

October 23, 2014

The regular Board meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on Thursday, October 23, 2014, in the Board Room of the OPRFHS.

- Call to Order** President Phelan called the meeting to order at 7:33 p.m. A roll call indicated the following Board of Education members were present: Thomas F. Cofsky, Dr. Steven Gevinson, Dr. Ralph H. Lee, Dr. Jackie Moore, Sharon Patchak Layman, John Phelan, and Jeff Weissglass. Also present were Dr. Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant Clerk of the Board.
- Visitors** Joining the meeting were Michael Carioscio, Chief Information Officer; Amy Hill, Director of Assessment and Research; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Dr. Gwen Walker-Qualls, Interim Director of Pupil Personnel; Karin Sullivan, Director of Communications and Community Relations; Joey Cofsky, Student Council Liaison Representative; and Sheila Hardin, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair.
- Visitors** OPRFHS faculty and staff members Saman Williams, Starsha McCann, Justin Maxwell, John Bokum, Kevin Peppard, community members; Stephen Jackson of the Oak Park Township, Ieva Ambraziejus, Airmaristers, Rebecca Bibbs of the *Oak Leaves*; and Terry Dean of the *Wednesday Journal*.
- Public Comments** John Bokum, 619 Home, encouraged the Board of Education to come to a conclusion on the pool site and his suggestion was to put it on the garage parking lot.
- He encouraged all to attend the Festival of Trees Gala on December 21, as it supports both communities and students.
- FOIA Requests** Ms. Kalmerton reported that 3 FOIA requests had been received and resolved.
- Student Council** Mr. Cofsky noted that two Student Council representatives would be Board of Education Liaisons for this year, Annika Holkeboer and himself. He reported:
- 1) Homecoming went well.
 - 2) Student Council members were volunteering at the Food Pantry after school.
 - 3) Student feedback on lunchroom changes was positive. While new regulations for food have been implemented, it is beginning to work well.
 - 4) Student Council members are writing thank-you notes to the faculty and staff.
- Faculty Report** Ms. Hardin reported that first quarter had ended and it has been a good year.
- Superintendent's Report** Dr. Isoye reported the following: 1) senior Matthias Pergams placed as a National Achievement Scholarship semifinalist; and 2) Sebastian Torero earned a National Hispanic Recognition Program (NHRP) award.

Dr. Isoye reported that Oak Park and River Forest librarian Dr. Anne Carlson received the 2014 Davis Cup Award by the Illinois Library Association, the prestigious award recognizes an Illinois librarian who has made an outstanding contribution in his or her service to youth.

During Beye Elementary School's annual "Walk to School Day," Dr. Isoye reported that several members from the Boys' and Girls' Basketball squads participated in the event to promote healthy living and an active lifestyle.

Dr. Isoye reported that the Varsity Girls Golf team won the 2014 Huskie Invite at Indian Boundary Golf Course, then went on to win the 2014 Regional Championship. This is the team's third regional championship in a row. Congratulations to: Amanda Youman, Nicole Gagliardo, Sophie Mouros, Elaine Houha, Paige Mosher, and Katie Latham. In addition, Amanda Youman qualified for state and finished 25th, with a combined score of 162. She now holds the record for the best-finishing state qualifier in the history of OPRF Girls Golf.

Dr. Isoye reported that the Varsity Boys' Golf team placed third in regionals. Congratulations to Chris Bell, Johnny Sullivan, Teddy Economos, Tyler Swanson, Kyle Warbinton, and Joe Werner. Team member Chris Bell qualified for state and finished tied for 12th place, with a combined score of 151—just one shot away from being All State.

Dr. Isoye reported that the film *American Promise* sponsored by the Library and OPRFHS will be shown October 30 at 6:00 p.m. in the Little Theatre. The film follows two African-American boys as they go through grades K-12; the movie can be found online as well.

The following items were removed from consent agenda:

- A.3 Approval of the FY 2014 Audit Report
- B. Approval of Policies for Amendment
- D. Approval of Open and Closed Session Minutes of September 23, 2014 and a declaration that the closed session audiotapes of March 2013 be destroyed.

