

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

**Committee of the Whole**  
**May 15, 2017**

A Committee of the Whole Committee meeting was held on May 15, 2017. Dr. Moore called the meeting called to order at 6:34 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members present were Fred Arkin, Matt Baron, Jennifer Cassell, Thomas F. Cofsky, Craig Iseli, Dr. Jackie Moore, and Sara Dixon Spivy. 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; Jason Dennis, Fred Preuss, Ronald Johnson, and Jeff Bergmann, OPRFHS faculty and staff; and Robert Wrobbles of Legat; Lisa Yafsky of Gallagher.

**Public Comments**

None

**Minutes**

Ms. Dixon Spivy moved to approve the minutes of March 14, 2017 and April 18, 2017 Committee of the Whole minutes; seconded by Mr. Arkin. A voice vote resulted in a motion carried.

**Presentation of Provisional Textbooks**

The Committee of the Whole recommended that the Board of Education approve the adoption of the instructional materials for these courses at its May meeting. The English and Science and Technology Divisions asked for formal Board of Education approval of instructional materials that were provisionally approved. Procedures for provisional texts becoming permanent had been followed: 1) provisional textbooks approved in March; and 2) permanent textbooks approved in May. Teachers found the books supportive of the curriculum. These are considered consumables.

With regard to the readability score, the modal reading score is post high school. Approximately 150 students would be reading at or below grade level in each grade (students enrolled in College Prep courses). Relative to electronic books, it is an option for students, but not through the bookstore at the high school at this time. Divisions are discussing how to access this option.

**Student Growth/Teacher Evaluation Workgroup**

This is the second year of using the current Teacher Performance Professional Growth System. The committee composed of both faculty and administrators developed and implemented this system at the beginning of the 2016-17 school year. This has been a collaborative and shared experience. Although this school year as the first year of implementation, the group met sparingly as we cycled identified teachers through the process. By the end of the next school year, all teachers will have completed the process. Briefly, the process of measuring student growth involves choosing classroom assessments, defining the measurement model, determining baseline and target

growth measures, and then setting growth thresholds. Continuing for the next school year, student growth measures will comprise 25% of the summative ratings of teacher evaluations. Following that, the student growth portion will increase to 30%. Each aspect of the process invites the participation of both teachers and evaluators. Maintaining a workable and relevant process is essential to student growth models that add value to instructional practices. The faculty and administrator workgroup have agreed to all elements required under the law to implement the teacher evaluation model. It is believed that the teacher evaluation system to which all parties have agreed includes a student growth model that is both workable and meaningful.

At this time division heads are summarizing their reports to HR. Ms. Hardin and Mr. Prale co-chaired the committee to develop the document, rubrics, and the student growth component, which leads to much discussion of student data and the teachers' professional growth plan. The assessments being used were in existence previously. Work began with teachers as to how they were using it, identifying students who will be measured, and how it would be incorporated into the model. It has no effect on them being over-tested; this is because of a change in the law. The major theme in the committee was to make it useful, not burdensome. Only half of the faculty went through the cycle, so the District will not have full feedback until the end of next year. Teachers were selected as part of the evaluation cycle. Other teachers wanted to participate because of their work on TCT teams and common assessment. The state model is that teachers are evaluated every two years.

Mr. Prale reported that the distribution of summative ratings is on par with the District's peers and he believed the conversation that occurs between teachers and evaluators is worthwhile. When talking about the rigor of the process, students may not be part of the growth cycle; they would not have a pre-test and, thus, not be counted. Some teachers might focus on the students in the lowest percentage of the growth. The teacher must dialogue with the Division Head as to who the students are and what is available to him/her? The number of students could be as few of 6 or 8, but the majority of teachers use a larger sampling. Division heads are the evaluators and have taken over 30 hours in mandating training via Teachscape. A committee, the principal and/or the superintendent can audit the evaluations using an inter-reliability to be sure that there is fidelity to the process. As evaluations are received, they are inputted into a spreadsheet. All teachers have to identify personal goals and work with their division heads. Each year, the process starts over again and there is always room for growth. Some of the questions are more strongly aligned with the evaluation process rather than the student growth process. Individual situations would dictate what support and processes would be implemented for teachers. While division heads are required to do two observations, if both the division head and the teacher desire to have more, they may do so. The summative portion is done based on the observations. Hearing the thoughts of the teachers is important. Conversations are held at the beginning of the growth cycle to determine what to do, at the midpoint, and at the end of student growth cycle. The reflection piece had been a part of the process previously; it is a pillar of the work. Teachers welcome the opportunity to reflect and share what they do with their evaluators and other teachers. One member observed that instructional coaches and the ISS Coordinator are not evaluated from support aspect.

