

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

Committee of the Whole
April 18, 2017

A Committee of the Whole Committee meeting was held on April 18, 2017. Mr. Weissglass called the meeting called to order at 6:32 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, and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board of Education and FOIA Officer.

Also present were Tod Altenburg, Chief School Business Officer; Amy Hill, Director of Assessment and Research; Michael Carioscio, Chief Information Officer; 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 Chair; Chris Thieme, Jason Dennis, Fred Preuss, Ronald Johnson, Jeff Bergmann, OPRFHS faculty and staff; and Robert Wrobble of Legat; Marty Bernstein, community member, and Steve Schering of the *Oak Leaves*.

A moment of silence was held to acknowledge the passing of Dr. Joylynn Pruitt-Adams' grandson.

Public Comments

Marty Bernstein read a letter written by Monica Sheehan because she was not available to attend this meeting.

“Whether eliminating the physical education swim requirement or allowing students to test out are options.

“According to a representative at Stevenson High School, the "modern" high school P.E. approach to swimming is to eliminate the swimming requirement and institute in its place a water safety class. In the class, students take the Red Cross swim test. If passed, no swimming is required. If a student fails to pass Level Two, three to six weeks of swimming are required. That's it. Stevenson is the only high school in the state with a 50-meter pool, and it has no required swimming class for its students. As you know, swimming is not an Illinois high school graduation requirement.

“Over the past year, one OPRF school board member has stated that unless all students are required to take swimming only African American students will be "in the pool". This argument is a non-starter. First off, this is pure speculation on the board member's part, and second, if the goal is to ensure that all students can swim, shouldn't the color of one's skin be a non-issue? To be clear, there are many OPRF sports teams that have little to no diversity. The girls' varsity lacrosse team has one or two players of color. The same is true for field hockey. In fact, I expect the aquatic teams are similar regarding the diversity of their memberships. It is clearly not an issue for the school's IHSA sports teams, it should not be an issue for a P.E. swimming class.

“OPRF students are allowed to "test out" of math classes. In fact, students are allowed to test out of technology classes, such as keyboarding, and they aren't even required to take another tech class. Swimming should be no different; a student should be allowed to "test out", just like at Stevenson High School. The fact is if you, the school board, are unwilling to review and update the antiquated 18-weeks of required swimming for all students (9-weeks for freshmen, 9-weeks for sophomores), two to three

times more required swimming than any other local school, the *Imagine OPRF Work Group* will be a waste of time regarding the pool issue, and it will result in a pre-determined outcome, an inflated need for pool water. It will be a sham.

“When OPRF built two full-size pools for a one-school campus in 1928, it overbuilt. The two pools are an example of the excesses of a decade known for excess. No other high school followed suit, and boys and girls shared the same pool, utilizing it at different times. As a result of OPRF's excessive expenditure in building two pools, the school and taxpayers have spent twice as much to maintain and repair the pools over the last 90 years, money that should have been spent on academics.

“The 2013 Stantec Report recommended one 8-lane, 25-yard, and standard-size high school competition pool in the East Pool/ South Gym to replace the two existing pools. Stantec repeatedly stated that the school's current 11-swimlanes are a luxury for a high school. Stantec's other recommendation was based on the *preference* of the then-pool committee, a stretch pool that was a want of the committee not a need of the school. Nothing has changed since the Stantec Report. It is the definitive assessment of on-campus pool options.

“Now is the time to right size the school's aquatic facilities and expenditures. Every dollar overspent on the construction and maintenance of a pool is a dollar not spent on education. According to OPRF, only 60% of its graduates complete a four-year college degree within six years. What specifically does OPRF offer the other 40% of its students in preparing them for success after high school? What certificate programs does OPRF offer these students and what more can be implemented to help ensure their success?”

“In closing, I am a strong advocate for OPRF and its students. My children have had excellent experiences at the high school, and I want the same for every other student. They deserve it.”

[Technology Update – Teaching and Learning Model](#)

Mike Carioscio stated that his team would present real life examples of what was occurring with technology in the classroom.

