dr. Millard thanked the community and the people in the building who have made it possible to be able to offer the opportunities that students have.

Dr. Millard, as the Board of Education's liaison to the search for the superintendent, reiterated the process. A series of focus groups to gather input as to the key aspects of the search had just been completed. In addition, several hundred people completed the on-line survey. The consultants are Dr. Linda Hanson, Dr. Alan Alson, and Dr. John Sawyer of School Exec Connect. On Wednesday, February 3, at 7:00 p.m., they will present a summary of the information from both the focus groups and the survey. During the month of February, they will be receiving, vetting applicants, etc., and determining which six to bring to the Board on March 9, during a closed session. Anyone with possible candidates should inform Dr. Hanson, Dr. Millard, or Ms. Kalmerton. During March, the Board of Education will pare down the number of candidates. A confidential committee will help screen the candidates; this committee will be composed of ten to twelve representative stakeholders in the community. This will be a confidential search. The expectation was to announce the name of the new superintendent at the April 29 Board of Education meeting.

Internal Board of Education Communications

It was the consensus of the majority of the Board of Education for the President Protempore to send out biweekly communication to Board of Education members about his conversations with the superintendent because of the scope of the Board's business at this time.

While Dr. Millard acknowledged not doing this during her presidency, she felt that she had been remiss in not communicating with the other Board of Education members about some of the things she and Dr. Weninger discussed.

Student Council

To help students visualize what they would be choosing as to graduation dress, Ms. Turcek reported that Student Council had decided to create a display case with the two options: white dress and dark suit or a navy cap and gown. Mr. Rouse is working with the Student Council President and, hopefully, a decision will be made by spring break. Her feeling was that the opinions on both options were evenly split.

Student Council is also attempting to raise funds for the victims of Haiti, but she has been disappointed at the results.

Elections for new officers will be held in March. One officers' position has been eliminated.

Student Council is moving towards a greater community focus: giving back, introducing school spirit, and working with the Huskie Athletic Council and the Kyle Braid Foundation. In this regard, students will be encouraged to wear orange and blue on Fridays.

On January 27, Student Council met with Dr. Hanson who asked three questions: What is great about school? What are the problems? What are five things the new superintendent needs to have? Those questions solidified her faith in the process. Twenty-four students of both genders and all grades participated. It was informative, they were able to vocalize their thoughts, and they felt heard.

Principal Report

Mr. Rouse presented the following report.

The second semester of school started relatively smoothly. He congratulated the faculty on its efforts to bring closure to first semester. Semester end is one of the most pressure-filled times in the lives of teachers, as they are providing comprehensive final assessments to the students within an extremely tight timeline in order to provide appropriate feedback.

He spoke about the high school's efforts to lend a helping hand in light of the horrific tragedy in Haiti. As of today, and thanks to the wonderful efforts of the students and staff, OPRF raised a total of \$1,140 for Haiti.

A few things to note:

1. Students will continue to collect the following week, the goal is \$4,000,
2. OPRFHS is collaborating with Rotary and these funds will be used to support Shelterbox—a self-contained shelter and survival box that can house ten people. Each costs \$1,000.
3. OPRFHS is communicating its efforts to OPRF Families via the HuskieNews with a link to donate @ Shelterbox on the OPRFHS website.
4. The Huskiepalooza in March will be renamed Haitipalooza and all proceeds will go to Haitian victims.

Mr. Rouse congratulated the following students as being recipients of the Student of the Quarter Awards for second semester.

Alexander Merchen, Natalie Rosseau, Drew Angle, Christopher Dowse, Arianne Parada, Helen Vander Griend, Antonio Foster, Roberto Heredia, Caleb Conway, Dupree Alexander, Rose Flanigan, Jordan Jackson, Eric Hallman, TaTyana Bonds.

OPRFHS hosted a Tri-District Institute Day for Districts 90, 97, and 200 and over 900 faculty and staff heard information relative to Response to Intervention strategies. The keynote speaker was Pat Quinn, nationally known as “The RtI Guy.” Mr. Quinn is the author of the nation’s largest newsletter dedicated specifically to helping teachers implement Response to Intervention. His online training “Response to Intervention Made Easy” has been used by thousands of teachers around the country and his live training events routinely sell out as teachers, counselors, and administrators gather to hear from America’s Best Teacher Trainer! Pat Quinn's newest book *Ultimate RTI* has been hailed as "the first book that really tells teachers what they are supposed to do to implement RTI." Mr. Quinn provided two very powerful, informative Keynote addresses: *Motivating All Students to Achieve (All three Districts)*, and *Response to Intervention for All Students (Districts 90 & 97; TAs and Support Staff of District 200)*.

