

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

Committee of the Whole
March 14, 2017

A Committee of the Whole meeting was held on March 14, 2017, Mr. Weissglass called the meeting called to order at 6:37 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members present were Thomas F. Cofsky, Fred Arkin, Jennifer Cassell, Dr. Steve Gevinson, Dr. Jackie Moore, Sara Dixon Spivy, and Jeff Weissglass. Dr. Joylynn Pruitt-Adams, Superintendent, and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the BOE and FOIA Officer.

Also present were Tod Altenburg, Chief School Business Official; 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; and Dr. Gwen Walker-Qualls, Director of Pupil Support Services.

Visitors: Sheila Hardin, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair; Latonia Jackson, Andrea Riles, Regina Topf, and Jeremy Powell, John Stelzer, Beth Wangelin, Sara Gierhahn, Lee Williams, employment specialist, Dominique Dial, and Craig Larson, Fred Preuss, Jeff Bergmann, OPRFHS faculty and staff; Rob Wrobbles of Legat Architects; Promise Anderson, Alexis Chandler, Kayla Locke, Adrianna Orr, Malcolm Crawford, Patrick Chapman, Myles Adams, Roland Royal III, Ishana, students; Attorney Tejas Shah of Franczek Radelet, Mory Ruiz-Velasco, Executive Director of P.A.S.O.

MSAN Student Conference Report

For many years OPRFHS students have participated in the MSAN student conferences. This year the conference was held October 12–15, 2016 in Chapel Hill, North Carolina and was hosted by Chapel Hill-Carrboro City Schools. Latonia Jackson, Andrea Riles, and Jeremy Powell served as chaperones of the students who attended the conference. Students attending the conference were Promise Anderson, Alexis Chandler, Kayla Locke, Adrianna Orr, Malcolm Crawford, Patrick Chapman, Myles Adams, and Roland Royal III.

The title of the 2016 MSAN student conference was “Every Step Leaves a Trail.” The students in attendance at this year’s conference heard keynote presentations on the power of student voice and the power of student equity. They took campus tours of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and Duke University and took part in several team building activities. Student evaluations of the conference indicate that participants felt engaged and completed the conference equipped to start to address issues back in their school communities. The OPRFHS MSAN students are developing action strategies that address the way we talk about and live race within our school community. By participating in the Network and supporting students focused on these issues, we hope that this work will spread throughout our community.

The students testified to the great opportunity that this was and they were grateful to the Board of Education for its support. One of the students had attended for 3 years, others only once. They encouraged continued conversations about increasing placement of students in AP classes. Getting students to be motivated and do well is a problem and more peer mentoring would be helpful. The students in the Leadership and Launch Program are mentoring students who did not have the motivation and they are now seeing the importance of taking academics seriously.

The Action Plan is:

MSAN After Hours

- Who: Students seeking a safe space to learn, study, and grow with their peers.
- What: A safe space where students study, work on assignments and receive assistance from peer tutors and other staff members while creating camaraderie amongst peers. Not all students work well in the tutoring center, albeit it is a quiet space. Many get discouraged because they don't want to look not smart.
- When: Mondays and Thursdays from 3:04-5:00 PM.
- Where: Tutoring Center (ISCR Room)
- Why: While gaining a sense of belonging, students are able to learn, study, and have meaningful discussion in a safe/judge-free environment, ultimately improving academic performance.

Where Do We Go From Here?

- Students of color comfortable with the supports OPRFHS already has in place.
- MSAN collaboration with other divisions to get more students of color involved in co-curriculars/events/activities
- Leadership/Empowerment Group for those who apply and agree with terms.

Ms. Latonia Jackson is the point person for this work. Ms. Riles stated that the Board has supported this endeavor and she asked it to remain open and transparent so that when an idea comes to her, she would like to bring it in the same exact way. She asked that the Board of Education allow to the students to make mistakes. If something does not work, tell them.