Consent Items

Mr. Phelan moved to approve the following consent items:

- Check Disbursements and Financial Resolutions dated October 23, 2014
- Monthly Treasurer's Report
- Monthly Financial Reports
- Personnel Recommendations, including New Hires, Resignations, Retirement and Stipends
- Policies for First Reading
 - Policy 7:20, Harassment of Students Prohibited
 - Policy 7:180, Prevention of and Response to Bullying, Intimidation, and Harassment (renamed and rewritten) (current)
 - Policy 7:240, Conduct Code for Participants in Extracurricular Activities
 - Policy 7:340, Student Records

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

FY 2014 Audit Report Mr. Phelan moved to approve the FY 2014 Audit Report; seconded by Dr. Moore. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

OPRFHS was praised for being a well-run district with good internal controls. The Audit Report was positive. Specifically complimented were the abilities of Doug Wiley, Supervisor of Finance, as they far exceeded the competencies seen in other districts. Edits were made to the transmittal letter, analysis and discussion relative to wording and organization.

Policies for Amendment

Mr. Phelan moved to approve the amendments to the following policies, as presented: seconded by Mr. Weissglass. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Policy 2:20, Powers and Duties of the School Board; Indemnification
Policy 4:60, Purchases and Contracts
Policy 5:30, Hiring Process and Criteria
Policy 5:260, Student Teachers
Policy 5:330, Sick Days, Vacation, Holidays and Leaves

Minutes

Mr. Phelan moved to approve the open and closed session minutes of September 23, 2014 and to declare that the closed session audiotapes of March 2012 be destroyed; seconded by Dr. Lee. A voice vote resulted motion carried.

Approval of Board of Education Committee

Mr. Phelan moved to form the Board of Education I-Gov Committee; seconded by Mr. Weissglass. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

Mr. Phelan will appoint 3 members to this committee.

SRO Agreement

Mr. Phelan moved to approve the Student Resource Officer (SRO) Intergovernmental Agreement with the Village of Oak Park, as presented; seconded by Dr. Gevinson.

Some of the Finance Committee's reservations about approving this contract included the fact that its structure for the existing year puts a retroactive financial burden on the District. It was explained that the contract originally came before the Board of Education in 2013 for consideration. The Board of Education that had approved this position originally had indicated that the intent was that it would be funded by the Village of Oak Park for a brief period of time with subsequent discussion about cost sharing. Twelve years passed and the discussion of cost sharing had not occurred. In 2012, the Village asked for a discussion of cost sharing because it said it did not have the money to continue the position. Mr. Phelan thought the cost should have been split and that it was the right thing to do with a neighboring taxing body. In 2013, when this was brought before the Board of Education, concerns were raised about supervision of an armed officer and about joint employer responsibility. However, the police department is responsible for supervision. The Village has borne the cost of the mutually beneficial relationship and the original vision was satisfactory. The Village and the District had said that they would share

the cost for that year. Ms. Patchak-Layman added that the Village had received a grant from the federal government for the SRO position and then, for a few years, swapped out police officers from the Downtown Oak Park (DTOP) to the schools, paying for them from the DTOP TIF. She questioned whether the Village of Oak Park benefited from having an SRO in the school? Her belief was that the Village did benefit from it and she asked if it had reports and the reasoning behind having this position.

Dr. Moore was concerned with the description of the school resource officer program on page 2, as these officers are sworn in by the Village of Oak Park as law enforcers. It is a delicate balance of having an SRO in the school as they may act as a police officer may act. They do not give out school discipline: they may be help to intervene in a situation or in a type of behavior. The goal is to provide some flexibility to distinguish between the roles of the police officer and the personnel of the school and thereby impose school-related discipline that are juvenile in nature or hand it off to the SIDs. She was concerned, given the long-term nature of the contract and in reading the description of the SRO program, that this was being approved prior to having the impact from the discipline retreat which could alter the language, and require more training of the SRO in the areas of mentoring, restorative justice, or relationship training. She wanted student feedback as to the number of contacts, etc. A concern exists that police outside of the building are not positive for particularly Latino and African American students. She hoped that the Board of Education could be more deliberate based on information that would be gathered. Dr. Lee added that at one point, because a Board of Education member was a former SRO and able to explain things to the Board of Education when questions arose, the Board of Education was comfortable with that process.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked for information as to how much time was spent with students, how many students, how many times were the police called to come in, how many times is the SRO called back to his office, what does flexibility mean and how does that play out as to what happens during the school day. She reflected that there are 4,000 to 5,000 people in this area every day, which is comparable to a beat officer. The police officers are to serve and protect. If time is being spent on something else, there is no proof of that fact. Nationally, not much information exists in this realm either. For \$148,000, the District could hire 3 Thrive counselors. These are new dollars. The Strategic Plan would have a spreadsheet about expenses. She believed that the District needed better guidelines and an understanding of the roles in the school.