Mr. Rouse especially thanked OPRF Faculty members Dr. Nikki Paplaczyk, John Costopoulos, and Andrea Neuman on their efforts in making this day possible. OPRFHS is also appreciative of Districts 90 and 97’s willingness to be a part of our institute day activities.

District Reports

Citizens’ Council—Ms. Iris Zaldivar reported on the January 14 Citizens’ Council meeting at which Mr. Finnegan spoke about the superintendent search

process, and Ms. Hill and Mr. Prale spoke about the achievement gap and which programs were and were not working.

At the February meeting, there will be a discussion about substance abuse and Citizens' Council hopes to have a forum on this issue at the end of the year.

APPLE—Ms. McCormack reported that the last APPLE meeting was well attended. Division Heads made helpful presentations.

Alumni Association—Mr. Finnegan noted that the Alumni Association was working on its golf outing and that its newsletter would go out shortly.

CTA— Ms. Patchak-Layman reported that music students were in Peoria for the IMEA All-State convention. The Jazz Ensemble and the Orchestra were performing a commissioned piece. Both Cindy Milojevic and Amy Hill were attending this event.

Faculty Senate—Mr. Hunter thanked Nancy Leavy for comments, Ms. Kalmerton for her management of the participation of all the superintendent focus groups, and the work being done by the Facilities Committee, and Ms. Witham to air condition areas of the building that are not air-conditioned.

ED-RED—Mr. Finnegan reported on ED-RED's annual dinner. He sat next to Maine Township people and its new superintendent who spoke about their situation. Mr. Finnegan was thankful to prior boards, the administration, Dr. Weninger, and Ms. Witham that OPRFHS is now in a position of strength and is able to do what it has to do. He was very sympathetic to those in the Maine District in having to make cuts to programs and teachers. It is important that OPRFHS keep as fiscally responsible as possible.

Superintendent's Report

Dr. Weninger also thanked Ms. Leavy for her comments. He had listened to the OPRFHS speech team readying itself for the weekend's competition.

He also reported that Dean Goodfellow was coordinating the participation of a small group of disenfranchised students in a focus group.

He also reported that OPRFHS hosted an Oak Park Development Board meeting in January where he gave a "State of the District" report.

The Park District of Oak Park is honoring OPRFHS with its Community Service Award.

The Jazz Ensemble and Symphony Orchestra performed at the Illinois Music Educators Conference January 28 in Peoria, IL. Both Amy Hill and Cindy Milojevic supported these groups at this event.

Dr. Weninger reported that Maine Township, Plainfield, and Wheaton-Warrenville High Schools were taking drastic action because of their deficit spending. He continued that Maine is comprised of three high schools and it is cutting 83 teachers in order to cut 75 teacher cuts as well as 50 to 60 support staff. It is trying to get to \$19 million in one year. Plainfield, which is much larger, is trying to cut \$16 million for next year and may send out over 200 notices of release and termination. Wheaton-Warrenville is cutting \$6 million from its budget next year. It has 2 high schools, 4 middle schools, and 13 elementary schools. OPRFHS is fortunate to have the support it has, and, at the same time, an equal call to continue to be the best stewards of the Districts' resources as possible. He asked that everyone remember that when a decision is made about finances, the District does not want to be in the position that these districts are in at this point.

Dr. Weninger reported that, as part of Black History Month, Reporter Lauren Jiggetts of Channel 5 News would interview Principal Rouse next week.

Consent Items

Mr. Allen moved to approve the consent items as follows:

- Check Disbursements and Financial Resolutions dated January 28, 2010 (attached to and made a part of the minutes of this meeting);
- Monthly November Financials;
- Authorization to prepare amended 2010 Budget;
- Authorization to Prepare FY 2011 Tentative Budget;
- Approval of Air Conditioning;

seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Treasurer's Report

Mr. Conway moved to approve the Treasurer's Report; seconded by Dr. Millard. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes.

The Board of Education also agreed to discuss at the February Finance Committee meeting moving District funds from Park National Bank to Community Bank in a symbolic move. Park National Bank is no longer a community bank, as it was taken over by US Bank. Mr. Conway continued that since October 30, 2009, US Bank has eliminated 300 employees and plans more cuts by April. Ms. Witham noted that there was no requirement to do an RFP for bank services.