Public Comments

Ms. Velasco, attorney, and executive director of P.A.S.O., which serves all western suburbs and has worked with organizations in Oak Park on immigrants who feel targeted. She has practiced law for 20 years and is a parent of an OPRFHS graduate and of a daughter coming from Brooks Elementary School. The issues on the ground in Oak Park are that families are living in fear. She hears from parents every day about people making plans to have someone care for their children when they have to leave. She reported that 6 parents were arrested in Bensenville and the very next day 80 children did not show up for school. She offered her support or assistance in developing a policy or procedure for the school. She is also working with the Villages of Melrose Park, Oak Park, Berwyn, and River Forest on this as well. A policy or procedure would not violate any laws and it would allow families to feel their children were safe in school. This is also being pushed at the state level.

Minutes

Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the Committee of the Whole minutes of February 14, 2017; seconded by Ms. Dixon Spivy. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

[Preview of 2017-18 Professional Development Plan](#)

Members of the Professional Development Oversight Committee (DPOC) have been working since the fall of the current school year to draft a new version of our professional development plan for certified staff. With the completion of our five-year rotation for learning strands we have built foundations in literacy, data-driven problem solving, assessment for learning, social-emotional learning, and racial equity. The plan for 2017-18 will include continued work in Teacher Collaboration Teams (TCTs) and in racial equity, dedicated time for school culture and climate work, and an expanded instructional coaching component.

Faculty had provided their feedback on PD for the second year. Several levels of staff were involved in the discussion, i.e., the PDOC, Faculty Senate, Building Leadership Team, and the District Leadership Team. Next year's plan is a transition from some things and a continuation of other things.

The transition piece is a shift from learning strands (strands) to instructional coaching (a 1.6 FTE increase), as a reflection that the experience with learning strands, namely that a model incorporating nine hours of large-group instruction spread over the course of a school year, did not result in consistent, substantive change in teacher practice. A common theme in feedback from faculty members has been the interest in continuous improvement that is teacher-driven and relevant, with ongoing support and time for practice, feedback, and reflection. Consistent, targeted, differentiated peer coaching will provide ongoing support for teachers implementing a school-wide initiative (e.g. technology integration, literacy, social-emotional learning, culturally proficient instruction, restorative justice) and targeted support for divisional/TCT/teacher initiatives. One or more coaches will be available each period of the school day to work with individual teachers as well as with TCTs. The team will consist of eight instructional coaches, each of whom will have a .4-release for coaching, with the following criteria for selection: 1) Demonstrated expertise in a broad range of instructional skills 2) Deep expertise in one or more areas aligned with the school's PD goals; and 3) Overall fit of individuals' areas of expertise to create a team with deep and broad knowledge. Coaches will be selected based on criteria. Hopefully, a team will be developed based on an individual's expertise in literacy, technology, SEL, culturally proficient, etc., and they then would be developers of those skills in others.

The faculty survey identified several themes that were an interest in PD, relevant to the high school. Some strand participants felt the experience was good and relevant, while others did not feel as strongly about it; it was more of a teacher interest. With coaches, teachers can express an interest in an area and get feedback on how to engage with students and reflect on how they are implementing it. It can serve both building and individual interests. Note: Jessica Stovall would probably be involved in cultural competency. Approximately 40 teachers, staff, and administrators will participate in weekly training to prepare to lead CARE Teams (Collaborative Action Research for Equity) beginning in 2018-19. CARE team leaders- in-training will help to facilitate seven 60-90 minute racial equity discussions with their colleagues in groups of 15-25 participants. Summer 2017 workshops for TCT leaders and AP teachers –should include a racial equity component. The Pacific Education Group protocol will be used as a framework for sustaining discussions about race and practices with students' experiences with professionals and families and protocol will give a way to do that. Board of Education members asked for materials on CARE Teams.

Instructional coaches will be available every period of the day, rather than just during lunch time. They will present at division meetings, at TCT meetings and/or work with a division or team. The goal is to have a number of people with experience in a wide range of areas, i.e., literacy, math, and SEL, etc. Technology integration will continue to enhance engagement and increase ways to communicate and collaborate with each other on a period-by-period basis. The expanded model will serve teachers.

Currently, faculty members do much formal and informal mentoring. The new faculty mentoring program allows for new teachers to be assigned a mentor who will work with that mentee for 2 years. Senior faculty demonstrates by participating in learning strands. All types of divisional faculty leadership occurs but only on an informal basis. Coaching is more formal. Senior faculty members have full-time teaching jobs and work outside of the school day doing grading and preparing. While many people do step up on a formal and informal basis, the administration does not believe it has a formal expectation that this coaching is happening. Coaches have no authority with regard to performance and that is the difference between a coach and a division head. The idea is not to come from a deficit place, i.e., a weakness. It is about going from good to great, etc. Division heads formally evaluate teachers and sometimes there is a difficult connection between someone who is evaluating and someone who is being coached. Coaching is about being critical friends.

