

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

Committee of the Whole Meeting
March 13, 2018

A Committee of the Whole Committee meeting was held on March 13, 2018. Dr. Moore called the meeting called to order at 6:33 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, as well as Greg Johnson, Assistant Superintendent for curriculum and Instruction, and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board of Education and FOIA Officer.

Also present were Tod Altenburg, Chief School Business Officer; Michael Carioscio, Chief Information Officer; Nathaniel Rouse, Principal; Karin Sullivan, Director of Communications and Community Relations; and Amy Hill, Director of Research and Assessment.

Visitors Dave Walksler, OPRFHS staff, Steve Schering of the Oak Leaves; Lisa Pintado-Vertner, community member

Public Comments

Lisa Pintado-Vertner, parent and involved with the Oak Park Call to Action, spoke about hiring at the February 22, 2018 Board meeting. Ms. Pintado-Vertner is a part of a coalition of groups that support recruiting and retaining more teachers of color, particularly African-American teachers. She read the following:

“At that meeting, we presented the goals of the Campaign for More Teachers of Color in Oak Park Schools, which are listed on the next page. We presented a petition showing community support for the campaign. We also requested a written response to our testimony within two weeks of that meeting.

“Specifically, we asked that you respond to the following questions, on behalf of the D-200 School District:

1. Will you develop and share with us an action plan to address these long-standing issues of inequity during the upcoming hiring cycle?
2. Will you give priority to expanding recruitment efforts to attract a wider pool of African American applicants in order to address current critical shortages?
3. Will you provide some immediate training and support to all staff involved in hiring so they can further develop and implement more strategies for incorporating the Districts’ commitment to equity and inclusion in all upcoming activities related to teacher recruitment and selection?

“We look forward to your response and we hope you can answer “yes” to all of these questions. If, so, it would be helpful if you could indicate some dates by which you can take these actions, preferably in the coming month, so that we don’t miss any opportunities in the upcoming hiring cycle.

“Once we receive your response, we would like to continue to work with you in support of this important effort to help close racial gaps and advance equity and excellence for all students.”

She concluded by saying that they wanted to be a support to this effort.

Approval of Minutes

Ms. Cassell moved to approve the minutes of January 16 and February 13, 2018, as presented; seconded by Mr. Cofsky. A voice vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Textbook Purchases for 2018-2019

It was the consensus of the Committee members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve the textbook purchases for the 2018-19 School Year as presented at its March Board of Education meeting.

Mr. Johnson reported that the process for selecting textbooks was similar this year to the one in the past. In the future, a comprehensive, holistic review of curriculum and textbooks will be completed in each division. Determining the process and conducting that review was impossible to do in one school year because the textbook adoption process begins in October. This year, each division convened an evaluation committee and submitted the best textbooks for Mr. Johnson's approval. Mr. Dennis and Mr. Johnson noted that cultural plurality was a part of the rubric.

Creation of Financial Advisory Committee

It was the consensus of the Committee of the Whole members to update the Financial Advisory Committee charter per the discussion and to submit it to the Board of Education for approval at its March 22, 2018 regular meeting.

The creation of the Financial Advisory Committee was one of the Strategic Plan's action items. It had been modeled after District 97's use of a community-based committee for input on finances, advisory, and engagement. Its charge would be to influence policy, review assumptions, and be a sounding board for the Board of Education. Its charge would not be a review of the budget or to look for cost savings. The composition would be board members, the Chief School Business Official, another member of the business office for support (per the administration), and 5 to 7 Oak Park and River Forest community members. A timeline for selecting members was included in the packet.

While it was proposed as a board committee because it added a layer of transparency, it could be an administrative committee. Several members noted that transparency can be challenging if a Board committee as it was discovered in the case of the Culture, Climate and Behavior Committee. The work of the small groups was limited.

Ms. Cassell appreciated changing the wording "qualified applicants" with regard to community members. She had concerns with that language as it has come up before in diversity hiring and she was mindful of using that qualifier. Mr. Iseli concurred. Dr. Moore added that requiring 10 years of financial management experience would prohibit younger people from being involved and she suggested having a balance of both public finance expertise and corporate expertise.