Funding of Coaching Stipends

Dr. Lee moved to accept the Funding of Coaching Stipend report; seconded by Mr. Conway. A roll call vote resulted in all six ayes and one nay. Motion carried. Ms. Patchak-Layman voted nay.

Ms. Patchak-Layman thanked Mr. Stelzer, Ms. Witham, and Dr. Weninger for providing the information on coaching stipends requested at the committee meeting. The issue is whether the Board of Education wants to transfer the funds, raised through fundraising efforts, over to the official roles and athletic stipends. More information has come to light and she asked if this program operated across the board, i.e. matching the Board of Education goals and mission for both students and faculty. The fact that this is not full school participation and the ratio of students participating does not match the population at the school caught her attention. Even more distressing is that the staffing and the coaching matches the staffing at the school. While it is simple to transfer funds from one account to another, she felt it would be wiser to have a much better understanding and review and to put suggested changes in place to work on the program before changing the funding of the 19 coaches in the proposal. She was so disturbed about the staffing that she was at the point of reconstitution, as it is so far from what was desired, that adding additional stipends under the budget and the faculty contract was not right. More discussion about this should occur with the school, the Board of Education, and the community. When there are 29 head coaches, 28 of whom are white and one is Hispanic, one wonders what is happening in the athletic program. What message does that send to the students who are part of this? Does it have an effect on them?

Ms. Patchak-Layman's other concern was the cost of the program in total versus the number of students who are able to participate in the program. Mr. Stelzer said there were a number of programs in which more students could participate, she theorized that was the way they were set up and recruited. She asked the other board members to think about this activity and how the athletic program will be able to better match the goals for the student participation. How does one reconcile that only one-third of the student body is receiving the benefit of these funds. Now with the discussion of finances, this should come into play.

Mr. Conway stated this makes it more pertinent and the Board of Education must look at those costs, but he did not want to penalize these athletes by holding up these stipends. The sports are broken down by gender while the others are co-ed. Certain programs are not minority friendly but he would not broadly say that just because there was a white coach, they were not sensitive to students. However, it is disheartening to see no minorities in the staff. His experience shows that many African-American students do not participate in the sports teams because of the reaction they have had to the leadership of the sports teams.

Mt. Rouse stated that OPRFHS prides itself on co-curricular activities. OPRFHS does not call sports programs or any clubs or activities "extra curriculars." In looking at this information, 1,165 participants is over

30% of the school. Mr. Stelzer is in a difficult situation when it comes to hiring minority coaches, because the District when it has hired minority teachers have asked them to extend their day with academics. He asked the Board of Education to consider the difficulty in hiring minority coaches.

Ms. McCormack stated that when the raw numbers of participation are looked at, one needs to recognize that other students participate in some other ways, a level of participation that is not necessarily on the field. Another concept is that equitable does not necessarily mean equal. One needs to think of equity rather than matching dollars to dollars.

Dr. Millard stated that the Board of Education has talked about getting more minority faces as coaches and sponsors and increasing minority students' involvement in programs and that should be included in that conversation. This comes in a slightly different form of which should not be forgotten. A larger conversation needs to occur on all activities.

Mr. Finnegan stated that these funds are raised by the students involved in these activities. General funds are not being used for stipends. Half of them come from families and the other from "pay to play" fee or other areas that are not being used for other funds. There are 123 students involved in non- sports related curriculums. He did not accept the fact that the District was not doing something for the other students.

Ms. Patchak-Layman stated that when these positions were being paid as volunteers from the fundraising, the monies paid matched what was collected, giving some breadth to the activities that might be occurring. When she looked at the list of volunteers who knew that the amount of money was variable, it did not seem that the volunteers were classified as assistant coaches in terms of their jobs. That provided flexibility. When moving over to the other activities, the funds then have to be relegated to either a head or assistant coach and any flexibility is lost. While \$52,000 comes from fees, a good number of those fees come from non-high school students.

Dr. Weninger noted that the high school has a tracking system in place so that it knows which students to reach out to and to get more involved. This plan provides for financial accountability. It is not smart for students to raise money to pay for personnel costs; that is a District responsibility and it is a critical philosophy to have. It will also lessen the burden to families and provide a safer coaching environment. This will also make OPRFHS more competitive in the marketplace.

It was the consensus of the Board of Education members to discuss this issue again at the PEG Committee meeting.