The current coaches are accessing 120 faculty members and are working at or near capacity. As the number of faculty rises, more coaching capacity is needed. Research says that allowing good teachers out of the classrooms to share their effective strategies and techniques is powerful. Another option to help teachers would be to increase PD time, which would cause reduced instructional time. Although these teachers will not be teaching 2 out of the 5 sections per day, they will be able to share their expertise with all classes. The intent is to develop a robust monitoring tool; however, the many variables will make assessment difficult. The goal will be coaching and developing goals to monitor to see if changes in faculty practice are taking place.

It is important to create an environment for teachers to voluntarily seek out coaching in a positive and supportive way and to delineate that this proposal is not related to the teacher's professional growth evaluation. The administration hires the coaches and creates a system that faculty finds appealing and students find benefit. There was confidence that coaching will be a desired component of mentoring. Because of differentiation, adult learning principals, teachers in the classrooms, etc., it is the best model. Coaches should be practicing teachers. Other schools have between 8 and 12 instructional coaches spread across their buildings. OPRFHS coaches are at capacity and are only reaching 120 teachers.

STAR (Success Through Alternative Resources) Program Update

Dr. Walker Qualls and Mr. Lee Williams thanked the Board of Education for the opportunity to provide programming for Special Education students. In March 2016, two proposals were presented: 1) School Refusal Program to accommodate students who were not attending off-campus schools to which the school was paying. Mrs. Beth Wangelin, special education teacher, Ms. Sara Gierhahn, part-time social worker, Mr. Lee Williams, employment specialist, Dominique Dial, transition specialist, and Mr. Craig Larson, tenured Off-Campus program chair, have been instrumental in the progress of the program.

The impetus of this program was to find a safe place for some students to feel comfortable so that they would attend school. Thus, space was created inside the front door. Students in this program take recovery classes to catch up because they were in the hospital and felt overwhelmed. Presently, 25 students are enrolled and the number is anticipated to grow because every quarter counselors are identifying students who could benefit from the program. Students like the flexibility of schedules and their needs are being met. Participation data was included in the report by class period.

Social worker services are provided to students individually. Home visits are made for students who are unable to enter the building. Many of these students feel overwhelmed and hopeless and have no idea on how to come back into the building. Parents are reaching out to the school for help. Incentives are sometimes offered to motivate students to come back into the building. With the help of the social worker, a few students can now self-monitor their level of anxiety numerically. This data is for the first semester only. Students are being taught coping skills. The administration plans to monitor this data quarterly and is presently talking about students having daily check-ins.

The second proposal was for employment specialist housed in the STAR program which has been successful in finding jobs for 30 of these students. The process includes instruction on filling out an application, resume writing, career assessment, etc. Over 259 SPED students have done a career assessment as part of their IEP and it helps them plan for after graduation. An employability group has been started and Mr. Williams does coaching on topics such as dressing for success, etc. He hopes to expand this to the transition programs.

The STAR program allowed 4 students to return to the building and saved the District approximately \$186,000. In addition, the parents of 9 students agreed to keep their children on campus.

Discussion ensued about what vocational opportunities are available after graduation, as some students will not go to college and want more time dedicated to learning and working on those skills rather than working on academics. Presently juniors and seniors work on post-secondary-type skills, resume writing, vocational interests, and the school administers a survey based on student aptitude. A recommendation was to hire an additional teacher to accommodate the increase of students who after graduation will choose to be educated up until their 22nd birthday.

With regard to the disproportionately higher number of transgender students in the program, Dr. Walker-Qualls explained that many students at this age are confused, anxious and identify sexually. The STAR Program is a safe place for them. Some transgender students have or are having surgeries and taking hormones and they could not handle mainstream classes, so their counselor recommended screening them for an IEP. The intent of the District is to provide them a supportive environment. Ms. Cassell felt this was an opportunity to be progressive and work on gender policies. A documented need now exists and the time to do it is now. Ms. Dixon Spivy welcomed any suggestions that the District had happening organically so that the Board of Education can start to address those things practically. Dr. Moore felt that students who had chronic truancy might also be candidates for this program and asked how the Board of Education could infuse the same level of approach to all level of students. All of these things apply to all of the students. Mr. Weissglass concurred with the language that every student is met with where they are, and that it is a national discussion.