Mr. Rouse noted that the SRO's duties are different from that of the Thrive counselors. Officer Ruiz has worked at the high school for two years, he has a general type 75 certification, is a sworn police officer, and has a social work background. Officer Ruiz is willing to do any programming the school requests. As a Hispanic male, he understands the stereotypes of African-American and Hispanics and he acts as a liaison first, as opposed to carrying a badge. SROs, in general, have extensive training.

Since the contract can be amended or canceled within 60 days, Mr. Weissglass moved to amend the motion. He moved to approve the SRO contract with the understanding that the District is involved in a review of its discipline system

and expects to revisit the role of the SRO and may ask to develop a revision to this agreement; seconded by Dr. Moore. A roll call vote resulted in six ayes and one nay. Ms. Patchak-Layman voted nay. Motion carried.

**Course Proposals
For 2015-16**

Mr. Phelan moved to approve the adoption of the course proposals for the 2015-16 Academic Catalog, as presented and as recommended by the Instruction Committee of the Board of Education at its October 14, 2014 meeting; seconded by Dr. Moore. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

Ms. Patchak-Layman expressed a concern about developing a class based on outside training, as the class is in place not for what the District is providing but for those students who are getting outside training.

ISAL III Program

Mr. Phelan moved to approve Dr. Isoye's request to enroll in IASA's two-year ISAL program; seconded by Mr. Weissglass. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Dr. Isoye reported that a letter of support was necessary from the president of the Board of Education. Dr. Isoye explained that if accepted to this program, it would entail 8 meetings over 2 years which generally are held on Friday and Saturdays. However, the first meeting will conflict with January 2015 Board of Education meeting and the Board of Education members will be asked to respond to alternative dates for that meeting. He looked forward to this experience in working with other superintendents in the same position.

**Testing Coordinator/
Consultant**

Mr. Phelan moved to approve the parameters of the proposed consultancy as detailed in the Professional Services Contract for a Testing Coordinator/Consultant, at a cost of no more than \$40,000, and authorize administration to identify and retain a service provider; seconded by Dr. Lee.

Ms. Hill took the feedback from the discussion at the Instruction Committee meeting and revised the document, including cost structure, and per diem for this position. In addition, the person who had been identified withdrew from consideration because of an offer received for a full-time job at a university. Another candidate with strong credentials has been identified.

PARCC testing oversight will remain the responsibility of Ms. Hill because of its logistical and adaptive challenges. Increasing are state testing and accountabilities. In addition to PARCC, the school will give the ACT test. Projects like this are growing in scope and numbers and the amount of coordination increases. Having this position will help the District coordinate the pieces. The IT Department would find this position to be helpful in coordinating the process. In addition, the number of Special Education students has increased and the magnitude of applying for accommodations is growing in order to make sure these students are receiving those accommodations. Special Education is still responsible for accommodations. AP proctors are covered by the AP budget. Parental concerns have increased and it will be positive for parents to be able to contact one person.

Dr. Isoye noted that OPRFHS chooses to offer national tests, as it believes that there are benefits to the students to take the tests locally, i.e., they are familiar

with the facilities and they know the faculty members who may proctor the tests. Because all of the tests, PSAT, SAT, ACT and some larger exams, have different rules and different organizations that run them, it becomes difficult for students and families to navigate all of the rules.