- Policy 102** Dr. Millard moved to amend Policy 102, Alternative Education, as presented; seconded by Mr. Allen. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.
- Policy 1100** Dr. Millard moved to amend Policy 1100, Partnership with the Community; as presented, seconded by Mr. Finnegan. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.
- Policy 1110** Dr. Millard moved to amend Policy 1110, Information to the Public, as presented; seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.
- Policy 1230** Dr. Millard moved to amend Policy 1230, School Attendance on Days of Religious Observances, as presented; seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.
- Policy 1325** Dr. Millard moved to amend Policy 1325, Building Security, as presented; seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.
- Policy 1400** Dr. Millard moved to amend Policy 1400, Recognition Naming of District 200 Facilities or Events, as presented; seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.
- Policy 3610** Dr. Lee moved to amend Policy 3610, Automated External Defibrillator Use, as presented; seconded by Mr. Finnegan. A roll call vote resulted in all six ayes and one present. Motion carried. Dr. Millard voted present.
- Policy 5116** Dr. Millard moved to amend Policy 5116, Alternative Educational Programs, as presented; seconded by Mr. Allen. A roll call vote resulted in all six ayes and one nay. Motion carried. Ms. Patchak-Layman voted nay.

Dr. Weninger noted that legal counsel had agreed there should be two forms, one for regular education students and one for special education students.

Ms. Patchak-Layman did not know if the word “general” in Letter E meant everything offered or if it meant the regular or honors curriculum. Dr. Weninger explained that it meant the overall curriculum. Ms. Patchak-Layman suggested eliminating that word. Mr. Prale stated that the language in special education programs used to be mainstreaming, but the word “general” is now more accurate. Ms. Patchak-Layman stated that “general” would mean that if a student has an IEP and taking honors

classes, he/she would also be able to take honors classes if placed in a facility. However, in previous conversations about honors classes, the Board of Education has been told that many places do not offer honors classes. Mr. Rouse replied that the law states that schools must provide the students their education per their IEP. They are not removed from special education and then moved to a place that would not speak to their IEP needs. A manifestation hearing is held anytime they might be moved. When thinking about an alternative education, think about them in the general education program. If they were expelled, those are the students that are referred to alternative education schools, not the IEP students.

There was no support for removing the word “general.”

Policy 3900

Dr. Millard moved to adopt Policy 3900, Freedom of Information Act, as recommended at the January 28 PEG Committee meeting; seconded by Mr. Finnegan. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Policy 4119

Dr. Lee moved to approve Policy 4119, Nepotism, for First Reading, with the changes noted at the Policy, Evaluation, and Goals Committee meeting prior to this Board meeting; seconded by Mr. Allen. A roll call vote resulted in six ayes and one nay. Ms. Patchak-Layman voted nay. Motion carried.

Policy 5136

Dr. Millard moved to approve Policy 5136, Student Travel, for First Reading, as presented; seconded by Mr. Finnegan. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Gifts and Donations

Mr. Finnegan moved to accept with gratitude the gifts, 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.

**Adoption of
Resolution Abating
\$1 Million from the
Working Cash
Fund to the
Education Fund**

Mr. Conway approved the Resolution to Abate \$1 million from the Working Cash Fund to the Education Fund, as presented; seconded by Dr. Millard. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Public Hearing

Mr. Allen opened the hearing for the intent to transfer \$1 million from the Education Fund to the Operations and Maintenance Fund at 9:31 p.m. Receiving no written or oral comments, Mr. Allen closed the hearing at 9:32 p.m.

**Adoption of
Resolution**

Mr. Finnegan approved the Resolution Transferring \$1 Million from the Education Fund to the Operations and Maintenance Fund; seconded

Transferring \$1 Million from the Education Fund to the Operations and Maintenance Fund

by Ms. McCormack. 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 Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

In response to Ms. Patchak-Layman's question as to what positions are posted, Mr. Edgecombe stated that all full time and part time positions are posted, but that temporary assignments are not necessarily posted. Temporary, short-term assignments (usually no longer than 3 months) are usually filled via word of mouth. Generally, these positions are filled by a retiree or someone looking for short-term work. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked that the subject of temporary employment and how candidates are screened for those positions be added to an HR meeting in the near future.

Approval of Summer School Stipends, Tuition And Dates

Dr. Millard moved to approve the Summer School 2010 tuition, stipends, and dates, as presented and discussed at the January 19, 2010 Finance Committee meeting; seconded by Mr. Allen. A roll call vote resulted in six ayes. Motion carried. Mr. Conway was absent from this vote.

The dates of the 2010 Summer School are June 16 – July 23.
Tuition will be \$180 per class.
Teacher stipends will be \$2450 per section.