Amendment to Scope of Perkins + Will Contract

At the Sept. 28, 2017, regular meeting, the Board of Education approved a contract for \$21,000 with Perkins + Will for architectural consulting services for Imagine OPRF. At that time, it was noted that the contract could be amended if the Imagine process require services beyond the contract being presented.

The work that the Perkins + Will team has contributed to the Imagine project to date has been invaluable. For the past six months, the architects have worked closely with the Imagine OPRF Work Group leadership and members to during the research and discovery phase of their work. The scope of work detailed in the Sept. 28, 2017, contract has been completed. The Imagine teams are embarking upon the next phase of the process, developing options to address the facilities needs that have been identified. This requires a great deal more work from Perkins + Will, as detailed in the attached proposed contract. The outcome of the additional work will be the final recommendations for a long term facilities master plan that will be presented to the Board of Education

this summer. With the proposed Perkins + Will contract including community engagement work, the Imagine OPRF Leadership Team has determined that the services of consultant Unicom-ARC are no longer needed. Ending that contract early provides a total savings of \$29,200 in the Imagine OPRF budget (\$26,000 in monthly fees and an estimated \$3,200 in travel expenses). The cost of the expanded Perkins + Will contract is \$112,000. Of that total, \$82,000 will be charged to the district in the FY18 Budget period ending June 30, 2018. The remaining \$30,000 will be billed after July 1, 2018; thus, it will impact the FY19 Budget. As of March 1, 2018, \$69,470 out of \$138,000 or 48.9% of the dollars budgeted for community engagement consultant services, architectural consultant work and architectural conceptual/design work for Imagine OPRF has been expended.

It was explained that the proposed contract was for consultant services only. Previously, the District had said these services may need to be expanded in order to meet the needs of IMAGINE and the needs of the work teams. This request was discussed by the Imagine Leadership team.

Some Committee members were perplexed with this request as the contract in place with Perkins and Will was for it to have a final report in June, reading from the original scope of work “intent that the Master Plan options and final report will be produced and put forth by the Imagine OPRF Work Group.” And, “Perkins+Will Team will engage with the Imagine OPRF Work Group and Teams at the first opportunity following receipt of approval to proceed and continue through the end of the process with the presentation of the recommended facilities master plan to the Board of Education.” This amendment considerably expands the role of Perkins and Will. What is the end product? What different responsibilities are being added? Was the original contract intent not for a master plan and conceptual ideas, but not design work, through June? Why is the Board being asked to amend this contract? Is the Board then hiring Perkins and Will as the architect? Had P&W reached the point it expanded for its vision, as this contract indicates? How does the additional time and money being request differ from what was already agreed upon in the original contract as this agreement says P&W will work through the end of the year and recommend a FMP with the IMAGINE, not to exceed so many hours, etc.

The administration responded that the first contract detailed that Perkins and Will would produce sketches and material, but that was not the actual detailed, master plans with drawings/options to be presented at community engagement meetings were not covered. The administration added that the IMAGINE team alone, without further information from an architect, would make the recommendations to the Board. However, to present options for the community to review and to give input, an architect’s input is needed. Both Mr. Arkin and Mr. Baron, as Board of Education liaisons to IMAGINE, noted that IMAGINE OPRF had done a great job and they were both impressed with P+W. One member pointed out that architectural services are generally 8% of a project. If this were a \$100 million project, the amount reflected in this contract would not include design work.

Comments from Board members included that this request was too soon and the hope was that P+W would be amenable to carrying through on the original contract and sometimes businesses put in lots of hours on a project in hopes of a further outcome.

The administration suggested a question and answer format at the regular Board of Education meeting on March 26 to see if a better position could be found to set IMAGINE up for success. The administration reiterated that P+W’s work was top-notch. The original contract was to assist and advise and P&W had accomplished that. It had shaped discussion, had been participatory with the work group meetings, and helped developed a list of high schools to visit. Mr. Johnson added that the work that P+W has done has been on a broad scope for learning needs and helping the District range the conversation and zero in on those needs. As for compiling ideas and crating ideas, that is when P+W stepped back. IMAGINE feels hamstrung with not having the conversations to configure the ideas being presented and that is the purpose in bringing this proposal forward to the Board. The Committee asked to hear from the IMAGINE workgroup because this is a shift from their scope of work. Previously, models were presented to the community and people fixated on them more than the

context. It did not serve the District well. Would renderings help? Mr. Poirer and Ms. Kamenista will be at the Board meeting on March 22, 2018.