With regard to the cost, Ms. Hill explained that before an independent person was paid by both ACT and SAT to conduct their testing. That person left the district. The person doing AP coordination was a part-time teacher who was hired full time, and that position was vacated. Administrative oversight was handled by 2 division heads who found that challenging and demanding for those two weeks. All 3 of these people were doing AP teaching as well. The compensation from AP Testing, ACT testing and SAT testing will offset some of the funding needed for this position. Hiring someone at a lower rate may also create some savings. This for the upper limit of 100 days and \$400 per day.

This person will not be allowed to apply for any permanent position as that would be a conflict of interest.

A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

**Board of Education
Member Conference
Registration Fee**

Mr. Phelan moved to approve Mr. Weissglass' request for the District to pay the registration fee of \$405 to attend the Joint Conference, November 21-23, 2014, per Policy 2:215, Board Member Expenses; seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

**Pool Committee
Update**

Mr. Phelan announced the members of the Pool Committee, the background, its purpose and dates of scheduled meetings and that Mr. Weissglass would chair the meeting,

Mr. Weissglass felt the committee members were a terrific group. The Committee has a fast timeframe and it is identifying new research. It will have to ask hard questions in order to provide the Board of Education with clear priority direction by the first week of December.

Discussion ensued about the makeup of the committee. Mr. Phelan explained that he choose people who he knew were interested and had different levels of expertise, i.e., Cathy Yen, a member of the Chamber of Commerce and former Booster Club president; Joe Connell, parent of swimmers; Steve Schuler, neighbor; Thomas Cronin republican committeeman from River Forest and father of 10 children; Chris Meister, who participated on the Finance Advisory Committee and is the Executive Director of Illinois. Ms. Patchak-Layman was surprised and disappointed that there were so few women on this public committee. While Mr. Phelan had invited other women to participate, they had declined. Dr. Lee did not believe the emphasis on sports should be a dominate interest of this committee. Mr. Weissglass noted that the message was that it was important to take into account girls' and boys' sports, issues of instruction, and the fiscal concerns of the broader community. Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that a majority of the Board of Education is on this committee, and in effect it is a decision made by the Board members. She questioned the whether the checks and balance were in place so that there will be conversation. Mr. Phelan

explained that while four do represent a majority of the Board of Education, it does not mean that deliberation would not occur and that these members will have the ability to change their minds. He was hesitant to leave off of the committee a Board of Education member who had questions. He wanted them to feel ready to make a decision when a recommendation comes forward to the full Board of Education. The committee is not charged with making a decision.

School Profile

Mr. Rouse presented the 2014-15 School Profile. No State Report Card has been received. A question was asked about why the Hispanic demographics had increased so dramatically. More information will be sought about this.

Levy Timeline and Discussion

The Board of Education received a copy of the Levy timeline that was presented to the Finance Committee on October 14. A graph was included in the packet that represented the work the FAC did a year ago when it recommended Option 5, the dark colored line, and an update of that with current information, the red colored line. While the lines don't match up, because of changes and now known items. When the Board of Education voted the Levy a year ago based on, the recommendation was a \$10 million reduction with four guidelines to bring the fund balance down to 100% in a two to four year period. To focus on the graph in the original version, the unknowns were capital needs and the assumption was that next year more capital needs would occur, i.e., the pool. An assumption for both scenarios is that \$20 million would come from the fund balance for the pool, as recommended by the FAC. Thus, capital needs are still unknown at this point. A difference between what was seen is the timing of when the District would seek deploying funds from the fund balance to support capital projects.

Mr. Cofsky explained that the red line drops below the blue line because of decisions made by the board because of incremental expenditures that have occurred during the past 12 months. From 2016, a flattening of curve exists which means that the difference between expense and revenue is tightening due to changes to assumptions, unknowns, but now known, i.e., changes in contracts, special education costs, retirement profile, etc. The big unknowns are: 1) pool facility and its payment, 2) additional capital on the broader facility to accommodate enrollment increases; 3) Senate Bill 16 which could reduce state funding by 75% or \$1.6 million; 5) pension liability; and 6) Strategic Plan.