Policy, Evaluation and Goals Section

The Committee of the Whole recommended that the following policies be approved for first reading at the regular Board of Education meeting on March 21, 2017, as presented;

Action and Policy	Explanation
Policy 4:175 , Convicted Child Sex Offender Screening; Notifications	This policy is renamed and the cross references and footnotes are updated to align with Policy 5:260 Student Teachers s it clarifies school code requirements for student teacher fingerprint-based criminal history records checks and continuous improvement. PRESS subscriber feedback overwhelming prefers that “students doing field or clinical experience other than student teach” not be in the sample default policy language. State law does not require these individuals, along with resource persons and volunteers, to have fingerprint-based criminal history records checks.
Policy 5:185 , Family and Medical Leave	PRESS update for non-substantive quality assurance purposes and also in response to some terminology changes in the regulations. Footnotes are updated to match new FMLA regulatory language, i.e., definition of spouse.
Policy 5:190 , Teacher Qualifications	Press updated policy, legal references, and footnotes to align with current teacher qualification requirements under ESEA, and to delete former NCLB references that teachers be highly qualified. This is consistent with ISBE guidance, stating that school districts need not comply with the highly qualified teacher requirement during the 2017-17 school year. There is no penalty for continuing to send this information during the 2016-17 school year.
Policy 5:330 , Sick Days, Vacation, Holidays, and Leaves	PRESS updated the policy, legal references, and footnotes. It included the subheading Other Leaves to include child bereavement leave.
Policy 6:15 , School Accountability	PRESS updated the policy and footnotes to delete former requirements under NCLB, including School Choice and Supplemental Education Services.

Policy 6:50 , School Wellness	PRESS updated policy, legal references, cross references, and footnotes in response to the final Smart Snacks rules and ISBE goals for physical activity. These rules were changed slightly from the final interim rule and the policy is updated throughout to reflect the changes.
Policy 6:145 , Migrant Students	PRESS updated the policy to reflect new migrant student program requirements under ESEA. Corresponding federal regulations have not been updated, but are likely within the next year.
Policy 6:160 , English Learners	PRESS updated policy legal references and footnotes to reflect new English Learner program requirements under ESEA. Corresponding federal regulations have not been updated; but the amendments are highly likely within the next year.
Policy 6:170 , Title I Programs	PRESS updated policy legal references and footnotes to reflect new Title I program requirements under ESEA. Under NCLB, it was titled Parental Involvement but is now titled Parent and Family Engagement.
Policy 6:310 , High School Credit for No-District Experiences; Course Substitutions; Re-entering Students	PRESS updated policy legal references and footnotes and cross references to reference new physical education regulations, added 40 ILL. Reg. 2990. Text that was duplicated in 7:260, Exemption from Physical Education, is removed. A title change in Policy 7:260 cross reference removes the word “Activity.”
Policy 7:60 , Residence	PRESS updated the policy, cross references to align with amendments to residency challenge procedures under effective January 1, 2017 to change to nonresident for consistency with the school code.
Policy 7:70 , Attendance and Truancy	PRESS Updated policy, cross references, and footnotes to clarify current Compulsory School Attendance ages and delete information regarding compulsory school attendance ages in effect before the 2014-15 school year. The Absenteeism and Truancy Program subhead and a related footnote reflect a new requirement that districts have a protocol for excusing a student in grades six through 12 from attendance to sound <i>Taps</i> at a military honors funeral held in Illinois for a deceased veteran.
Policy 7:305 , Student Athlete Concussions and Head Injuries	PRESS has included a section that IHSA schools must require their certified athletic trainers to complete and submit a monthly report to IHSA on student-athletes who have sustained a concussion during either a school-sponsored activity overseen by the athletic trainer or in which the athletic director is made aware. Dr. Gevinson felt that the Policy 7:305 did not deal with sub-concussive hits. The section on concussions on the website does not deal with sub-concussive hits and includes an outdated 2011 report on the sports concussion epidemic. Much has happened in 6 years. The information that is linked to the IHSA presentation downplays the dangers and distorts it, somewhat. Why not suggest that parent and student-athletes watch a more compelling video such as the <i>Head Games</i> documentary by Steven James on presenting the dilemmas that parents and students deal with. The school is not doing as much as it should to educate parents in the interest of their safety.
Policy 7:315 , Restrictions on Publications; High Schools	PRESS is replacing Policy 7:310, Restrictions on Publications, with 7:315 to reflect its applicability to high school students only. The text, Legal References, and footnotes within Policy 7:310 were used as the base for this new policy. The updates are in response to the Speech Rights of Student Journalists Act, 105 ILCS 80/1, added by P.A. 99-678. The Act does not authorize or protect expression by a student journalist that 1) is libelous, slanderous, or obscene; 2) constitutes an unwarranted invasion of privacy; 3) violates federal or state law; or 4) incites students as to create a clear and present danger of the commission of an unlawful act, the violation of policies of the school district, or material and substantial disruption of the orderly operation of the school. It was suggested that school officials consult their board attorneys before prior restraint of student publications. It was the consensus of the Committee to recommend that the wording of Policy 7:315, Publications in High Schools, “including but not limited to educational services” be deleted under 4b.

