

OAK PARK AND RIVER FOREST HIGH SCHOOL
201 North Scoville Avenue
Oak Park, IL 60302

Committee of the Whole
January 17, 2017

An Instruction Committee meeting was held on January 17, 2017. Mr. Weissglass called the meeting called to order at 8:00 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members present were Fred Arkin, Jennifer Cassell, Thomas F. Cofsky, Dr. Steve Gevinson, Dr. Jackie Moore, Sara Dixon Spivy, and Jeff Weissglass. Dr. Joylynn Pruitt, Interim Superintendent, and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board of Education and FOIA Officer.

Also present were Tod Altenburg, CSBO; Amy Hill, Director of Assessment and Research; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; Karin Sullivan, Director of Communications and Community Relations; Dr. Gwen Walker-Qualls, Director of Pupil Support Services;

Visitors: Sheila Hardin, Faculty Senate Executive Committee; Jason Dennis, Matt Baron, Laura Hardwick, Dr. Carl Spight, Monica Sheehan, George Bailey, and others.

Public Comments

Dr. Carl Spight hoped the Board of Education would make comment on discipline report. He had been the chair and statistician of a studies team commissioned by the Board of Education in 1992-93 and he as the task force's statistician that ultimately creative the document *The Learning Performance Gap* study, as well as under contract with the high school as its educational researcher. As such, he knew OPRFHS's discipline data history in detail. As a statistician and activist in the community, he has been concerned about equity and outcomes that have patterned for many decades. The discipline report shows a dramatic reduction in ISS and OSS and it could be an early occasion of victory. But one must know that there are not and should not be modified by important caveat ask yourself and Mr. Rouse what was happening with inputs and outputs with respect to what appears to be dramatic reductions. Have the first referrals decreased as the ISS and OSS. Where did they go? Could a dramatic reduction occur without a dramatic change in climate and yet students changed their behavior or did the District change its behavior. Where is that in the report? Is this is a new processing of the data or is something fundamentally happening? He asked where was the cross tabulation, the pattern of association of all of the services mentioned and the ultimate consequences. He was offended that the public does not have an opportunity to comment on the report.

Minutes

Ms. Dixon Spivy moved to approve the Instruction Committee minutes of December 13, 2016, as amended; seconded by Mr. Arkin. A voice vote resulted in motion carried. The amendment was to replace Instruction Committee with Committee of the Whole where appropriate.

Instruction Section

Semester 1 Discipline Report

Mr. Rouse presented the Semester I Discipline Report. The administration was able to He noted that because the District's system to collect and analyze data faster, the administration is able to provide the information in the same school year.

Senate Bill 100 has dramatically impacted school across the state as to how OSS's are issued related to disproportionately affected minority students. While not statisticians, the District has seen reduced

infractions because of 1) the law, and 2) the use of Pupil Support Services rather than consequences. The last chart speaks to the efforts of the entire staff to alter their conversations with students. This year Student Intervention Directors (SIDs) determined to stop the practice of issuing ISS for such things like tardies. Instead, more interventions are initiated, i.e., calls to the home, conversations with teachers and counselors, etc., before suspensions are issued.

The narrative under the section titled Comparison of 2nd Semester 2015-16 School Year to 1st Semester 2016-17 School Year was noted that OSSs decreased significantly from 69 occurrences during the first semester of the 2015-2016 school year to 5 occurrences this past semester--a 93% reduction. ISS's were also drastically lowered in that same time period from 269 to 49. This is an 82% reduction. Examples of restorative practices used included mediation, parent and teacher conferences, social work referrals, and motivational mentorship work. Discussion ensued.

Dr. Moore found some of the information confusing. Had Restorative Justice practices/interventions helped with the decrease of infractions? While the decrease could be an artifact of Senate Bill 100 only, it is not connected. Has the GPA gone up? Are there fewer classroom issues? Are teachers connecting more? The model is not notated in the report. Previously, she has asked for information relative to race and gender. Why is it that half of the discipline issues are being attributed to African- American students when those students do not comprise half of the student body? Is the District double counting? Even with the infractions and the consequences, it felt more like passive and active defiance were subjective. Some students get warnings and some students get detentions because they already have 3 and 4 infractions. What are the procedures and policies to see if discipline is being meted out properly? When the PSS Team chart was presented at last year's Instruction Committee, it was a checklist of the many services being offered, but it did not list the effectiveness of those services. If this information is not connected with student achievement and school climate data that goes into the Strategic Plan and its goals, it is unknown whether someone will get a phone call, a referral to the PSS Team or a Saturday detention. If a student is expected to do homework during an ISS and a social worker comes in at the end of the hour, that is not restorative--it is biding time. Outcome data is needed. If the high school does not have statisticians, then it may need some in order to tell the story of the students.