Teacher stipends were being raised \$50 this year to keep competitive with competing Districts. There has been some difficulty in getting teachers to teach some classes.

Approval of Minutes and

Mr. Conway moved to approve the open and closed session minutes December 15, 17, 23, 2009, and January 12, 19, and 21, 2010 to declare that the Audiotapes of the closed sessions of May 2008 be destroyed; seconded by Mr. Allen. A roll all vote resulted in all six ayes and one nay. Ms. Patchak-Layman voted nay. Motion carried.

Baldrige Assessment Process

The PEG Committee began a discussion on goals which included the discussion of a proposal to postpone the Baldrige Assessment Process until the fall. In preparation of that discussion, Mr. Bloom of Blueprint Education Services had presented the option of proceeding on a limited basis for the leadership. The purpose of pursuing a self-assessment this spring were described in the committee with the intention that if the District were to

consider this, the Board of Education would need to look at the other aspects of the workload, including the focus of goals which command a great deal of attention by the administration. Mr. Allen was sympathetic to those who do not feel they have a composite understanding as to what this process will entail. Ms. McCormack shared she has not been involved in it, but her own evolution suggests that this kind of self-assessment could be valuable for the District; the reason for proceeding would be for the advantage of having current administrators involved and offering unique assessments. Ms. McCormack admitted that there were unresolved questions in that meeting, but she was willing to help the Board of Education in all ways. Dr. Lee also shared that he did not have the kind of understanding of Baldrige that he wanted, because he had not asked all of the questions he should have and he found the workshops too broad. While he asked, in general terms, what would the school do and expect to get from this process, he supported going forward with some aspects of it because he believed that in so doing, the District would be able to answer the questions it cannot do at this time. He felt the time spent would be justified. He recognized that the District would have to shift the administrators' priorities.

It was agreed that the consultant would be asked to present to the Board of Education at the February PEG meeting so that further questions could be addressed.

Mr. Finnegan concurred with having the consultant at the Board of Education meeting, but he did not believe the frustration that he and Ms. McCormack were feeling would be solved by anything other than just the process. Whether the process was worth the time, would be a leap of faith. The question is can the District move forward on a truncated basis this current school year that will leave the Board of Education and the new superintendent potentially with a roadmap to start. He wanted to find a way to start by doing the leadership portion and to see if an administrator below Dr. Weninger could do this work to leave Dr. Weninger free to the vital tasks outside of Baldrige. He looked to have a smaller number of people involved and to use it as a start for the new superintendent as a way to inform him/her about the school. Then the Board of Education will know if the administration finds it valuable enough to champion it and, if so, find enough people to fill out whatever criterion teams are needed. He reiterated leaving Dr. Weninger outside of this process and if someone does not step up and take the chair's role, the Board of Education will know that it does not have the right administrative leadership to take on this assessment. Appreciating Mr. Finnegan's consideration of his workload, Dr. Weninger informed him that Mr. Bloom is the facilitator. The teams involve members of DLT, the Board of Education, parents, and students. There is no other chair and it cuts across all sections of leadership. The process being proposed now is more typical in industry. OPRFHS wanted to include all stakeholders in order to be more transparent. Dr. Lee supported Mr. Finnegan's suggestion and he understood

the time pressure on the superintendent. However, he felt that Dr. Weninger had insights that he wanted included in the process. Dr. Weninger noted that the Steering Committee is composed of DLT and it was not focused on the superintendent.

Mr. Finnegan asked if the Board of Education moved forward with Baldrige what would come off the table. Dr. Weninger responded that the obligated committee work includes regular work and additional items that occurred this year. The Administration presented what it felt it could accomplish in 2009/10 and what it could accomplish in 2011. Dr. Millard reflected that if Baldrige were added to the list for 2010, the workload would not change. It behooves the Board of Education to question whether or not there was any value to changing its goals for 2009-2010. Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that Baldrige's measurement analysis and knowledge management was ongoing; the Board of Education talks about it every month within the Instruction Committee meeting. She did not believe some of this was additional work in terms of the content areas. The information still goes into the general information pot. Dr. Weninger noted that it was not what goes on inside the Instruction Committee meeting but the time of administrators and Board of Education spend outside the meeting. He proposed postponing the things at the bottom of the page, except for the Baldrige Assessment Process.

On the issue of grading, Ms. Patchak-Layman stated that some things could be done in bits and pieces and it could involve others to keep the momentum going. She did not believe that this was an all or nothing activity. In fact, Baldrige puts out an all school survey.

