The regular Board meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on Thursday, August 23, 2012, in the Board Room of the OPRFHS.

**Call to Order**

President Finnegan called the meeting to order at 6:37 p.m. A roll call indicated the following Board of Education members were present: Terry Finnegan, Valerie Fisher, Dr. Dietra D. Millard, Amy McCormack, Sharon Patchak-Layman, and John Phelan. Also present were Dr. Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; Cheryl L. Witham, Assistant Superintendent for Finance and Operations and Treasurer; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

**Closed Session**

At 6:38 p.m., on Thursday, August 23, 2012, Mr. Finnegan 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; Student disciplinary cases 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(10); 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 Ms. McCormack. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

The Board of Education reconvened its open session at 7:12 p.m. and recessed until 7:30 p.m. Joining the meeting were: Michael Carioscio, Chief Information Officer, Dr. Tina Halliman, Director of Special Education; Amy Hill, Director of Assessment and Research, Karin Sullivan, Communications and/or Community Relations Coordinator.

**Visitors**

The Board of Education welcomed the following visitors: OPRFHS employees Karin Sullivan, Communications and/or Community Relations Coordinator; Robert Zummallen, Director of Buildings and Grounds; Naomi Hildner, faculty; Stan Jagielski of Henry Bros., John Bokum and Nancy Leavy of the League of Women Voters, and Terry Dean of the Wednesday Journal.

**Public Comments**

John Bokum, 629 S. Home Avenue, Oak Park, addressed the Board of Education about two issues: 1) taxes, and 2) Chicago Magazine’s ranking of OPRFHS as one of the best high schools in the Chicagoland area. With respect to taxes, he asked the Board of Education again to consider freezing the upcoming tax levy. He said his taxes had risen from $900 in 1979 to $12,000 presently.

Naomi Hildner, resident of 907 N. Lombard, Oak Park, and faculty member, spoke to the Board of Education about summer school. The change of the summer school schedule had been her concern, yet the juniors who had previously failed both sessions ended up receiving a grade of A or B with this schedule. Remarkably, they were able to read three novels and write a junior theme in a three-week session. They reasons they were able to do so included: 1) time to complete the homework in class, 2) receipt of grades daily, 3) knowledge of the journal question to be asked before every class, 4) annotation of the text and then sharing that with the class. She felt the schedule was remarkably successful, and she still has a friendly relationship with these students.
Jonathan Gilmer, resident of 633 N. Grove, Oak Park and student, hoped all had enjoyed their summer. He had read an article from CNN, which reported that 300,000 education jobs had been lost since 2009. He also quoted President Obama who responded to that information, “Think about what that means for our country. At a time when the rest of the world is racing to out-educate America, these cuts force our kids into crowded classrooms, cancel programs for preschoolers and kindergarteners, and shorten the school week and the school year. That’s the opposite of what we should be doing as a country.” He asked the Board of Education members if they had considered every possible scenario and considered the consequences. Recently appointed to his church council, Mr. Gilmore is gaining experience about considering the consequences before taking a vote. Two Board of Education members had voted against the RIFing because they did not believe they had known all of the options.

Jacob Meeks, resident of 813 N. Forest, Oak Park and student, addressed the Board of Education about goals, which had much to do with decreasing systemic inequality, etc. In thinking about the AYP report, which reports how well students were achieving at OPRFHS, he stated that it was vital to consider the allocation of funds (furniture etc.) and how that reflects an attitude toward the parents, students, teachers, and faculty.

Ms. Patchak-Layman brought forth the following proposed statement for Board of Education member consideration at the next Board of Education committee meeting with adoption at the following Board of Education meeting.

Oak Park and River Forest High School
Board of Education
Statement on Equity and Excellence

OPRFHS is committed to equity because excellence for all students requires equity. This commitment will be achieved by:

- Providing all students with resources, opportunities, supports, and interventions to ensure that they achieve their full potential.
- Giving students what they need to maximize their learning and well-being.
- Assuring that all OPRFHS staff members actively continue to examine and eliminate institutional beliefs, policies, practices, and teaching that perpetuates racial disparities in achievement.
- Preparing all students to succeed in a multi-cultural society by teaching the contributions and viewpoints of all people.
- Raising the achievement of all students while eliminating the racial predictability of achievement.

Mr. Finnegan noted that five FOIA requests had been received and four were resolved.