The Finance Committee members discussed bringing two options to the Board of Education for the Levy: 1) Levy at \$64.9 million, which would be the 2012 Levy, which is not depicted in this example, and would increase the fund balance; and 2) continue the FAC recommendation of Option 5, Levy at \$54.8 million, which would reduce the Levy by \$10 million with a \$100,000 less, in order to do the "look-back" provision. Mr. Altenburg and Mr. Miller were asked to bring more information to the committee on November 10, after which a Special Board meeting will be scheduled to approve a Preliminary Levy. The final Levy cannot be higher than the Preliminary Levy, i.e., the 2012 option. Discussion ensued about having a Special Board Meeting before the November 10 meeting or before the December 18 meeting.

It was clarified that this includes is \$20 million for capital and \$20 million for tax reduction (2 years of \$10 million tax reduction), and debt abatement.

Discussion ensued about enrollment projections, and FTE which had been included in the assumptions. What was not included in the assumptions were support roles, counselors, directors, and positions that will serve students beyond that classroom. The counselors said they were at their maximum of 276, 26 over the best practices number of 250, yet even that may be too high for OPRFHS. The counselors are frustrated about not meeting student needs. It seemed clear from that conversation that the District has to start thinking about additional counselors, class size, administrative functions, or some other model that would be provided. When should that discussion arise? Annually the Board of Education might want to talk about this and hear the recommendations of the administration to achieve the right balance.

The discussion now is about the Levy discussion this year. It has to do with the look-back provision. Will the Board of Education continue a \$10 million temporary tax reduction for a second year? To make that decision, it has to evaluate whether continuing that temporary tax reduction is wise and whether the fund balance at that point would remain strong enough to allow the District to do the capital funding that is necessary and to continue on the path of a referendum six or seven years out at a rate of 15 to 25 cents. The District cannot do more than 2 years of reduction, is there a period of time when the District could take another temporary reduction at a future time, once more information is known. At this point it would be possible legally, but that may change due to a bill that was being considered.

The Finance Committee is recommending a certain levy amount based on an assumption, i.e., \$20 million would come out of the fund balance. That assumption will be reviewed annually. This was the mid-range of the pool cost assumption at that time.

It was the consensus of the majority of the Board of Education to not have a special meeting before the November 10 meeting but rather have a higher levy as a placeholder. The benefit is that it is a reminder that the Board of Education will go back to the 2012 Levy eventually. It is part of the story.

Ms. Patchak-Layman did not understand why the assumptions could not be finalized, saying that \$20 million of the fund balance will go to capital improvements, so that there is a way to look at the larger amount of money and know what will have happen to it. If the \$20 million is not correct because of capital amounts, then talk about another amount of money and decide based on that money, the fund balance shrinks because of a particular project, and then it is an easier conversation about where the Levy should be once a commitment exists for where the fund balance is going. Mr. Phelan felt much had changed since that number was suggested and discussion could occur on that motion, but just simplifying the discussion is not the right reason to lock into a number that is now wrong. Ms. Patchak-Layman felt the Board of Education could pick the number. If the intent is that some of the fund balance is going to capital, then that should be specified. If not, why put in a higher levy when trying to draw it down. Two members felt it would be premature to transfer a

specific number into a protected capital account, depending on where and when a facility should be built.

**Update from
Guidance/Student
Services Division**

The Board of Education was informed that the Student Services Division provided an update on its work at the Instruction Committee meeting, including recent divisional activities, highlighted ideas for future opportunities, and identified areas of support for consideration. The main themes from the counselor presentation included:

- A discussion of the current counselor-to-student caseload ratios. The core questions were is the current ratio sufficient, is additional capacity possible, or should a reduction in caseload be considered.
- Counselors discussed the depth and consistency of services provided. The attachment to this memo outlines those services and main aspects of the counselors' role.
- Counselors expressed generally positive feelings toward development of an advisory program for our students.
- Staff discussed the range and quality of contact with other support services, including the School Resource Officer and Youth Therapists. Some of those conversations occur in the weekly meetings of Pupil Support Services Teams.
- Board members discussed ways to consider and record time and effort, exploring technology and other systems of service delivery as a way to sort out and further detail the work of counselors for purposes of analysis and development.
- In line with strategic planning, counselors are seeking more time and collaboration with community-based entities as a way to further support students.