Mr. Rouse stated that if truncating the Baldrige was helpful, something that the Board of Education thought that necessary, why consider not doing it the right way. Concerning the weighting grade discussion, as principal, Mr. Rouse hoped that the Board of Education would not have the conversations about grade weighting without the administration. He also reminded the Board of Education of the difficulties that were had last year regarding budgeting and sectioning last spring. Sectioning takes much time and in order to meet the needs of the students, the District needs to have the time. Mr. Rouse continued regarding budgeting, the administration encroaches upon Ms. Witham's time and the administrators do not have time to gather the information requested to her. Based on her new process, he now understands that he is part of the final conversations for the teachers, so that too speaks to time.

Dr. Millard referenced her questions to Mr. Bloom regarding the issues of beginning this assessment now versus waiting until next year. His response was that many of these people leaving the District represent institutional history and memory. Because of their affiliation with the District, they would offer insightful information as to where the District has done well and where it

could improve. Mr. Bloom has worked with other districts without having other stakeholder buy-in, but it can still be helpful for the whole organization at the beginning to see what Baldrige has to offer. She was sympathetic to the workload and some adjustments were necessary. She agreed that Mr. Bloom could explain the process this more convincingly.

Dr. Weninger stated that the District does not want to lose momentum to the weighted grades and ranking review, but, in his opinion after having gone through this two times with other districts, a change in the grading discussion would have more of an impact than anything else would in the school. It goes to the root of the way this building is structured. Thus, if the Board of Education wants people to take this seriously and for them to buy-in on this issue, it cannot be piecemealed out. He told Christy Harris that the work she had done was wonderful, but if she presents it to the faculty, they will not own that work because they were not a part of developing it. If the Board of Education wants buy-in and a serious review, it cannot be jettisoned by a group of parents.

Dr. Lee asked each Board of Education members to declare where they stood on Baldrige.

Mr. Finnegan asked if Baldrige could be included with the first 17 items for 2010. Dr. Weninger replied yes. Mr. Finnegan was unsure of the best course of action. He thought the Board of Education was looking at an introductory piece rather than truncating the process with the idea that more would be done later. He wanted to do the process, he did not want to lose the moment, and he took Mr. Rouse's concerns to heart. Is the District better off postponing this process when there is an ability to roll it out in a larger format or lose the momentum if it does not go forward? Dr. Weninger disagreed with Mr. Rouse. He felt giving the new superintendent something to work with would be helpful. After having been through being a new superintendent, it would be important. Another important piece is losing the historical perspective from the present leadership. This is something that would be tangible.

Dr. Millard wanted to proceed starting at the end of February with Mr. Bloom coming to the PEG committee meeting to help others feel more confident as to how this would proceed.

Mr. Allen, based on his conversation with Mr. Bloom, had asked that the process be expanded to other stakeholders as Mr. Allen's experience of broader involvement brought significant results. Because of his excitement, he had not anticipated the resistance. It was important for this process to get started and to be completed. The District has many moving parts, but there are not plans about how to educate the students. He looks at the list of work items and notes that they need to be done this year and every year. When looking at time allocation and time management, the Board of Education

knows it has huge mountains to climb. He had wanted a large faculty buy in and particularly a large student buy in and he was disappointed that students will not be participating. He believes that if the Baldrige Assessment Process is not completed this semester, it will never be. While Dr. Millard did not believe it automatically excluded students, Dr. Weninger stated that it was clearly the Board of Education, DLT, BLT and Division Heads and, if time, the students, and faculty.

There was some discussion of negotiating with Mr. Bloom, as the scope of the process had changed. Mr. Finnegan noted that the District was not cutting what it wanted to do, only cutting it into sections.

Ms. Patchak-Layman wanted to pursue Baldrige, as there is an interest among staff, especially support staff. To her, the benefit was to have all stakeholders involved in one committee. She felt students and parents were still interested in being part of discussions. She also wanted more facilitators involved in the training for Courageous Conversations About Race next year. That subject is near and dear to her heart and she felt there were not enough faculty PEG-trained facilitators. She noted that there were faculty members interested in the training and she wanted to move it forward to the spring so that in September the Board of Education is able to jumpstart those conversations about race.