Ms. Richardson reported that this was the first day of school for all students. Everyone was pleased with the new cell phone policy and she looked forward to working with the board about the students’ concerns. Ms. Richardson plans to engage students by setting up a Facebook page, surveys, etc.
Mr. Hunter reported the following:

1) teachers were very busy;
2) the building looked ready for the new year;
3) the construction and the availability of the classrooms were complete;
4) teachers’ participation in professional development with regard to professional development goals this summer was sometimes the equivalent of two weeks as teachers were involved in the seminars and the projects;
5) the learning strands were well received by the teachers;
6) the Institute Day presentations were great;
7) the faculty looked forward to learning from their colleagues and then employing what they learned; and
8) Positive reports about the students were being received.

Mr. Hunter awaited the reports as to the effectiveness of the new programs SEAL and ICOR. Many projects were not addressed last year, i.e., the work of the Finance Advisory Committee, etc. He believed the District would make its financial targets, but only by accident.

Mr. Hunter was pleased with the selection of Dr. Alson who was contracted to facilitate the strategic plan. The District needs to consider the physical building from the perspective of a homeowner. The state of the athletic and building facilities concerned him. As a homeowner, he wanted to insure that OPRFHS was competitive in every avenue: physically, academically, scholastically, and intra-scholastically, over the long term. He hoped that the Strategic Plan could help with that planning and allow the District to pursue larger issues. The District has to maintain its current product.

Mr. Hunter felt Ms. Patchak-Layman’s statement on equity was excellent, and he felt the faculty had the desire to do it, but he cautioned that resolutions were limiting, as they could be forgotten. The words “rigor, continuity, and consistence” used in the Board of Education goals concerned him, because they represent different meanings to different people: one may feel something is too hard and one may feel something is too easy.

Mr. Hunter anticipated that this would be a long year. He thanked the Board of Education for the opportunity to report and he welcomed them back to the table after the summer.

Superintendent Dr. Isoye welcomed Lauren Richardson as the new Student Council Board of Education Liaison.

Dr. Isoye thanked the staff of the Buildings and Grounds and the Technology departments, the administrative assistants, and the administrators for their work in readying the school for the new year.

Dr. Isoye reported that construction had been completed on schedule.

Dr. Isoye reported that on August 1, all administrators were in the building and they were given time to complete the state-mandated training.
Dr. Isoye reported that two days of in-service were provided to faculty and staff in order to begin discussions about strategic planning, learning strands, TCT’s, divisional and departmental work, and special education regulations.

Dr. Isoye reported that freshmen acquainted themselves on the first day with each other, their counselors, student leaders, and followed their schedules and met their teachers.

Dr. Isoye reported that the first day of school for all students was August 23.

Finally, Dr. Isoye reported that OPRFHS just received notification that the ACT composite was 24.5, the highest score in the high school’s history. The other scores were as follows: English 24.9, Math 24.1, Reading 24.7, and Science 23.6. A detailed report will be made in September.

Update on Strategic Plan

Dr. Alson addressed the faculty and staff on Institute Day to explain that the purpose of the strategic plan was to identify the current state and define the preferred state of the school. Cross-categorical groups met later that day to record what they found were the strengths of the high school and what were its weaknesses.

Dr. Isoye will meet with Ms. Fisher, Ms. Patchak-Layman, and Mr. Prale to establish steering committee dates. The first official Board of Education update will occur in October.

Continued Board of Education Goal Discussion

Mr. Phelan provided background on the Board of Education goals presented:

1. Racial Equity
   a. Eliminate systemic inhibitors to academic success for students of color, including but not limited to those, which discourage students from attempting higher-level courses or penalize students for pursuing high levels of academic achievement.
   b. Show evidence of any change in racial predictability in recent years.

2. Student Engagement and Achievement
   a. Increase student achievement and engagement through quality classroom instruction and other enhanced learning opportunities.
   b. Use best practices to provide that each section of the same course is structurally consistent in providing the same challenging curriculum and rigorous teaching expectations in every section of the same course.

3. Learning Environment and School Culture
   a. Manage resources to provide a safe, effective, and efficient learning environment that encourages students to stay on campus and to participate in activities that promote student engagement before, during, and after school.
   b. Expand efforts to engage students in co-curricular/athletic activities while encouraging such teams and activities to welcome students from under represented demographics.
   c. Review the student code of conduct and consider revisions designed to rehabilitate students without unnecessarily damaging future prospects or depriving them of instructional time while maintaining a safe environment for all.