Dr. Gevinson noted that when he was walking through the halls earlier in the day, students were very orderly in going to class. He too was impressed with the reduction of ISS and OSS and why? While much of it flows from Senate Bill 100, the reductions in referrals should not be affected by that Bill. Mr. Rouse responded that when there are fewer SID referrals, it means teachers are writing fewer referrals as they seek out counselors and SIDS for alternative ideas. The faculty has received information regarding SB 100 via Institute Day presentations, etc. Students are helping teachers. Conversations are occurring about discipline and norms, as well as expectations about the environment of writing fewer referrals. Dr. Gevinson noted that teacher contact is now almost 1,100. Was that higher than before? He invited further questioning of this report by the Culture, Climate and Behavior meeting on Thursday.

Mr. Arkin noted a typo on table 2 where it should read first semester, not second semester. He continued that failure-to-serve detentions represented about 990 of the 1,141 infractions. He believed that the District could drill down on those 150 infractions to find the causations. He also believed that the District should explore the reason for the big reduction of failure-to-serve detentions, as it went from 1873 to 1141 first semester. The majority of consequences were because of being tardy and failure-to-serve detentions. What restorative practices are being applied to each of these infractions? He found Table 4 helpful, as it showed that only four students were repeaters.

Ms. Dixon Spivy reflected that no one thought the Board of Education's job was complete. The report told her that the District was grossly over-referring in the past. The intent of SB 100 is to keep more students in school. Are teachers not writing referrals and ignoring behavior? That does happen in other

environments. She asked for an explanation of what these interventions meant, i.e., what is the length of a phone call, etc.? A model was needed.

Ms. Cassell said that CCB talked about having qualitative versus quantitative data. The District needs to better inform by drilling down or adding data. Qualitative data would include surveying students, faculty, and staff, as to how PD has changed practices in the classroom. It is hard to believe that since SB 100 teachers are not writing as many referrals. How have they been handling behaviors? She felt it would be beneficial to hear more about the interventions.

Mr. Rouse stated that this report is about statistics about discipline. The SIDS report annually in April about interventions. He will go back to the team and try to compile something more amenable.

Dr. Moore stated that it may require more than internal time. The District invested in a data warehouse, but it means nothing if outputs are not being received. She was uncomfortable with the report going to CCB because she did not know what they would do with it. At some point, soon, the Board of Education must talk about discipline and restorative practices. Having separate reports is an issue. She was disappointed that there was no time to talk more thoroughly about the Code of Conduct that had started with the discipline retreat at the library. All of the questions asked then are being asked now.

Mr. Weissglass appreciated his colleague comments and was curious as to where the CCB was in relation to some of the comments raised just raised and it might find some questions to explore. The District needs to keep moving toward a more intentional use of data to help inform a practice. Without data or student behavior knowledge, he was concerned about the way the term restorative practices is being used in this document. It reminded him of how the goals of the Strategic Plan were lopped on top of what was already being done. Restorative practices need definition, i.e., models or parameters, otherwise it becomes rhetoric and meaningless. Just sending an email is not restorative practices. SB 100 includes professional development of school board members and Mr. Weissglass asked what the Board of Education should be doing.

Mr. Cofsky concurred with the earlier comments. In an arena because of legislation with SB 100, it is critical that there is a fundamental anchor on the input (behavior) data, and he does not see qualitative and quantitative data.

Dr. Gevinson favored providing this report to the CCB for interrogation and asked what needs to be done to make it a better report. Even though the results are wonderful and show progress, it is hard to assess what is and what is not working. He realized that categories were needed to fit in as many scenarios as possible, but it seemed objective. Ms. Dixon Spivy would be uncomfortable not sharing it with the CCB.

Dr. Pruitt-Adams recapped the conversation.