<p>Policy 8:70, Accommodating Individuals with Disabilities</p>	<p>PRESS updated the policy, legal references and footnote regarding the responsibility of the Title II Coordinator.</p>
---	--

Welcoming Community “Safe Zone” Resolution

Attorney Shah, the immigration specialist for Franczek Radelet, was available to answer questions on the Safe Zone Resolution which the Committee of the Whole recommended that the Board of Education approve this at its March 21 meeting.

Q: Regarding the collaboration aspect, and as the Board of Education is talking about districts and governing bodies adopting these resolutions, is it possible to strengthen West 40 and also have a more global, joint resolution with partner school districts?

A: Yes. These resolutions are about demonstrating welcome to students regardless of their immigration status.

Q: How can District 200 work with Triton, a post-secondary school, and others schools within West 40?

A: Conversation with the right level in these organizations would be necessary. The District could reach out to surrounding districts to see what they were doing. District 97 had a resolution on its agenda that night. District 90 talked about it that day as well.

Q: This resolution is directed toward students, but how can faculty and staff be protected?

A: By building protections for faculty and staff to ensure that they are not the target of immigration enforcement. Pieces of the resolution could be amended to reflect that, but there are pieces specific to students that do not apply in the context of staff members. Under federal law, verification of work must occur at the beginning of one’s employment.

Q: Is the District required to provide?

A: ICE agents can come in with a warrant and ask to look at I9. The District could say it was opposed to ICE raids, but in terms of adopting a resolution that ICE cannot come in was stepping beyond the federal law that says they are allowed to do that. They could have an administrative warrant. An administrative warrant would need to be signed by a judge in order to detain faculty, staff or students.

Q: How can the district ensure that students and staff will be protected off campus, i.e. a field trip?

A: No easy answer exists for this challenging question. When looking at the context of the school, the right to privacy is just like at home. However, if a group of students are in a public space, the District cannot assert the protection in that context. School property is a more protective forum. The community would want a role to play before ICE took action, but legally what is the basis of ICE to act? It would be because of reasonable suspicion versus a federal warrant and engagement in enforcement activities.

Q: If ICE entered the building and the faculty and staff refused to cooperate, would there be any individual repercussions? Would they be put in harm's' way?

A: The resolution outlines policies that the District has adopted. Nothing represents a conflict of federal law. The belief would be that an employee would not be in danger of breaking the law.

Q: For this to be successful, training of personnel is key. The District does not want to

give a false sense of security if students went on a trip. How broadly could this be interpreted?
Student housing?

A: An acknowledgment of a guardianship order over a child does not have to be signed by a judge, and what has been heard is that there is some misunderstanding of what is required in those circumstances. The resolution can be tweaked to say the District is talking about its obligations to student records, standing in the shoes of a parent, rather than individual social concerns.

Q: Is the District incurring liability by seemingly providing information that it does not intend?

A: Yes, the language will be tightened up, keeping it to “policy related.”