4. Finance and Operations
a. Develop a system of performance based evaluations and compensation for administrators.
b. Conduct a review of existing programs and initiatives to focus resources on those that are cost effective and achieve important goals.

5. Governance
   a. Establish an appropriate scorecard for the district to assess school improvement.
   b. Complete strategic planning with community, faculty, administration, and Board input in order to set a long term, five-year vision for the District and annual sub-goals designed to execute the plan’s overall vision.

Every year the Board of Education meets to articulate its goals for the coming year. The goals tend to fall into the same general categories: student achievement; racial equity; school culture; finance/operations; and governance. In some years, the Board stated policy in only four of these categories, but many included all five. For the past several years, the Board of Education has articulated its goals as broad, general policy statements, although often supplemented with a list of action steps. The purpose was to reassure the public of its committedness to those policies and visions. In June, the Board of Education went through its goals for the previous year and participated in an exercise that illustrated to many of the Board of Education members that these broad policy statements failed to communicate clearly and with sufficient specificity, what it expected the administrators to work on in the coming year. One administrator, speaking frankly and at the Board of Education’s request, indicated that the breadth of those statements made it difficult to address any issue in depth. These insightful comments stimulated a conversation about whether the proposed goals should provide guidance. Should the focus be on the small advances the Board of Education desires, rather than the ultimate aspirations it wants those advances to achieve? As a result, the goals look different from prior years. The Board of Education identifies the actions that it wants the administrators take in the furtherance of the policies the Board of Education has articulated for years, rather than rearticulating its commitment to those aspirations. The Board of Education remains committed to those policies and visions, but it chooses to emphasize action rather than aspiration for the coming year. The drafted goals specifically direct the administration and the Board of Education should be held accountable for the success or failure of that direction to improve the high school and move toward those aspirations. The Board of Education expects the administration to address more than the goals announced. It is to continue to pursue racial equality, student achievement and engagement, and fiscal responsibility in every aspect of its administration of the school. The goals for the Board of Education to vote on today are the strategies its wants the administration to pursue, along with its other ongoing efforts, to achieve the articulated vision. The Board of Education anticipates that the start of the strategic plan in the fall will solidify its aspirations for the coming years. If this experiment is successful, the Board of Education can integrate annual directions in the strategic plan that will help to achieve those aspirations in the coming years.

Discussion ensued. Ms. Patchak-Layman believed that the staff and administration would abide by the wishes of the Board of Education, but the Board of Education has no goal statement on which to reflect to determine if they should work on them. Much work happens in the school. The statements of the Board of Education direct that work. Not having a general statement for each of the goals makes continuing the Board of Education’s work, already begun, difficult. A goal may not be broad enough to bring in
other activities. She believed that putting what is presented under a general statement would preserve what the District has been doing for the last three years and beyond. She looked for the general statements to remain and for the Board of Education to use them as the overarching goal in order to reflect back and to go forward. Mr. Phelan stated that since the basic five goals were virtually identical from last year, it was expected that those statements were assumed because they were discussed in earlier meetings. Mr. Finnegan felt the new format was an attempt to get the most efficiency. At the last meeting, information was shared that fifty (50) different activities had been tied to the Board of Education’s goals; all departments had aligned themselves to the goals. The subheadings point to the direct work and the actual programs that come back to the Board of Education. This puts the administration, the experts, in charge of the items. The Board of Education’s role is to charge the faculty and staff to respond to its vision. Mr. Finnegan supported what the goals as presented because the statements were understood. He agreed with Mr. Hunter that the Board of Education had to work through the definitions. He understood Ms. Patchak-Layman’s viewpoint, but this was the year of strategic planning and other discussion would occur.

Ms. Fisher said the Board of Education had discussed the same points raised by Ms. Patchak-Layman at another meeting. Mr. Phelan's side-by-side comparison of the Board of Education’s goals for the past several years showed that there was an essential, common thread. However, the Board of Education wanted to emphasize action, as opposed to more generic statements. The majority of the Board of Education members did not want to provide action plans, because it recognized that to do so would be micromanaging. She was satisfied with the goals as drafted. She also did not believe anyone would object to Ms. Patchak-Layman’s statement, but she did not see the point in modifying these goals. She did not believe that additional language would encourage more action by the administration and the faculty. Because equity and excellence is an understood foundation, adding the additional statements would not bring anything different.