- 1) The district will look at the capacity of the system to integrate data and develop processes between student behavior intervention and results, i.e., reduction in behavior, repeat behavior, and academic progression of students.
- 2) Removing the tiered level makes this report ambiguous and a definition of interventions is requested. How many Failure-to-serve does a student have and who is repeating?

She and Mr. Rouse and the team will talk about what the system can do with HERO and Skyward. The Committee's voice has been heard and the administration will look at how to better frame a report to substantiate reduction in behavior both qualitatively and quantitatively. Ms. Dixon Spivy added that Mr. Spicer has done work at Fenger, will be doing an OPRFHS site visit, and had made a presentation at CCB. He knows what restorative practices are. Dr. Moore stated that the District must be intentional about training for restorative practices. Professional development is not restorative practices training.

When talking about a reduction in behavior, it should not be looked at from one angle as it is about how students are perceived and how one does a cross section of race and gender in order to know which students fall into the categories. For half day detention for failure-to-serve, if the student's esteem is not being built, it is the same as being home or worse.

BrightBytes Technology Survey Results

Committee members were informed that students, families, faculty, and staff had been surveyed in November 2016 regarding reported growth in technology access, skills, and the technology environment in general. Areas in need of continued focus include Digital Citizenship, incorporation of technology into instruction (use of the 4 C's of 21st-century skills--critical thinking, communication, collaboration, and creativity), and professional development.

Students reported improvement in barriers to utilizing technology in their learning, i.e., 1 to 1 initiative. Teachers are adapting to the initiative and are reporting that they are comfortable with learning technology. A Google presentation was made. This will be revisited at the February Committee of the Whole meeting and questions can be sent to Ms. Kalmerton.

Community Engagement

Last month proposed that the Board of Education allow the administration to form a committee that would look at facilities, equity, and the pool. The administration reviewed a draft of a process to create an engagement committee that will represent the broad range of views held by approximately 25 community members, as noted below.

Phase I: Launch (January - March 2017)

1. Create launch team.

a. Superintendent invites a small group of community members to join her and the director of communications and community relations on the launch team. The team will include an equal number of members who led public efforts for and against the bond issue. Invitees must agree to subordinate personal interests for the long-term good of the community. Good response.

b. Launch team determines qualifications for members of the larger community engagement committee who will work together to make recommendations on a new facilities plan. Launch team members are not required to sit on the larger committee. Emails have been received from the community who want to participate in the bigger committee.

i. Applicants to the engagement committee must be able to subordinate personal interests for the long-term good of the community.

ii. Potential members must attend a mandatory pre-application meeting.

iii. Applicants must commit to attending all mandatory committee orientation dates.

2. Hold mandatory pre-application meetings.

a. Conduct community all-call to apply for committee membership, including a postcard mailed to all residential addresses. Potential committee members must attend a pre-application meeting in order to be eligible to apply for a position on the committee.

b. Administration and launch team members will provide an overview of work that's been done to date and outline the scope of the work that will be required of committee members.

3. Application and selection process.

a. The Launch Team will identify 25 committee members from the pool of applicants.

b. Community members who attend a mandatory pre-application meeting will be invited to submit a formal application in order to be considered for the team.

c. The launch team, including the superintendent, will select 25 committee members from the applications submitted. Applicants have to commit to remaining involved for the duration of the process.

Phase 2: Mandatory Orientation (April 2017)

Committee members must attend a mandatory orientation in order to establish sufficient background knowledge and understanding to be effective. Administrators and launch team will lead. Looking for community engagement committee to shape the process. All voices to be heard and all data to be heard, and collaborative decision as to next steps. The administration's job is to ensure data is provided, including reports. Other taxing bodies are being asked to participate. The charge will truly be driven by the committee and the committee will make the recommendation to go out for a referendum. They will also prioritize tasks, pool, academics, etc.

Phase 3: Committee Work (May - December 2017)

The Community Engagement & Outreach Committee will determine its structure with regards to leadership, subcommittees, meeting schedules, etc.

- Determine member availability over the summer.
- Require monthly reports to the board.
- Consider timeline:
 - May - June: Look at existing data and frame out community engagement (format, facilitation, times, locations, promotion, etc.).
 - August - October: Two engagement sessions per month, for a total of six sessions.
 - October: Recommendations to Board.
 - November Board meeting: Approve referendum question if applicable. For reference:
 - Gubernatorial Primary Election is March 20, 2018.
 - Gubernatorial General Election is November 6, 2018.