Marci DiVerde, who had the 2-year position of a teacher leader, will return to her position as a Spanish teacher in the fall. She reminded the committee of the 1:1 CTIP Technology Project: all students received Chromebooks and are being taught how to use them responsibly and effectively.

Jessica Stovall presents her class a box that has several locks on it and to unlock the locks, the students have to correctly answer questions through the course content. A video was shown that showed the students working on this project. The focus of this exercise is collaboration and creativity. It has gamified education as it uses both digital and educational tools. It has been very successful.

Seniors are digitally recording their legacy stories and using virtual reality goggles to do tours of them.

The District provides students with tools, knowledge, and training. Andy Bolan, an Educational Technology instructor, works in the TLC. Adam Bader, a math teacher, uses a flipped classroom technique with Chromebooks. Students learn about instruction digitally and then ask questions during class time about the instruction. Students never miss the lessons because they can watch the notes at any time. It has changed the culture of the classroom, especially at the time when new material is being introduced.

Ms. Earline McLaren, the instructional technology coordinator, worked with Allison Hennings' college prep freshman bio class on a human disturbance and ecosystem project. The focus was the dedicated

device and instruction. Students were divided into research teams of 3 to 4. These students created 48 slides with explanations. Most of them had never done a research project and no one knew how to cite sources. They created and edited their own videos, adding them in their presentations, and learned new vocabulary, etc. Ms. Hennings credited Sara Rosa and Amber Hooper for helping the students integrate content and become more proficient with writing and integrated technology. Students researched primary sources and integrated actual quotes in their writings. Students received immediate feedback on their writing. Other ways they integrated technology was to include a link about vocabulary to real live movies to explain in their words. Test scores on this unit were much higher. Students liked it and collaborated. Thirteen of these students are presenting at the Percy Symposium this Saturday. These students are still seeking answers to questions from Ms. McLaren.

Lisa Vincent, the assistive technology coordinator, works with students with disabilities or students who struggle with some aspects of learning. She introduced Read and Write for Google, which is a Chrome extension. OPRFHS purchased a site license at a minimal price. It is a toolbar on Chrome that supports reading and writing. It is being offered to all students it is ubiquitous in the building. The top 5 uses are:

- 1) Play feature, text to speech.
- 2) Speech Input, voice dictation.
- 3) Word prediction - predicts word being typed. It mirrors what is on the phones.
- 4) Simplifies text. If one has a digital article, it removes visual clutter and decreases the amount and complexity of the text.
- 5) Highlighting feature - a digital article can be annotated with this tool.

Two students testified to this use. Ms. Vincent said it has been a gratifying experience to put these tools in the students' hands.

Mr. Carioscio stated that the goal is to continue to build capacity for the faculty and to increase outreach to students to create foundational skills. He thanked Dr. Isoye, Mr. Weissglass, and Dr. Ralph Lee for their support on behalf of the ET team, faculty and, most importantly, on behalf of the students.

It was reported that the learning curve for students has been non-existent. Teachers had some glitches but the support from ET made the process relatively smooth. Teachers were comfortable trying something new. When Ms. McLaren worked with Ms. Hennings on her first project, heavy support was provided. The second project received more digital feedback as the skill level had advanced tremendously. Students were able to do their own troubleshooting.

Teachers have been informed of the Read and Write tool via Lunch and Learns. The goal is for every teacher to be aware of it. The quality of the voice recognition program, Dragon, for an average speaking person, is shockingly good. The ones who have more speech challenges need more specialized software. The Chromebook's built-in microphones are very powerful.

[Policies for First Reading](#)

It was the consensus of the Committee members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve policies 5:100, Staff Development Program, Policy 7:250, Student Support Services, and Policy 7:260, Exemption from Physical Education at its regular April meeting.