Even though the workload of some of the division heads had decreased, some of the division heads were still challenged with evaluation timeline and its cycles. Every year non-tenured must be evaluated. Every other year, tenured teachers are evaluated.

Mr. Prale stated that people identify with their divisions. With regard to the measurement models, they are divisional and driven by teachers. Things are shared and people become interested. Single period releases help to develop culture.

### Board/Finance Committee Goals Update

1. Compensation: Nearly all of the needed information from Korn-Ferry has been received. Non-affiliated and administrative evaluations for the 2016-2017 school year have yet to be completed and sent to the Human Resources Department (due May 15).
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's Proposed Budget was held later in the meeting.

### Presentation of Insurance Broker RFP

The Committee of the Whole recommended the award of the Insurance Broker RFP to Arthur J. Gallagher & Company be moved forward to the Board of Education for approval at its May 25 meeting.

Arthur J. Gallagher & Company has been the District's Insurance Broker since 2010. During the last contract renewal in December 2015, the Board Finance Committee members unanimously recommended soliciting proposals for these services in line with the renewal date of September 2016. During 2016, many personnel turnovers occurred in key departments that interact directly with the insurance broker which delayed publishing, requesting proposals and running an effective process. The Director of Purchasing and Transportation recommended waiting until permanent personnel were in place to ensure all stakeholder groups would be represented effectively in the RFP process. A Request for Proposals was published on January 11, 2017, and proposals were received for insurance brokerage services on February 9, 2017.

Proposals were received from four (4) firms. The Director of Purchasing and Transportation reviewed and evaluated each proposal for accuracy in required submission information, conformity to the scope of work requested and overall responsiveness to the Request for Proposal. After evaluating each firm's proposal and completing a scoring matrix for each proposal, the Director of Purchasing and Transportation recommended shortlisting down to two firms and bringing the two firms in for an interview and presentation to Human Resources staff, Business Office staff and an Evaluation Committee made up of key stakeholder groups holding various positions within the District. The two firms were: Arthur J. Gallagher & Company and Vista National Insurance Group, Inc. After in-depth conversations and review of materials, reports, web pages, and on-line services, Arthur J. Gallagher & Company was rated the highest in the combined scoring for their Client Structure and Philosophy, Service Team, Client Support Services, Healthcare Reform Support, Financial Planning and Cost Containment and New Client Implementation.

The process for making this recommendation was to develop the scope of work and the specifications (health medical and dental, assist in annual enrollment, wellness, life disability, EAP, VEBA) for the evaluators (all stakeholder groups, i.e., insurance company, Mr. Altenburg and Ms. Horton). Requests for RFP was published in the newspaper, posted on the website, and sent out to the IASBO, which has a buyer's guide. Mr. Johnson reviewed the proposals and if the respondents had the appropriate requirements, he looked at the specific work, including the location, the service team number, their roles and responsibilities, support services such as online technology, how OPRFHS could else benefit from them, their strategy for health care reform, compliance, etc., financial planning, implementation, and RFQ responses individually. Eleven firms received the documents. Four responded and Mr. Johnson evaluated and reviewed the costs and made a recommendation to look at shortlist. He then drilled down on their proposals and rated them. The questions were part of the proposal, the aggregate score was on another scoring interest. The process was clean and clear. Note: the medical expense is \$8.5 million.

Board of Education comments included whether the services that would have been offered by another vendor, even though at a higher cost, would have been worthy of consideration and ultimately save the district money in the long run. The Administration made a professional determination.

Gallagher noted that it could do a preliminary review whenever the Board requested it, even as early as September 19, so that the Board would not have to make a renewal decision just before open enrollment. Mr. Arkin and Ms. Yafsky will meet to discuss administrative fixed cost, calculations, base costs based on funds, premiums, how fees are generated, trends, and the loss experience (the claims), and delineate out the claims that go beyond the stop loss, etc. Gallagher furnishes a monthly tracking report to the District. This is not presented to the Board of Education because of HIPPA rules. The District experienced large claims in March.

The Wellness Plan has ebbed and flowed. Every other year the Board of Education gives money to do wellness screenings. Other districts run wellness screenings every year, provide classes, etc. The District has a Wellness Committee, which is different from the Insurance Committee. Screening programs have drawn good participation and it is beneficial for the individual. The EAP provider was changed two years ago and includes more services, i.e., financial wellness, emotional, etc.

One member noted that he wanted to see a 3- to 5-year strategic plan for insurance. Ms. Yafsky stated that a 3-year estimate of where the District's cost should be is included in the renewal packet. Last year discussion ensued about plan changes and some things did occur, but the Board of Education was not involved in those conversations.