Life Safety Amendment

It was the consensus of the Committee members recommend to the board of Education to approve the Life Safety Amendment at its regular March Board meeting after clarification on urgency of correcting the code violations.

Oak Park and River Forest High School D200 uses Life Safety Funds for allowable projects under this funding mechanism by the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE). This year two specific building improvement projects will be completed with Life Safety Funds (also referred to as Fire Prevention and Safety Funds), pending approval by the ISBE. Requesting permission from ISBE requires the submission of the attached of documents:

1. Request for Authorization to Use Fire Prevention and Safety Funds
2. Violation and Recommendation Schedule
3. Schedule of Recommended Work Items and Estimated Costs

There are two projects in which the use of Life Safety Funds is being pursued:

- A. The removal and replacement of sprinkler heads and check valves building-wide.
- B. The removal of the existing zone fire alarm system and with an addressable fire alarm and mass notification system in the Stadium Building.

The total amount of Life Safety monies being requested is \$217,200. The July 1, 2017 Life Safety fund balance was \$1,627,812. The new 10-year Life Safety Survey will be presented to the Committee of the Whole in April.

These two amendments are being brought forth now since they must be completed by July 28, 2018.

Policies for First Reading

It was the consensus of the Committee members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve the following policies for first reading as presented.

1. [Policy 2:260, Uniform Grievance Procedure](#)
2. [Policy 4:10, Fiscal and Business Management](#)
3. [Policy 5:100, Staff Development](#)
4. [Policy 5:220, Substitute Teachers](#)
5. [Policy 5:240, Suspension](#)
6. [Policy 5:290, Employment Termination and Suspension](#)
7. [Policy 6:60, Curriculum Content](#)
8. [Policy 6:150, Home and Hospital Instruction](#)
9. [Policy 6:300, Graduation Requirements](#)
10. [Policy 6:310, High School Credit for Non-District Experiences; Course](#) Substitutions; Re-Entering Students
11. [Policy 6:340, Student Testing and Assessment Program](#)
12. [Policy 7:10, Equal Educational Opportunities](#)
13. [Policy 7:15, Student and Family Privacy Rights](#)
14. [Policy 7:20, Harassment of Students Prohibited](#)
15. [Policy 7:70, Attendance and Truancy](#)
16. [Policy 7:180, Prevention of and Response to Bullying, Intimidation, and](#) Harassment
17. [Policy 7:250, Student Support Services](#)
18. [Policy 7:270, Administering Medicines to Students](#)
19. [Policy 7:340, Student Records](#)

With regard to Policy 5:240, Suspension, and Policy 7:70, Attendance and Truancy, the administration noted that it reviews what will happen with a student after fact-checking from various members of the building. In reviewing procedures with regard to attendance, more information can be posted to website regarding policies and this can be reviewed annually with students.

Collective Bargaining is not an issue with Policies 7:20, Harassment of Students Prohibited, and 7:180, Prevention of and Response to Bullying, Intimidation and Harassment. Union representation is present if speaking to that issue.

The reason for specifying certain people as complaint and nondiscrimination managers in policy is because Title IX requires it.

Policy 5:290, [Employment Termination and Suspension](#), cannot be talked about in closed session because it is a policy.

Community input is garnered on Policy 6:60, Curriculum, via the Strategic Plan planning process with action teams. Procedures might shift and changes to policy can be explored. One member was struck by the language as it relates to holocaust, slavery, and civil rights and felt that needed to be expanded.

Discussion on Policy 4:170, School Safety

It was the consensus of the Committee of the Whole to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve Policy 4:170, School Safety, at its regular March Board meeting.