<p><u>Policy 5:100</u>, Staff Development Program</p>	<p>This policy is updated with non-substantive quality assurance changes. The attorney suggests that the District include the ISBE's Asthma Protocol in its procedural manual. Staff training can be accomplished through mandatory GNC trainings. Recommended for first reading.</p>
---	---

Policy 5:260 , Student Teachers	This policy had been presented for first reading at the March 14 COW Meeting.
Policy 6:15 , School Accountability	This policy had been presented for first reading at the March 14 COW Meeting.
Policy 7:250 , Student Support Services	PRESS Updated policy, legal references, and footnotes to note that student support services provided by the District may include a liaison to facilitate the enrollment and transfer of records of foster care students. The Administration does not recommend that the Board of Education designate a liaison. Recommended for first reading
Policy 7:260 , Exemption from Physical Education	PRESS renamed this policy and updated sample language to meet the requirement requiring policies to identify any evidence or support the Board of Education will require for excuses it deems appropriate. A sentence is added to address certain excusals for high school students that are managed in Policy 6:310 High School Credit for Non-District Experiences; Course Substitutions. In addition, excusal requests must be reviewed on an individual basis in accordance with criteria set for in 105 ILSC 5/27-6. Recommended for first reading.
Policy 7:70 , Attendance and Truancy	This policy had been presented for first reading at the March 14 COW Meeting.

Update on Strategic Plan

Ms. Sullivan and Mr. Carioscio gave an update on the Strategic Plan. It continues to address the Board of Education’s six goals and the terminology was maintained. Under each goal was a set of strategies and actions items, including smart goals, and assignment of ownership. All of the previously work had been reviewed. The challenge was crowd-sourcing. Currently, table groups have been working on their own pieces and it is important that they see it as a whole. A request was made to continue to preview it with all of the stakeholders involved and get their feedback and then bring it to the Board of Education in June. The original timeline for bringing this to the Board of Education in April was because of the change in the Board of Education.

The Administration was directed to bring this forward in draft form to the April 27 meeting if Dr. Pruitt-Adams was comfortable in doing so. Mr. Carioscio stated that this is a living document and its approval is less important because it will change due to the people doing the work will provide input.

Update on Culture, Climate and Behavior Committee (CCB)

Ms. Dixon Spivy reported that a penultimate CCB meeting was held on April 10. It approved 3 recommendations for the Board of Education to approve for next year, which will influence future years. Through the work of the Strategic Plan, the hope was to resume the work of the CCB regarding assessments and inventory which will influence the course for future recommendations. Her goal had been more encompassing, but a need exists to be disciplined on bringing this forward. The work will continue in the fall.

Mr. Rouse stated that questions arose as to where racial equity fit into the plans. A recommendation was made to have an equity coordinator. The administration will vet that idea through DELT to make sure of the intersection with racial equity and CCB. The committee worked hard and met less than 30 times.

Ms. Cassell stated that the committee made progress, but the action steps and strategies of the Strategic Plan have to be set and used as the guiding principles for decisions to be made. Dr. Pruitt-Adams noted that she had shared all of the recommendations made by the CCB with DLT and some of the strategies in the Strategic Plan came out of ideas from CCB. Dr. Pruitt-Adams also presented these to Faculty Senate and shared its recommendations to CCB.

The Board of Education will approve the recommendations at the April 27 meeting.

Finance Section

Board/Finance Committee Goals Update

1. Compensation: No report.
2. Metrics: This conversation continues as the Board's goals for the Strategic Plan have not been finalized.
3. Cost Containment: No further discussion is being presented tonight.
4. Facilities: A discussion on Imagine OPRF Parameters and Proposed Budget is on the agenda tonight.

Presentation by Korn-Ferry

This will be discussed in closed session on April 27.

Presentation of Auditorium Sound System Bid

It was the consensus of COW to recommend that the Auditorium Sound System Bid be moved forward to the Board of Education for approval at its regular April meeting. The sound system bid is being brought forward because of components that currently range from 17 to 42 years old. The proposal to refurbish the Auditorium sound system will bring a number of significant benefits to the District, its students and the more than 30,000 audience members hosted each year. This will also include ADA assisted listening support. The bid of \$563,280.13 is \$100,000 under what was anticipated. This will be part of summer work 2017.