Q: Should something be included about training all appropriate personnel?

A: Yes. Ultimately, this is just a piece of paper, but it will take training. What will change is higher consciousness in the institution. However, it is possible that policies can involve if ICE rescinds.

Variable Pay

The Committee of the Whole recommended that the variable pay plan model developed for non-affiliated district employees be discussed with Korn Ferry and validate the numbers.

Questions/comments that the members had included:

- 1) This should not give a false sense of 3%. Depending on the value of the job, the percentage increase could go down and, in terms of job duties, it could be aligned and a performance linkage could be a factor.
- 2) Most of the employees will be exceptional and the District would not want people who just met meet standards. From where do the set of ranges come? 6% to 8% increase would be in the lower quadrant and 3-5% at the higher quadrant. The marketplace would also dictate a change in percentage. These increases would fall on a bell-shaped curve. The faculty would not be the same.
- 3) The magnitude of the percentages in the cells is significantly different from the model presented in January. It makes sense to have poor performance criteria and not have that many people in 0 to 25; most would be in the 2nd and 3rd columns. Within those 4 cells that would be the top four cells in those two middle columns which would be exceptional and meet standards and look at increases of 2% to 7%.
- 4) Statistics were involved in setting that these and the Board of Education wants to target a percentage increase and have confirmation. This is based on the performance ratings and where people fall in that, and some degree of normal distribution. It is critical to start with data performance management. This grid is designed to say here is the employee base based on what the average increase needs to be for the whole district.
- 5) Nothing in this district follows a normal curve.
- 6) The exception is too high.

FTE Requests

The overall FTE request for the 2017-2018 school year was based upon increased enrollment projections from the Forecast Five/PMA report and professional development (instructional coaching). The administration determined before sectioning began that FTE would increase 5.6 over last year, bringing the total for 2017-2018 to 263.6 FTE (258.0 + 5.6). Sectioning and professional development dictates an additional 4.1 FTE over the 263.6 FTE allotment and represents the hiring of a special education teacher, a speech pathologist, a part-time social worker and the expansion of the

instructional coaching professional development for teachers. Savings would be realized by the hiring of an in-house speech therapist versus hiring a contractual person (\$4,000).

Mr. Cofsky was concerned about the student cost. With feeder districts reducing staff, he found it challenging to increase staffing beyond what it is needed to maintain enrollment. If the cost per student was lowered, he supported the request, but asked:

- 1) What is the enrollment increased this is being based on?
- 2) What is the District doing regarding per cost per student?
- 3) How can the hiring of teachers and staff every year be tracked? Special Education is a concern.
- 3) How does instructional coaching align with the administrative and faculty contracts?

Next year the District expects 33 students to participate in the CITE program; 23 students are already confirmed. This community is well educated and parents want their children here for special education services and the District has been successful in collaborating with them. A comprehensive program is needed. One teacher for 33 students would not be successful. The administration must monitor off-campus placements and find ways to bring these students back to the home community.

Next year OPRFHS's enrollment is expected to increase by 132 students, which is a 4% increase. Special Education now has been between 590 to 598 students. Next year, 606 are expected with more students transferring into the community for these services.

One member wanted some kind of model for noting the rationale and data that would give compelling reasoning for going from contracted staff to hiring staff. What are the commonalities for hiring FTE? The rationale? This is the same type of information needed for the coaching positions. The narrative of that report said that large groups of instruction did not result in consistent practices. How is that known? Where is the data that illustrates that point? This would help to systemize reporting. Dr. Pruitt-Adams suggested categories such as student achievement, growth, equity, cost impact on the 2017-18 budget, linkage to the Strategic Plan, etc. The member wanted a matrix to illustrate the work that had occurred. If the process is there and the data is available, it would help, in terms of transparency and communication, as well. A standardizing of the process was needed.

Another member wanted to see a consistency in formatting to show the incremental cost to the district. Another member was frustrated because the Board of Education seemed to have no choice but to approve the request. Last year, some division heads received releases.

Stipend Review Committee Proposal for 2017-2018

The Committee of the Whole recommended that the Stipend Review Committee Proposal for 2017-18 be moved to the Board of Education for approval at its regular March meeting.