The Board had asked for a report on school safety. The administration is challenged in being a welcome school and being safe. People have asked for metal detectors and what resources are available, etc. The research on metal detector shows that when metal detectors are used, students have repeatedly brought in weapons and contraband: they are not a deterrent. Drills are held when they are convenient for the school; however, the administration will prepare for an impromptu drill at an inappropriate time with resources here to help. More drills may be scheduled. One was held last summer during summer, which had not been required. The conversation is about awareness. The Director of Security meets with the local fire and police departments to discuss what will occur the following year. This year new radios, which now connect to the fire department, were issued because the old ones would not work in “dead spots.” Security staff were trained on proper radio etiquette. The Welcome Center now has an override system so that security staff there can take control of a situation if necessary. Conversations will be had about fire drills and crisis trainings at the new teacher orientation. The District’s crisis plan is fluid and changes. The District has a Safety Committee whose membership includes Mr. Walksler, Dr. Moore, the police, etc. OPRFHS has an Incident Command System, which requires National Incident Management System (NIMS) training, is overseen by Homeland Security under Presidential Directive #5. New security offices must go through this training before their probationary period is complete.

The administration’s intent is to send out another communication to families about school safety before spring break.

The District is in compliance on all state required drills (shelter in place, fire, hard lockdown) for the past 5 years and the District has never failed a test. However, last year a drill was compromised by parents coming to school. Parents are allowed to take children home if they have been given clearance. A suggestion was to give parent groups training on where to go, etc.

Security and Safety staff receiving NIMS, bomb response training, crisis prevention and intervention, active shooter, Epipen, AED, CPR, social media, drug and alcohol recognition, diversity, and professionalism. Cross training occurs for all.

The District uses TipSoft SMS as a tool for students to anonymously share information related to school safety (threats, concern for student wellbeing). The number for this tip line is on the back of their ID's. The Student Intervention Directors (SIDs), Director of Campus Security, and the SRO can communicate with the tipsters. One member asked for a case study about anonymous tips.

The Commandscope is information sharing with first responders who are unfamiliar with the emergency site. It provides immediate access to floor plans, cameras, etc. It interfaces with the local fire department and police department. It can be used to view enroute to the scene of the incident. Pre-plan data collection is accessible. Police and Fire Departments do their own trainings in the building and the SRO knows the building well.

While it is impossible to protect this building 100%, one member noted that some community members were most concerned about identifying students with problems. Research says that most of these offenders have had mental issues, SEL issues, were bullied. They are concerned about providing them with the supports they need through social services, the SIDS, counseling, and working with the parents themselves to identify these students and prevent something from occurring. The administration responded that the District's Early Warning System helps to identify students academically. Social workers and psychologists are available to talk with students from the social emotional aspect. The staff works tirelessly to support students. It is important for students not to feel like they are being a snitch and are comfortable enough to have a relationship with a responsible adult in the building. That is the key to prevention. Student advocates are the "specialists" and the District works through the system to get the students the social emotional supports they need.

How does OPRFHS compare with peer districts in terms of security personnel? Niles has a staff of 28. OPRFHS has 33. Evanston has 35. While the numbers are comparable, they also have additional managers. OPRFHS does not close from 7:00 a.m. until 10:00 p.m. Discussion is ensuing about shifting resources.

A concern was raised about the rotational issue of the SRO. With regard to making the building more user-friendly, it was noted that IMAGINE was looking at that including renumbering the rooms. A suggestion was to use different colors or animals.

One member was concerned about the effect on students of having to go through the trauma and doing the drills many times. The administration said the District provides reactive and proactive help. SWAT teams are not brought in as some schools do. The District wants to be prepared and yet balance that with the educational aspects. One member suggested having debrief or decompression time for students after a drill as it is a mini trauma.

Another suggestion was to have greeters so that personnel knows who is coming into the building.

Future Agenda Items

- 1) Review of Investment Practices - deployment of funds. This will be presented to the Board of education in April. It did not come forward in February because of the changes in the tax law. Mr. Iseli and Mr. Altenburg will develop questions.
- 2) Scholarship Foundation - How can the board support different entities and provide opportunity for streamlining groups, i.e., Alumni, Scholarship Foundation, etc., as they have common ground?
- 3) Memorialize the Compensation Philosophy

4) Board discussion on minority recruiting, a subset would be growing “our” own and creating a vocational program, etc. This will fall under the Board’s hiring policy.

5) A side conversation about raising private funds for IMAGINE OPRF, with nonprofit or support groups.

Adjournment

At p.m., Dr. Moore moved to adjourn the meeting; seconded by M. A voice vote resulted in all ayes.

Submitted by Gail Kalmerton
Clerk of the Board