Faculty and staff will be on the committee. A Board of Education member will be a listening voice, but not a contributor to the session.

One member asked how will they know when something is missing. The architects of record for the school are not expected to be a resource for this committee. The administration has reached out to an architectural company who has done this type of work for assistance. Ms. Dixon Spivy was worried about funding and asked what was to be the output of the committee. The response was that the administration will look to it make recommendations to the Board of Education and it will have the final decision as to whether the entire plan or a portion of the plan is approved.

Ms. Cassell stated that discussion had occurred about the Board of Education giving parameters or a specific charge to a larger committee and she did not see that in this timeline. Dr. Pruitt-Adams stated that it would be built in, but it is not listed in the proposal.

Mr. Weissglass was very supportive of the process and eager to not be involved. One of the potential challenges that he saw is that if this went down the path where the District is thinking about any major renovations and fundamentally the cost will be more than \$25 million in total, at that point the question arises as to whether to use the fund balance versus issuing debt. If the fund balance is used, then one must ask when an operating referendum would occur. He was worried about having a funding conversation that would imply an operating referendum in 2019. Dr. Pruitt noted that the community will be educated on finance and an operating referendum. Dr. Gevinson said that the education portion should come early because the consequences of using the fund balance are huge.

Mr. Cofsky liked the focus on getting engagement and putting in a process. He echoed Ms. Cassell's comments. From his experience, drumming up ideas and renovating the building with \$50 million could have been stopped early in the discussion. He did not want to curb the energy and ideas, but he also did not want to be wasting time that is not actionable.

Board of Education members who knew of people who were interested in participating should pass their contact information on to Dr. Pruitt-Adams and she will send a letter to him/her. An update report will be provided next month.

Policy Section

The Committee of the Whole unanimously recommended that Policy 6:340, Student Testing and Assessment Program be moved to the Board of Education for approval of first reading as presented at its regular January meeting.

Finance Section

Board/Finance Committee Goals Update

Mr. Altenburg provided the following update on the goals as presented:

1. Compensation: Dr. Pruitt, Ms. Horton, and Mr. Altenburg were to provide an update later in the meeting.
2. Metrics: This conversation continues as the Board's goals for the Strategic Plan have not been finalized.
3. Cost Containment: The first DLT Budget Retreat took place on November 29, 2016. At the retreat, the topic of cost containment was presented. A definition was being proposed later in the meeting.
4. Facilities: The Administration will recommend suggestions for restarting community deliberation about an alternative plan at next week's Board of Education meeting.

Variable Pay/District Administrative Evaluation

Based on feedback from the December meeting, the District Administration revised the documents with regard to variable pay and the District administrative evaluation.

The Committee had asked for a goal on equity aligned with the SP's goals and that was reflected in Item H. Provide equity-focused leadership to District 200 planning efforts as outlined in the Strategic Plan, i.e., values, vision, mission and goals. It will apply to all spectrums of each person. Also attached was the recommendation for salary based on performance ratings and the HAY schedule. A range was included. If a person were below the minimum of the HAY GROUP but rated exceptional, they could receive a range of pay of 3 to 4%. The Information wanted to see not just one number but a range and thus revised to provide that data. A point range for each indicator was included in the evaluation tool for each indicator so it adds up to the point range. Someone may have an N/A that would not negatively impact his/her performance rating. The chart mirrors what had been used in the past by the representative from The HAY Group. A range for a quartile is needed as it is outlined. The HAY Group is structured on 3 points: 1) the midpoint, 2) above and 3) below. The premise for this was to build in a range of nonaffiliated positions. One could get a 3% or 4% increase because he/she was not at the midpoint. The raise is not automatic; it is the percentage range that helps to create the range. One member felt that if someone had a salary of \$169,900 and someone else could have a salary \$170,001, and you could get a 4% increase and the other would get only a 2% increase. It should not be that drastic. Mr. Weissglass noted that administrators will look at the comp ratio and give basically the same raise. One member felt the HAY Group should be referenced. Note: As the evaluation piece is closed out, this will be used in the new year. Dr. Pruitt-Adams noted that there were components of this tool that could be used for her evaluation, but it needs more specificity in terms of the superintendent's role. Dr. Moore, Ms. Spivy Dixon, and Dr. Pruitt-Adams are determining what tool would be most rigorous.