One member asked about how the conversation about decrease caseloads or changing the way the work is divided and how that would fit into the Strategic Plan. Another member noted that the number of counselors was lessened when some counselors were turned into discipline deans; that is something for the Strategic Plan to consider.

**Student Participation
Data Report**

The Instruction Committee wanted the Board of Education to receive the Extracurricular Student Participation 2013-14 Report. Comments from the Instruction Committee members included:

- The distribution of students in programs is generally consistent with that reported in previous years.
- Some slight improvement across a variety of racial categories was noted.
- In response to some questions generated at last year's discussion with Board members, included was additional information regarding discipline and Code of Conduct violations in the most recent report.
- Some questions were raised regarding continuing to explore the available information further. Specifically, sorting the participation by athletics and activities and also by students who receive individualized services or other school designations could be helpful in determining appropriate programs and procedures for best serving students.

- In regard to athletic teams, the committee asked that the District note capacity and no-cut status for individual teams. That information is provided as an attachment to the memo.

What metrics can be found about the students? Students not involved in athletics and activities at the school could be involved with work, with church or some other activity not recognized by the school.

Summer School Report

The Instruction Committee wanted to share the 2014 Summer School Report with the Board of Education. Comments from the Instruction Committee members included:

- Is it possible to track attendance as a separate indicator for student involvement and achievement?
- The summary of the overall efforts and interventions was helpful in understanding the changes in summer school supports offered.
- Is it possible to track the student outcomes to compare the experience in the 14-day courses versus the 28-day courses?

Additional money was used for outreach services, tutoring, etc. Concordia provided free social work services. Student enrollment was increased. The District thanked Ron Johnson, Doug Wiley, Jennifer Walstra, and Linda Hayes for their help.

Questions were raised about the increased number of students versus course decreases, and trends.

CTIP Update

The Classroom Integration Technology Plan (CTIP) was accepted by the Board of Education in April. The first phase of that plan involved deploying technology into the classrooms (20+ teachers and 800 devices). The presentation to the Instruction Committee as to the status update on the first phase was included in the packet information.

Discussion ensued about devices. The District committed to Chromebooks for the first phase of the pilot, not 1:1. The PARCC testing required a keyboard and a specific screen size for its testing and thus the notebook was the best choice. The next phase will evaluate whether IPADs or Chromebooks should be used. A pilot may use both devices and then the administration would bring forth a recommendation to the Board of Education. The IPAD, as a shared device, does not work but as a 1:1, it does make sense and the students could take them home. It was noted that both the feeder districts use IPADs. The Board's role is with the budget, and this discussion is highlighted in the Technology Committee.

One member noted that the critical factor to the success of a 1:1 rollout is the culture within in the school and teacher buy-in. Using shared devices this year is more about teachers and preparing the ground, building confidence, and building the capacity of IT department. This first year was about the importance of getting comfortable with having this much technology in the classroom. A presentation was made to Technology about the purchase of the Chromebooks, PARCC testing.

One member noted that some research testified that for 1:1 use, a laptop was more beneficial for high school students. IPADs are more beneficial for more leisure-type activities.

Strategic Plan

The PEG Committee asked that a Strategic Plan Update be shared with the Board of Education. The implementation teams have been formed and the names of the co-chairs were provided. Many of the teams had begun to meet and they have asked to meet with Dr. Isoye to determine direction and to build relationships amongst their team members. Two teams were relatively small and people were being recruited for them. Dr. Isoye is suggesting that the teams consider 3 bucket items—1) what can be done now, 2) what can be done second semester, and 3) what can be done in the future. Resources will be allocated based on the items that come forward. The process will be “messy” at first, but the teams can ask for guidance from the administrators. Mr. Weissglass noted that the Board of Education is trying to support innovation. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if there were community involvement or stipends to be paid. Dr. Isoye was unsure of those things at this point.

**District, Community
And State Reports**

Reports from Citizens’ Council, PTO/Parents 4 Student Success, Huskies Boosters’ Club, and APPLAUSE! were imbedded in the agenda.

Adjournment

At 11:15 p.m. on October 23, 2014, Mr. Phelan moved to adjourn the Board of Education meeting; seconded by Dr. Moore. A voice vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

John Phelan
President

Dr. Jackie Moore
Secretary