Presentation of MENTA Contract

It was the consensus of COW to recommend that the MENTA Contract be forwarded to the full Board of Education for approval at its regular April meeting. The scope of the contract is:

Contract Amount for Guaranteed Tuition:	\$201,332.19
Contract Amount for Guaranteed Transportation:	\$37,722.24
Contract Amount Guaranteed Total:	\$239,054.43

Administrative staff at OPRFHS D200 proposes entering into the attached agreements with the MENTA group. Its decision to continue to work with MENTA is based on the goal to improve outcomes for OPRFHS students who attend alternative education sites. The goal was to work within the budget and increase attendance and graduation outcomes for students. FY17 costs for alternative education services were budgeted at \$199,346.25 for tuition and an additional \$38,232 for transporting students for a total of \$237,578.25. Actual Year-to-Date expenses for tuition are \$125,198.79; transportation costs are \$25,331.25 for a total year to date of \$99,310.65 expended to date in FY17.

A typo which appeared in the second paragraph will be corrected when presented at the April 27 meeting.

Presentation of Special Education Systems Contract

The consensus of the Committee of the Whole recommended moving the Special Education Systems Transportation Agreement for MENTA forward to the Board of Education for approval at its regular April meeting. The terms of the contract are as follows:

SPED Students - FY 2018 Anticipated Total \$88,848.57; 5 full-time students
Alternative Placement/Non-SPED Students - \$26.64 per day per student (FY 2018 Anticipated Total \$37,722.24; 8 long-term placement students)
Total Contracted Amount: \$126,570.80
A 2.2% increase.

A request was made to compare pre-MENTA costs for services and transportation in the April 27 report.

[Presentation of E2 Network Management Services Contract Renewal](#)

The Committee of the Whole recommended that the 3-year contract with E2 Network Services be moved forward to the Board of Education for approval at its April 27 meeting. This company is integral in keeping the network stable every day. The services it provides are included as part of the contract while other network companies offer them ala carte. It has been an excellent partner. An option would be to add 2.5 in-house people to do this work. While the technicians are versed in networking, they are not network administrators.

[Presentation of Yearbook Printing Contract Renewal](#)

The Committee of the Whole recommended the second contract extension with Jostens be moved forward to the Board of Education for approval at its April 27 meeting. The current contract is \$47,760 and the new contract will be \$49,120, a 2.8% increase. Discussion ensued about the large fund balance in the yearbook fund. A reason was that 10 years a profit was had. Because this is a student activity account, the balance rolls over, and it cannot be zeroed out each year. These are not taxpayer dollars.

[Presentation of Board Budget](#)

The Committee of the Whole recommended that the Board's budget includes the cost of engagement consultant as well as the other costs for IMAGINE OPRF and to change the term "pool consultant" to "engagement consultant". The budget increased approximately 20% largely due to the engagement consultant for OPRF of \$70,000. Previously \$70,000 was used for the long-term facilities plan. Legal fees exceeded the budgeted amount, but that is not expected to continue and this area will be monitored. Legal fees span multiple areas and it was recommended that this will continue in the budget as is, but they will be coded as to their appropriate areas, i.e., Special Education, HR, Business Office, etc.

[Presentation Prom 2018 Contract](#)

The Committee of the Whole recommended that the Pro 2018 contract be moved forward to the Board of Education for approval at the April 27 meeting as presented. A student committee was a part of the RFP process. This contract represents a 6.2% increase, which is paid for by the students. A request was made to expand the student voice in this process. One member appreciated the competitiveness of the landscape.