Discussion had ensued about the request for a gymnastic club. The administration explained the reasons for not bringing this club forward for approval were:

- 1) Lack of interest. Only 3 students were interested.
- 2) Paperwork was incomplete.
- 3) Criteria for a new club was not met.
- 4) No money exists for this club in the budget.
- 5) A hiring process for a coach exists. The parents' desired coach already has a full-time job with the Park District from 3 to 9 p.m. and working with these students and for the Park District at the same time would be unacceptable with OPRFHS and the Park District. He would have to quit. This person originally thought this was for next year, not this year. Coaches must be covered by insurance. IHSA has not said the students can practice alongside

each other, as it is a club sport practicing at a gym center alongside with Park District participants. The Park District has said that its gym program is recreationally based and it is not interested in kids competing at the competition level and that its facility is at capacity. The Administration has met with the Park District and has reached out to IHSA in regard to this matter. It is not simply striking language in a policy. While the District has met with the parents five times already, Mr. Rouse and Dr. Pruitt-Adams will meet with the families about this request again.

The increase in the stipend budget for next year is \$23,000 or 1.5%. The Board of Education's goal was to increase student engagement. This recommendation based on data. Has OPRFHS reached saturation as there have been sizable increases in this area in the last couple of years? The administration explained that each club turns in a formal application that has attendance, a roster of each student's pilot clubs, and if students were in other activities, etc. The Stipend Committee reviews the application to see if this is the only club in which someone is a member and, thus, whether or not they are engaged. One member asked for additional demographics such as race and gender to be included in the report as part of the evaluative criteria. Other questions: How long does a pilot last? What is the rationale? How many students are participating? At this time only official clubs are entered into Skyward and their data is easily accessible. Data on pilot clubs is not easily accessible. The administration will try to add pilots to Skyward. One member reflected that the purpose of the pilot is to justify the need and the data is necessary.

Intramurals are growing. Currently, 2 people share .5 stipend with one being the head of intramurals. Intramural games include powder pull, dodge ball, spike ball, softball, a more focused basketball program, bowling, floor hockey, Frisbee, etc. SADD was reduced to the Red Ribbon Committee with 1 event.

Textbook Bids and Textbooks FY 18

The Committee of the Whole recommended that the Textbook Bids and Textbooks FY18 be moved to the Board of Education at its March 21 meeting for approval. A question was raised about whether this was a 5-year rolling average. It was explained that the purchase would total \$645,000, which is a 2.5% trend, recognizing a 3% enrollment, filler and rebinding costs. If looking at the \$540,000, it is a forward rolling process, but it is subject to the same process. The \$193,000 is not a savings, but rolled into next year; the bookstore director helps anticipate needs. Fluidity in the projections exists based on textbook need. The definitions are by definition wrong.

The administration has identified 2 or 3 core academic courses to see if the teachers will experiment with electronic, open source, Chromebook web-based materials. Discussions are occurring and the District is looking for more of a negative spend because of technology. Question: What data is available to see how many teachers are using that technology?

Imagine OPRF Work Group

On Dec. 12, 2016, the Board approved a resolution directing the administration to establish a community engagement and outreach committee. The committee is charged with making recommendations to the Board of Education on a facilities plan, which will support District goals related to equity, current and future academic needs, and fiscal responsibility. The Launch Team has been formed and includes members with various perspectives about the pool, other citizens and faculty, and staff. Postcards have been mailed asking for applicants for the IMAGINE OPRF Work Group. Its charge will be to make a recommendation of a facilities plan that will support academic programming, potentially going for a referendum in November 2018 versus March 2018. In the spring election, the primary voters tend to be older, more tax-resistant and less predictable. In November, while more people may turn out because of the election of the governor, the voters tend to be younger,

have younger children and would be supportive of a facilities referendum. Two vendors who responded to the RPF have said that going to a referendum in the spring would be too aggressive and would not allow the District to maximize the potential for success. Should another opportunity present itself, the Board of Education can evaluate it and respond to it. The conditions of the pools are a priority and will be on a faster track than other pieces of community engagement. A conversation has begun with the Park district about a recreational building. A pool crisis plan is being developed.

The Committee will look at instructional space that will support academic programming. Ill Science Standards, are the rooms meeting those needs; technology, not just 1:1, when talking about equity, the District is talking about the whole campus and impacting every facet possible. The Committee will use the current plans as a direction for the work.