Ms. Patchak-Layman, on the same note for next year, having a discussion on the grading and the weighting of grades is an example of parents taking the initiative to bring something forward for the Board of Education to take action. A specific proposal came to the Board of Education's attention last fall. She felt there were faculty at the school who, given the opportunity, would be willing to do some of that work. A Division Head might be able to chair a committee. Faculty members and parents are willing and ready to step in to help. These people should not take on the entire project, but there are specific things they can do and a support person could be the liaison chair as information is gathered. She wanted to find the pieces people can do so the momentum is not lost.

Ms. McCormack echoed Ms. Patchak-Layman's thoughts about getting more PEG training for people in the building hoping that two or three more people could be trained within the next month. Nationally, this is an important time to begin that process. She stated that she would support whatever the Board of Education decided to do about Baldrige wholeheartedly and she would appreciate Mr. Bloom's attendance at the next PEG meeting. Relative to training more people as facilitators for the courageous conversations, Mr. Rouse stated that the training consisted of six weeks of online courses plus eight additional days of travel.

Dr. Lee, too, wanted Mr. Bloom to attend the PEG Committee meeting and while he advocated for truncating Baldrige, he did not believe the District should break this into pieces. The District should do what was recommended in the conversation between Dr. Weninger, Mr. Allen, and Mr. Bloom. He suggested assessing what was learned about the process in late June and then making a determination as to whether to go forward or not, even if it meant a financial loss.

Mr. Conway agreed to focus on the leadership triad at this time, and noted it was important to find out where Faculty Senate stood in this process, as the Board of Education cannot do it alone. Dr. Weninger stated that Mr. Bloom was hopeful that some faculty would be involved, but the District could focus on the leadership.

Relative to the Board of Education's goal on finance, Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if the Finance Advisory Committee would be releasing any information. Ms. Witham noted that the committee had met a few times and will meet two times in February. She hoped to bring forward the discussion to the Board of Education in March. The methodology of putting the budget together has been agreed upon, but it cannot be implemented in this budget cycle. If the Board of Education agrees with its suggestion, people could be trained in this approach for the next budget cycle.

Additional Discussion Administrative Compensation

Items

Dr. Weninger presented the Board of Education members with a memorandum outlining the philosophy and guiding principles of compensation of administrators. If the Board of Education wanted to discuss individuals or even groups of individuals, he suggested that they do so in closed session.

Discussion ensued about whether administrators should be paid more than faculty members should. In terms of reasonableness, the Board of Education will never be able to say that a faculty member will never make more than an administrator would. Dr. Lee concurred that the range for administrators should be higher than the range of their subordinates. To him the exact wording implies that the lowest level administrator with the least amount of experience could be paid less than the highest level on the faculty scale. Mr. Edgecombe agreed there should be a range that represents a level of compensation that would place administrators in a position of making more than a significant number of their subordinates.

Ms. McCormack asked if division heads had additional responsibilities. Mr. Edgecombe responded that yes, but the argument before the Board of Education is how does the District get people to be division heads if they are going to make less than a teacher. Presently, some faculty members have higher salaries than Division Heads.

Mr. Finnegan did not understand the desire to decouple division head salaries from the bargaining unit. He wanted them included as members of the faculty to which they belonged. Mr. Allen noted that one would then be at risk of them brokering for themselves. Dr. Weninger felt Mr. Finnegan's point was well taken. Division Heads do have to have a foot on both sides of the fence. While they are advocates of the division, they also put that in the context of their roles of administrators with greater responsibilities and perspectives. In the case of Division Heads, the District wants them to have a foot in both camps to advocate curricular and at the same time advocate for the District. That is a difficult role to play. They need to be compensated differently than faculty, e.g., such as paying their TRS, etc., and he did not believe they could do the job required of them in 191 days, which is their work year.

When asked if there were a provision for per diem work for Division Heads, Mr. Edgecombe responded affirmatively, if approved, but he was not sure that approach had been utilized in his tenure. Division Heads that have lost faculty members in the middle of the summer have come in for the hiring process as just part of their hiring responsibility; no additional compensation was provided. Mr. Finnegan then asked if the District wanted Division Heads to do more work for no more compensation. Dr. Weninger reiterated there were other ways to pay for this work.

Mr. Finnegan stated that Division Heads are a critical step in the chain of command and the Board of Education, needed to state its goals, which turn into policies, as a means to get the faculty to teach in the way the Board of Education wants it to do. He would not want to move this forward before there is enough buy-in and feedback to show that the Division Heads understood and accepted it.

Dr. Millard asked how OPRFHS compared districts when the head of World Languages has many more languages and more teachers in a division than similar divisions in other schools. One cannot just look at salaries, as the demands are different. Dr. Weninger noted that Division Heads have said that they do not want to differentiate between themselves. Dr. Weninger noted that Division Heads would prefer the same salary structure/system as the faculty, because it has predictability and stability.