[Presentation of Legat Architects Contract 2018 Summer Capital Improvements](#)

The Committee of the Whole reviewed and recommended the Legat Architects Contract A/E Fee for the 2018 Summer Capital Improvement work in the amount of \$166,588 and reimbursable fees of \$15,000. These fees are based on the 2018 estimated scope of work which is valued at \$2,242,000 shown on the 2018 Capital Improvement Summer Plan spreadsheet. The work to create and do the drawings was done on the athletic field work, but the Board decided not to do it last year and therefore, Legat was giving a credit for it, but it still has to do a review of the drawings. However, the scope remains the same and the drawings done last year can be used this year. To get the drawings to the bidding phase is 75% of the effort. It was noted that tennis courts were not being discussed because information is still being collected. If IMAGINE OPRF determined that an alternative

site for the tennis courts was necessary, then the drawings would have to be redone completely to account for the new site.

Discussion of IMAGINE OPRF Parameters

The Committee was informed that the Pre-Application meetings drew about 30 to 40 people. A request was made from the potential participants and Launch Team for parameters before launching into this work, so there will be no surprises. This list will provide guidelines but lots of room to move within guidelines. Dr. Pruitt Adams and Ms. Sullivan had suggested that the Board of Education consider addressing the following:

- Total budget for a long-term facilities plan
- Amount that can come from the fund balance
- Priorities in terms of equity and educational programming
- Whether eliminating the physical education swim requirement or allowing students to test out are options
- Whether competition swimming can be either on- or off-campus
- Whether removing the parking garage is an option
- Any facilities options the committee must consider or, conversely, take off the table

The Launch Teams hopes to finalize the membership by the end of May and have solid guidelines by the June Board of Education meeting. An RFP was issued and proposals were received for a facilitator/engagement consultant. Further conversations about this process are planned for next week.

Limits need to be imposed for this 25-person committee. Discussion ensued. One member noted that the first two items were about specified dollars. The last ones were about choices. Areas not included were timeline or sequence and integration with the strategic plan. Another member asked for Dr. Pruitt-Adams input before having this discussion as the last 4 were questions relative to the input the Board of Education sought and the reason for creating the committee. A suggestion was made that discussions first occur with the committee, then the Board of Education, and then perhaps a back and forth would occur. The Board of Education does not want to set parameters that will be too limiting or something that would be contrary to what the working group wanted to accomplish. That is the reason for the community-based committee.

It is anticipated that the \$70,000 and \$20,000 for facilities and referendum consultants would suffice for the entire process. However, other costs for advertising, mailings, food, supplies, phone survey, etc., are not included. Those costs will be incurred over 3 years.

Dr. Gevinson felt the District already had significant information regarding this process and he would be happy to have a discussion and set parameters immediately. Ms. Cassell concurred that the budgetary parameter is a priority. The LTFP had parameters but the committee did not stay within those parameters. A set idea needs to be communicated to the group and to the consultant that the number is a hard stop. In addition to getting feedback from the committee, she asked for feedback from the administration before she would be comfortable making a decision.

A question was asked if the District had looked at the PE swim requirement.

Mr. Altenburg will be reviewing the Forecast 5 data with Dr. Pruitt-Adams and then bring it to the Board of Education. If necessary, the District would look to going for a capital referendum in November 2018, which is 15 months from now. The length of this plan will depend on the budget. Last year, the 10-year plan was pared down to 5-year plan.

Mr. Weissglass asked if the Board should help frame the guidelines around this before the committee begins to work? Research on testing out of PE is a piece of information that is needed. He suggested someone facilitate that discussion with the Board. He believed the new Board of Education should be providing guidelines but he would like to offer his thoughts as a discussion item at the April 27 meeting or in writing. What are the tradeoffs with different scenarios? What needs to get done in next decade? What will the school ask of the community? Whatever decisions are made, they cannot be made in isolation of the operating referendum. The Board of Education will defer to Dr. Pruitt-Adams as to whether she would like to hear Mr. Weissglass and Dr. Gevinson's thoughts about the OPRF IMAGINE parameters at the April 27 meeting or in writing.

Adjournment

At 8:25 p.m., Ms. Dixon Spivy moved to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Mr. Arkin. A voice vote resulted in all ayes.

Submitted by Gail Kalmerton
Clerk of the Board