IMAGINE OPRF

The launch team expects to have the final selection of Imagine OPRF Work Group members made at its May 22, 2017, meeting. Board approval of a budget at its regular meeting on May 25, 2017, would allow the work to begin as soon as possible. The total expenditure of \$145,000 is spread over fiscal years 2017, 2018, and 2019; the amount for each fiscal year would be incorporated into that year's overall budget for the district. The majority of expenditures is planned for the fiscal year 2018, as that is when the bulk of the work and community engagement are expected to take place.

Description	FY17	FY18	FY19	Total
Community Engagement Consultant	\$7,500.00	\$53,000.00	\$7,500.00	\$68,000.00
Public Opinion Polling	\$ 0.00	\$22,000.00	\$ 0.00	\$22,000.00
K12 Architect Consultant	\$0.00	\$21,654.00	\$3,200.00	\$24,854.00
Postcards	\$ 0.00	\$12,896.00	\$ 0.00	\$12,896.00
Ads	\$ 0.00	\$ 2,960.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 2,960.00
Food	\$ 0.00	\$ 3,900.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 3,900.00
Supplies and Materials	\$ 0.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 500.00
Postage	\$ 0.00	\$ 8,440.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 8,440.00
Facilities (Non-OPRF)	\$ 0.00	\$ 250.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 250.00
Design	\$ 0.00	\$ 1,200.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 1,200.00
Proposed Budget	\$ 7,500.00	\$126,800.00	\$10,700.00	\$145,000.00

The RFP for an engagement consultant will be brought for approval at a future meeting. All aspects of the community will be represented in the workgroup. Additional funds would be needed for conceptual drawings. All architects would be able to submit proposals. One member wanted to discuss the merits or demerits of the budget.

A variety of people applied to be part of the Work Group including architects who have an understanding of being cutting edge, 21st-century learning, energy savings, air quality, space per child, structure and going forward proficiently. In addition, project managers and engineers have applied. All of those that applied have a passion for the District, but they were not guaranteed the service. The Illinois Architectural Professional Service Act defines what an architect does, part of this work is consultant work, up to \$25000. Once drawings/ conceptual designs have been created, the District will direct its work to a K-12 architect.

The Launch Committee was solicited for input regarding the budget and ultimately endorsed it. One member stated that the launch team was the proxy for the management work group and he wanted the team to feel comfortable that it will have the funds to allow the team to complete its charge.

Mr. Iseli asked to know the scope of the public opinions, etc., from the Board standpoint, so as not to duplicate the work of the architects.

#### Board Budget

The Committee of the Whole recommended that the Board of Education budget be approved at its regular May meeting. It includes anticipated expenses for the IMAGINE OPRF for the 2016-17 school year.

Discussion ensued. A suggestion was made to create a hybrid of all of the information desired in surveys in order to reduce the number of surveys to be administered and to develop a 5-year budget that will encompass implementation of Strategic Plan. IMAGINE OPRF was included in the Board's budget because it related back to the Strategic Plan and the Launch and facilities were out of the Board budget. Historically, doing so would be for the sake of transparency and holding the Board of Education accountable. A suggestion was to add a separate line item for consulting (\$21,000) and design work (\$65,000).

In the future, legal fees will be coded by department so as to capture which departments are spending these monies, i.e., discipline, residency, property tax appeals, FOIAs, etc.

#### Presentation of Audit Engagement Letter

The Committee of the Whole recommended that the Audit Engagement Letter from Baker Tilly Virchow Krause, LLP be moved forward to the Board of Education for approval at its May 25, 2017, meeting.

The Engagement Letter confirms the terms, objectives, and nature of the services that it will provide to OPRFHS. The Business Office has been more than satisfied with the performance of Baker Tilly Virchow Krause and wishes to engage it for another year of auditing services. The cost of the audit last year was \$55,290. The proposed cost of the audit for fiscal year ending June 30, 2017, is \$57,005. The total increase is \$1,715 or 3.1%. One Committee member asked if a discount could be secured for a 2-year audit engagement letter.

#### New Business

Ms. Cassell asked that attention be given to strengthening the District's transgender policy. Dr. Pruitt Adams added that several recommendations came from staff to put more into the Strategic Plan regarding transgender.

Mr. Iseli asked for a list of policies that went beyond PRESS.

Committee members were instructed to email Ms. Kalmerton about future agenda items.

#### **Adjournment**

At 8:15 p.m., Ms. Cassell moved to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Ms. Dixon Spivy. A voice vote resulted in all ayes.

Submitted by Gail Kalmerton  
Clerk of the Board