Mr. Allen stated that he has people under him who have gotten two annual increases in seven years. When there is a budget crisis, the management side is not paid. The federal structure is even more rigorous. Mr. Prale responded that this then might lend predictability to a salary schedule. The argument would not be to use years of service, but performance incentives as a way to move people along.

When questioned about Principal 6, it was noted that the proposed 5.7 percent increase was driven by the concern that the District would not be able to attract and retain top quality candidates. The District is trying to be competitive in the building and in the Chicagoland area. If there were a rigorous evaluation and accountability, a raise of 5.7% would be merited. Ms. Witham suggested rewarding people who are star performers and give remuneration when people become skillful. Allan Odem, author of *Human Capital*, has done work for faculty and others about how one starts to conceptualize the parts of the job and how one gets excellent out of them. Division Heads would be a good group to plot out a course of action. Ms. Patchak-Layman added that this would be good for all positions. If one improves in one's job and masters it, it would be beneficial to increase one's salary and move to something else.

This will be discussed at the Human Resources Committee meeting. The document is the result of discussions with BLT, DLT, and Division heads. Division Heads do not agree with all of these items.

Ms. McCormack noted that reaching a decision was difficult without seeing actual numbers.

Mr. Finnegan asked if the hierarchy needed to be place so that people were compensated in such a way that DLT would be held in more esteem, etc. Dr. Weninger stated that to the nonprofessional there is a misconception that one would want to aspire from a Division Head to a BLT member to DLT member, but that is not the case in education. There are different levels of compensation among Division Heads, the Building Leadership Team, and the District Leadership Team. There are some differences in the work schedule. BLT members work 12 months and Division Heads work 191 days.

Mr. Allen and Dr. Lee felt that Number 2 needed rewording, as it was confusing.

Dr. Lee's initial reaction was that this was a reaction to the 1.5 percent increase, but he understood that the staff has a reasonable expectation of what is coming with the realization that there will be tough years. He also had a conflict with #6, and agreed that Division Heads needed a different pay scale than the faculty.

Mr. Allen did not like giving guaranteed raises.

Mr. Prale noted that if some of these features could be offered, administrators would migrate to OPRFHS. The Administration is trying to bring rationality to the system. This is a business marketplace and the high school need to be competitive.

Dr. Weninger stated that this discussion was not the reaction to the 1.5 increase for administrators. It was the direction the Board of Education gave the administration. This is not just about base salary, as there are ways to separate out administrators from the faculty. He asked for the opportunity to show the Board of Education how to compensate administrators when the CPI was low.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if the Division Head stipend of \$12,064 was acceptable to them. Mr. Edgecombe stated that there had been no objections.

Dr. Weninger proposed taking away the stipends leaving the Division Heads with a base salary comparable to other districts. These leadership stipends are not part of the CBA.

Q: If one were a teacher in this District and were to move to an administrative position, would that person retain tenure for duration of employment?

A: Yes, so long as there is no multiyear contract. Any certified employee who works for the District for four years has tenure and an administrator could go back into the union and bump someone with less years of experience, if qualified. Both the Illinois Education Relations Act and the CBA govern bumping rights.

Some administrators might not want a multi-year contract, because multi-year contracts must be tied to academic achievement. Mr. Finnegan did not feel it was necessary that OPRFHS be tied to what other districts were doing. Mr. Edgecombe stated that fact has been mitigated, as the District wants its employees at the middle of the comparison group.

A further discussion will occur at the February Human Resources Committee and the Board of Education will be given options and guiding directions.

Closed Session

At 12:10 a.m., on Friday, January 29, 2010, Dr. Millard moved to go into closed session to discuss 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); the appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of specific employees of the District or legal counsel for the District, including hearing testimony on a complaint lodged against an employee or against legal counsel for the District to determine its validity. 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(1), as amended by PA. 93—57; and 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. Allen. A roll call vote resulted in six ayes. Motion carried. Mr. Conway was absent from this vote.

At 12:58 a.m. on Friday, January 29, 2010, the Board of Education resumed its open session.

Adjournment

At 12:59 a.m. on Friday, January 29, 2010, Dr. Millard moved to adjourn the Board of Education meeting; seconded by Ms. Patchak-Layman. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Dr. Ralph H. Lee
President Protempore & Vice President

John C. Allen, IV
Secretary