One member was concerned about the amount of time the committee will have to study and absorb the issues and come up with a solution. Having issues with the pool in the meantime is a risk, but the Board of Education decided last fall that this was the best and the only course of action. Mr. Weissglass stated that the conversation with the Park District is a moving part. The Committee needs to look at this fully and the Board of Education needs to do the best it can. He believed that broader consensus will be had and thus it will be less adversarial. For him, the more engaged the community is, the better.

Summer Construction Work for FY 18

The Committee of the Whole recommended that the 2018 Capital Improvement Summer Plan be moved forward to the Board of Education for approval at its March 21, 2017, meeting with the dugouts and tennis courts being alternatives. In 2008 the Director of Buildings and Grounds at that time, Robert Zummallen, sent a memo to the Assistant Superintendent of Operations. The memo addressed concerns about the building's old-aging HVAC units and other deferred maintenance of electrical services and domestic water line infrastructure. From the deferred maintenance concerns, Mr. Zummallen developed a long-term plan to replace the HVAC units, upgrade electrical panels and replace water mains. The plan was laid out to spend \$3 million to \$5 million each year until 2022-2023. The plan was approved by the Board of Education in 2009, and work began in the summer of 2009. Every year new Capital Improvement plans are brought forth to the Board of Education for approval. Great success has been had in moving forward with these plans, and our building has benefited both in the quality of the student learning environment and cost savings of natural gas and electrical usage. The projects for the FY 2018 summer work include the following:

- Heat Exchangers 2, 3, 4 1West Gym New Diffusers
- Cross Connect Chillers
- CUA (10)
- Exhaust Fan Replacement (10) and Rooms 419, 420, B7
- Sprinkler Head/Check Valve
- Replacement Security Cameras Electrical Upgrades (TBD)
- Phase 2 Lightning Protection
- Exterior Masonry
- Football Field Turf Phase 2
- Athletic Field Work (\$297K for capital projects) (alternative)
- Tennis Courts (alternative)

The capital projects have had favorable bids, coming under budget, for the last 5 years. Illinois School Accounting will not allow those monies to be transferred to another fund.

It was the consensus of the Committee members not to move forward with the athletic field work or the tennis courts replacement because a decision had not been made as to where the pool would be situated, but include them as alternatives. Discussion ensued about the replacement of the tennis courts due to their age and condition and whether that should be undertaken given that they are used not only for a sport, curricular activity but by the community as well. One member felt that if the tennis courts were not playable they could be closed until a pool location is known. To replace them now before a pool location is known could be a waste of taxpayer money and another member agreed. Mr. Preuss stated that students were complaining about sliding on the courts. The fire department is called to remove surface dirt.

With regard to the turf, the district has had an 8-year warranty and this is the 8th year of that warranty. A question was raised about having full lighting protection, which would cost about \$60,000 more.

One member felt strongly about separating out the LTFP from the maintenance plan, i.e. tennis courts. The District is expecting a life safety plan that needs to be folded into the maintenance plan. The current capital improvement plan is almost 10 years old, but it needs to be extended out to future years. This member concurred with doing all of the lighting at once. Why are there \$53,000 in architectural fees to replace the turf? Mr. Pruess added that since it would be a turf replacement, the company said it would cost \$525,000, which would include 1 or 2 loads of gravel for releveling dips, etc. As long as there were no problems with drainage, he did not foresee the need for an architect if OPRFHS had a national contract for field turf, striping, logo, etc.

Presentation of Legat Architects

The Committee of the Whole recommended moving the Legat Architects Contract A/E Fee for the 2018 Summer Capital Improvement work in the amount of \$218,150 and reimbursable fees of \$15,000 to the full Board of Education for approval at its March meeting. These fees are based on a total capital improvement budget of \$3,192,200.2018 capital improvements only. If alternatives are added, the contract will be amended. The District is presently in the process of developing a procedure for putting an RFQ out for architectural services. It would be part of the facilities plan and the RFQ will go out within a year.

Adjournment

At 10:47 p.m., Dr. Moore moved to adjourn the Committee of the Whole; seconded by Ms. Cassell. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

Submitted by
Gail Kalmerton