Definition of Cost Containment

DLT recommended the following working definition of cost containment.

“Making informed financial decisions aimed at reducing and/or eliminating expenses while maintaining or improving clearly defined student and operational goals and outcomes.”

Discussion ensued about whether the intention was to use this definition for the purpose of setting targets, as that would tie it to containing actual costs. Dr. Pruitt-Adams felt that the definition encompassed that, i.e., what and how the District spends, critical questions as to value added, impact on students either positive or negative of expenditures, etc. What kind of impact is there to students? What is the ROI? In terms of staff, if a new position is requested, then what is the trade off and what is the value added by the position as well as the impact on the overall educational experience for the students. The goals are the targets and identifying the outcomes and then monitoring those outcomes. Dr. Gevinson asked if this implied that the District should be in cost containment mode. How does the Board of Education know when it adds or takes away from the actual impact on operational student goals will be, i.e., the adding of the 5th PSS Team? Dr. Pruitt-Adams noted that a rationale and expected outcomes should be provided, i.e., it will increase student proficiency in math by X percentage. Mr. Arkin stated that the District is always in a cost containment mode. He argued that the 5th PSS Team was value added.

Mr. Weissglass stated that it was a simpatico definition of being fiscally responsible and cost containment. Dr. Gevinson liked the definition but hoped that it did not imply that it is directing actions. If it implies that is what the District is doing, that is a problem. Mr. Altenburg stated that the definition says that the District is doing its due diligence when a recommendation is brought to the Board of Education, i.e., so that the Board of Education can make fiscally responsible decisions. Mr. Cofsky stated that cost containment was about delivering student value. It is a philosophy of fiscal responsibility but also a process of how review to see if the resources were being used wisely. Ms. Dixon Spivy stated that the ultimate goal was a return-on-investment, not reducing and/or eliminating expenses. Mr. Weissglass stated that the idea of slowing growth of expenses is critical in cost containment concept because reducing or eliminate happens sometimes, but in a period of enrollment growth, it is about slowing the rate of expenses. Dr. Gevinson stated that there were opposite desires. The District wants to reduce expenditures and not hurt but improve programs and at the same time, improve the program at increasing expenses. Why not add a 6th PSS Team? How should limits be set? Is it within the Finance Activity Committee model? Is it within no more than 20% of the FAC model? That would a useful discussion because if the District knows it could do better educationally if money was spent more wisely, is that a discussion the Board of Education wants to have.

Mr. Altenburg felt a budget workshop with the board and administration would be good. Mr. Weissglass agreed and as the District is working on the full implementation of the Strategic Plan to do that in context with goal 6. Mr. Cofsky stated that discussions have occurred on the financial metrics as we have to provide guidance that the cost per student needs to be x. That is the framework that would drive decisions.

Dr. Pruitt-Adams thanked Mr. Altenburg for his work.

Contracts

Presentation of Fence Padding for Stadium and Practice Field Bid

The Committee of the Whole unanimously recommended that the Board of Education award the contract for fence padding to Keeper Goals at its regular January Board of Education meeting.

The current fence safety padding for the stadium and west field fencing were up for replacement as of 7/1/2016. The padding replacements were requested by the Athletic Director during the 2016-2017 capital budgeting process. Bids were solicited on November 30, 2016, and received on December 15, 2016. Six contractors received bid packages, and on December 15, 2016, we received one bid from Keeper Goals. Contract Amount: \$42,850 Budgeted Amount: \$40,000. Other approved capital items came in under budget to cover the budget shortage for this project. No increase in the District budget is needed to cover the shortage. This was a request from the Athletic Director.

Authority to Commence FY 18 Fiscal Budget

The Committee of the Whole unanimously recommended that the Board of Education approve the resolution Authorizing the Preparation of a Tentative Budget for FY '18 at its regular January meeting.

Monthly Treasurer's Report

The Committee of the Whole unanimously recommended that the Board of Education approve the Monthly Treasurer's Report at its regular January meeting.

New Business

None

Adjournment

The Committee adjourned at 8:33 p.m.