Ms. McCormack’s response to Mr. Hunter’s point was that the conversation was more about students having the same experience, as opposed to the other words. Students may not have the "same" class experience depending upon the teacher. Mr. Phelan felt it was what he had heard that the faculty was already doing; it was just emphasizing the teachers collaborating on how to teach in the best practices. Mr. Hunter agreed that it was part of the teacher's professional obligation, and that a Board of Education goal for professional development was not necessary. Ms. McCormack stated that this goal was a way for the Board of Education to take responsibility to see that it happens. Mr. Finnegan stated 1) the Board of Education represents the community, and 2) the administration will create the action items.

Ms. Patchak-Layman stated that an advantage of having a goal statement such as "The Board of Education will provide an inclusive education for all students and take action to eliminate racial predictability, disproportionality in student achievement, and systemic inhibitors to success for students and staff of color” is that the District looks to see if what it does inhibits their success. It is a general goal that allows the District an avenue to pursue, i.e., the policy manual, the finances as they relate to goals, etc. Mr. Phelan reiterated that he believed the Board of Education had to be specific at the outset to determine whether it will be satisfied with the results. The goals as written emphasize the areas in which the Board of Education wants action. Ms. Fisher did not believe that the HR Department’s efforts to hire minorities would be hindered or
limited because no Board of Education goal specifically addressed it. It has been the
department’s focus for years, and it will continue to be. Dr. Isoye stated that the District
is being deliberate about looking at things through a racial equity lens. The
administrative team has a commitment to the understanding and to working with the
idea of race. Last year, many actions occurred that related to the goals and yet they
were not specifically listed in the goals. At the Board of Education retreat, the
discussion included the Board of Education focusing and providing a different level of
direction. The writing of the goals this year is an experiment in the wording and
actions. Ms. Patchak-Layman’s statement is at the 30,000-feet level and goes beyond
the annual goals.

Dr. Millard had read the goals in a global sense. More emphasis was placed on the
students, and that emphasis requires the entire community.

Ms. Patchak-Layman desired a goal that athletic participation would reflect the student
demographics. The previous discussion about that noted that every activity should be
welcoming to every group of students. The Board of Education did not want to force
students to engage in activities in which they had no interest. However, the school
wants them to feel welcome to participate, if they so desire. Mr. Finnegan stated that
the faculty leaders of the cheerleading and drill teams had worked diligently at having
less self-segregation and more integration. He did not want a quota system. He wanted
all students to feel welcome at all activities, not just athletics.

Policy 5152

It was the consensus of the Board of Education members to approve Policy
5152, Cellular Telephones and Electronic Paging Devices, for second reading and
action under the Action portion of this agenda, as amended as follows:

2nd para, 2 line: Add: “However, the use of electronic devices during tests or quizzes is
prohibited.” after the word “teacher”. The intent of the amendment does not include
calculators.

Post-Secondary Plans

The transcript for the Class of 2012 indicates that 87 percent of the graduates
plan to attend college: 71 percent to four-year colleges; 16 percent to junior colleges.

The majority of students are attending college in Illinois, with Triton College and the
University of Illinois at Urbana continuing as the top choices.

Final transcripts sent to 228 colleges and universities numbered 665.
A total of 436 scholarships were award with the total dollar amount of $8,609,878.
Students self-reported, provided to counselors, and provided through Naviance.
Athletic scholarships did not have a designated amount and that was not included in the
$8 million. Students are also attending post-secondary schools in Mexico, New
Zeeland, France, Philippines, Scotland, and Japan.

Discussion ensued about the amount of scholarship money that is awarded. Mr. Rouse
will provide additional information as to how they are calculated, what is the term of
the scholarship, etc.

National Clearing House Preliminary

OPRFHS established a relationship with the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) to
learn with greater accuracy about its graduates’ post-secondary educational
After implementing a way for graduates to opt out of directory information for nearly 6,000 graduates from the classes of 2004-2011. The packet information contained postsecondary data.

Graduates of the classes of 2004-2011 enrolled in college immediately after graduation from high school at an average rate of 81%. That rate is lower than the percentage of students for whom the District has traditionally sent final transcripts to colleges (typically around 91%, reported in the College Transcript Summary). The discrepancy raises questions, which have not yet been answered. For a national perspective, consider that in 2009, the most recent year for which data are available, the comparable national rate of college matriculation was 70.1%.

The choices regarding types of institutions (public v. private) and levels of institutions (four-year v. two-year) have remained relatively stable over the period from 2004-2011. On average, just under half of the graduates select public institutions and roughly one third select private institutions; roughly, two-thirds of the students enroll in four-year institutions while approximately 15% choose two-year schools. A clear for the past eight graduating cohorts is the increase in the number of students enrolling in out-of-state institutions and a corresponding decrease in the rate of enrollment at in-state institutions.

NSC data also track students who first enroll in college at any time within their first year after high school and at any time within their second year after high school. These rates were broken down by institutional type, level, and location (pp. 6-16). Among OPRFHS graduates, on average an additional eight percent have enrolled in college by the end of their second year out of high school, bringing the total rate of college matriculation within two years post-high school to 89%.

The NSC reports rates of degree attainment, both for four-year and associates degrees, within six years of high school graduation. Of the graduating cohorts for whom data was sent, only the classes of 2004 and 2005 have been out of high school long enough to report this metric, and on average, 60% of those students attained a college degree: 56% of which earned degrees from four-year institutions, while 4% of which have earned degrees from two-year institutions. Nationally, 32% of the 25 to 29 year-olds had a bachelor’s degree or higher degree in 2011.

Two additional data sets deserve mention. For each graduating cohort, the NSC provides charts showing the year-to-year progress of the students in post-secondary enrollment and degree attainment (pp. 29-43). The class of 2004 had an incremental increase in the percentage of graduates who attained a degree in the seventh year after high school graduation, suggesting that over time (and to a point that is yet to be known); the overall rate of degree attainment may continue to increase. The final table on page 44 provides a numerical breakdown of the colleges at which OPRFHS students most commonly enroll in the fall immediately after high school graduation. Triton ranks number one on this list, with twice as many OPRFHS graduates enrolling immediately after high school than the second-ranked school, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

While deeper analysis must occur on these data sets, one trend is that post-secondary outcomes are less favorable for students who enroll in two-year institutions compared to those who attend four-year institutions. Of 2004 and 2005 graduates of OPRFHS
who enrolled in college within the first two years after high school graduation, 79% of those enrolled at four-year institutions earned a degree within six years, compared with 25% of those enrolled at two-year institutions.

This is for information only. Additional data has just been received but not yet analyzed. Is the lower graduation rate of those students attending two-year colleges lower because those students matriculated and graduated from four-year colleges?

Discussion ensued. If students go through a two-year program and then transfer to a four-year program, are they counted as earning two degrees? Can Triton verify where their graduates went? More students go to Triton for their first two years rather than four-year colleges than in the past may be due to cost. Mr. Finnegan noted that Triton and Dominican were working closely together so that families will know that their students will matriculate to Dominican. That is a discussion for the high school, as well.

Institute Day Report

Ms. Hill reported on the events that occurred on Institute Day, August 20, 2012. They included:

1. breakfast provided by Food Service;
2. live music provided by the student Jazz Ensemble;
3. welcome back comments from representations of Student Council, Faculty Senate, Food Service, Buildings and Grounds, Safety and Support, and the Non-Certified Group;
4. introduction of new staff; welcome addresses by Ms. McCormack, Mr. Rouse, and Dr. Isoye;
5. an overview of building professional development plans for the year by Chala Holland; and
6. meetings for certified staff and teacher assistances, by divisions, to learn and share pertinent start-of-the-school-year information.

In addition, the District’s Wellness Committee sponsored a Health Fair to which staff attended, as their scheduled allowed. The fair featured a variety of local healthcare providers, fitness experts, bodywork practitioners, and representatives from insurance providers. The Wellness Committee will use feedback from a staff evaluation in its analysis and planning for future events.

The feedback has been positive, primarily about providing instruction in the learning strands. Mr. Finnegan thanked Ms. McCormack for making remarks on behalf of the Board of Education.

Construction Update

A construction update was provided in the packet. A summary of the work included:

- Building exterior improvements. Contractors completed the tuck-pointing and renovations of the masonry and stone from the south/east corner of the building to Exit #12, which is the mall entrance to the field house.
- The new press box and ticket booth located by the visitor’s bleachers in the stadium have been completed.
- Basement level included the completion of old hot and cold water plumbing lines in preparation to begin the vertical replacement of plumbing lines in 2013.
First floor improvements of new fritz tile in the north end of the old building are complete. This improvement was phase II of 4 projected phases.

The west pool's rubber deck was replaced with new epoxy flooring.

Second floor new building room 215, 204, 201, 247 and 244 received new ceilings and lights.

Third floor new building replacement of ceiling and lights in classrooms and hallways. Buildings and grounds painters, including previous OPRFHS students, painted classrooms, and hallways.

Third floor new building HVAC improvements are completed. We demolished four old fan units and replaced them with two new, more efficient, and economically friendly units.

Third floor technology improvement in several classrooms. New short throw projectors and wireless access points were added. Buildings and Grounds carpenters placed all of the new white boards for the short throw projectors.

Fourth floor room 436 received new ceilings and lights and several other classrooms received short throw projectors and new white boards. This completes the classroom short throw projector and white board replacement project.

Stan Jagielski, senior project manager of Henry Bros., joined Mr. Zummallen in making the presentation. The projects began on June 11, 2012 and were substantially completed on August 3, 2012. The Regional Office of Education inspected the areas that were improved and issued the Certificate of Occupancy on August 9, 2012. The construction came in close to budget. In addition, $3,000 in overtime cost for Buildings and Grounds were saved because construction was completed in a timely manner. Mr. Jagielski complimented the staff for helping to make the project successful. Ms. Witham acknowledged the proficient scheduling by Mr. Zummallen.

The Board of Education had reviewed the Tentative Budget at its August 14, 2012 Finance Committee meeting. This presentation was another opportunity for the Board of Education and the community to review this document. Ms. Witham highlighted the following areas.

- Items such as test scores, grants, etc., are yet to be included.
- Page 2 provided the overall governmental funds. Total revenue will be $77,725,386 and total expenditures will be $70,795,431.
- Page 4 showed an overall revenue increase of 1.70%. CPI for this year’s levy was 1.5%. Oak Park Hospital was added to the tax rolls. The sources of revenue are shown in Chart 1.03.
- The total EAV for the 2011 levy is down by approximately 15% from the 2010 levy. This will not affect the high school’s revenue because that is determined by CPI.
- Chart 1.05 on Page 8 provided Property Taxes Extended (Calendar Year Basis).
- Page 9 showed the District’s property tax rate per $100 equalized assessed valuation. Due to the PTELL caps and the requirement to levy by dollar amount rather than rate, equalized assessed value and tax rates have an inverse relationship; if EAV increases faster than the CPI-U (Consumer
Price Index for all Urban Consumers) then the tax rates decreases. If EAV declines, the tax rate increases.

• Page 22 included what the District had earmarked because of the Board of Education goals. This part of the document had been expanded upon from previous years.

• Page 39 included a summary of staffing. The number of faculty had not been reduced. The -4 FTE reflected personnel moved to administrative roles, e.g., Special Education and SID, etc. The total increase in staff was 10.75 FTE.

• Page 49 provided historical information and future enrollment projections, i.e., the Ehler demographics. Projections showed that enrollment will be two less next year than October 1 2011 and it will steadily increase through 2018. The District is conducting a facility utilization and capacity report. Preliminary reports indicate that the high school does have the capacity to house a larger student body if changes are made to the way the District utilizes its space.

• Page 80 provided information relative to what funds are included in the educational fund: Education, Food Service, and Bookstore Funds.

• Page 147 provided the proposed construction projects for each year until FY 2016-17. The Long Term Facility Planning Committee facility will identify possible resources needed for educational areas.

• Page 184 provided information as to the impact the high school has had on homeowners with property valued at $300,000 since the 2006 levy. This year there was a decline in the tax burden on homeowners and an increase for commercial property owners. Property owners should be experiencing an increase of .47% this year relative to the high school taxes.

The Board of Education will vote to approve a resolution to place the tentative budget on display under the Action portion of the agenda.

**Independent Workers’ Contract with Wyotek**

It was the consensus of the Board of Education members to approve the contract with Patricia Wyotek for social work services for the 2012-13 school year in the Special Education Department under the Action portion of the agenda.

**Comprehensive Group Contracted Services**

It was the consensus of the Board of Education members to approve the contract with The Comprehensive Group for District services related to occupational, physical, speech, and/or other therapy services for the 2012-13 school year under the Action portion of the agenda. No changes have occurred to this year’s contract from the 2011-12 contract.

**Tames Contracted Services**

It was the consensus of the Board of Education members to approve contracted services from Tames Health Resources Service relative to reimbursement for health care including but not limited to medical evaluations, diagnostic services, and/or screening and treatment services provided to children for the 2012-13 school year. No changes have occurred to this year’s contract from the 2011-12 contract.
**Instructional Materials Fee**

It was the consensus of the Board of Education members to declare under the Action portion of the agenda that all OPRFHS students enrolled will pay the Instructional Materials Fee. The Board of Education originally approved the Instructional Materials Fee in March 2012. This additional approval will provide clarity that both on-campus and off-campus students will pay this fee.

Discussion ensued about what tuition fees for students at off campus schools included. It does include fees for instructional materials, but not as a subset. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked for it to be designated as a subset.

**Consent Items**

Ms. Patchak Layman asked that the Instructional Materials Fee be removed from the consent agenda.

Mr. Finnegan moved to approve the consent item as follows:

- Check Disbursements and Financial Resolutions dated Thursday, August 23, 2012
- the Monthly Treasurer’s Report for June
- Gifts
- Resolution to Place Tentative Budget for 2012-13 on Display
- CITE II RFCC Agreement Addendum
- Independent Workers’ Contract
- Comprehensive Group Contracted Services for Special Education
- Tames Contracted Services for Special Education

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

**Instructional Materials Fee**

Ms. Fisher moved to affirm that the Instructional Materials Fee was for all OPRFHS students; seconded by Mr. Phelan. A roll call vote resulted in five ayes and one nay. Ms. Patchak-Layman voted nay. Motion carried.

Ms. Patchak-Layman did not believe the school could charge an Instructional Materials Fee to students who were placed at an off-campus school.

**Personnel Recommendations**

Mr. Finnegan moved to approve the personnel recommendations (New Hires, Resignations, and Stipends; seconded by Ms. Fisher. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

The Board of Education will be informed of when the staffing report will be presented.

**Board of Education Goals for 2012-13 School Year**

Mr. Phelan moved to approve the 2012-13 Board of Education goals, as presented; seconded by Ms. McCormack. A roll call vote resulted in five ayes and one nay. Ms. Patchak-Layman voted nay. Motion carried.

**Amendment of Citizens’ Council Membership 2012-2013**

Mr. Finnegan moved to amend the membership of Citizens’ Council for the 2012-13 school year, as presented; seconded by Mr. Phelan. A voice call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Dr. Isoye will talk with the cochairs again regarding demographics. He knew they had made a concerted effort to look at the distribution of members. One Board of
Education member noted that the number of representatives from Oak Park and from River Forest were almost equal.

Policy 5152  
Mr. Finnegan moved to approve Policy 5152, Cellular Telephones and Electronic Paging Devices, for Second Reading and Action, as amended; seconded by Ms. Fisher. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Election Representative Designation  
Mr. Finnegan moved to appoint Gail Kalmerton as the designated election representative for the Board of Education elections in April 2013; seconded by Ms. Fisher. A voice vote resulted motion carried.

Student Discipline  
Mr. Finnegan moved to expel Student EXP 08-23-12-1 through Summer School of the 2012-13 school year but to hold the expulsion in abeyance, contingent upon successful completion and regular attendance at an alternative school. The District also recommends anger management counseling and post-secondary counseling. An administrative review will take place in December 2012 to determine if a change of placement is appropriate based upon student progress; seconded by Mr. Phelan. A roll call vote resulted in five ayes and one nay. Ms. Patchak-Layman voted nay. Motion carried.

Open & Closed Minutes  
Mr. Finnegan moved to approve the open and closed minutes of June 14, 20, 28, and July 12, and 18, and August 14, 2012; seconded by Dr. Millard. A roll call vote resulted in five ayes and one nay. Ms. Patchak-Layman voted nay. Motion carried.

District Reports  
The Huskie Booster Kickoff Event was scheduled for Thursday, August 30.

Miscellaneous  
An update on residency/registration was requested. A report will be forthcoming.

Adjournment  
At 9:47 p.m. on Thursday, August 23, 2012, Ms. McCormack moved to adjourn this meeting; seconded by Mr. Finnegan. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

Amy McCormack  
Secretary

By Gail Kalmerton  
Clerk of the Board