

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

**Committee of the Whole Meeting**  
**June 19, 2019**

A Committee of the Whole Committee meeting was held on June 19, 2018. Dr. Moore called the meeting called to order at 6:35 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 Dr. Joylynn Pruitt Adams, Superintendent; 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; Dr. Gwen Walker-Qualls, Director of Pupil Support Services; Karin Sullivan, Director of Communications and Community Relations; and Amy Hill, Director of Research and Assessment.

Visitors: Carolyn Gust, OPRFHS Director of Transportation; Ares Dalianis of Franczek Radelet; Dori and Bernstein, Kitty Conklin, Jack Davidson, Lynn Kaminesta, Maureen and Bruce Kleinman, Amanda Massie, Michael Nevis, Lisa Pearah, Kevin Peppard, Mike Poirier, Ina Sennello, Monica Sheehan, Doug Springer, Leslie Sutphen, community; and Steve Schering of the *Oak Leaves*.

**Public Comments**

Jack Davidson requested that the Board of Education review its swimming requirements as they seemed antiquated and a review may have an impact on the IMAGINE project. He suggested changing the name of the high school to OPRF Swim Academy and the High School, as this was the message being received by the community.

Lisa Pearah requested the Board of Education revised its outdated PE swim requirements and allow students to “test out” of swimming. She was concerned about the cost of tearing down the Fieldhouse as it had been deemed structurally sound. Previously the Board had rejected a proposed pool building because of the high cost. If the cost recommended by IMAGINE comes in high, she suggested building a smaller pool. The school’s mission should be laser-focused on strengthening academic programs. She stated that there was no need for luxury items to be paid for by the taxpayers.

Amanda Massie stated that her son was a swimmer and that the present pool size was adequate. She continued that “overspending” did nothing to help with the equity issue and it took money away from things such as vocational training. A “big pool” is a want, not a need. She asked too that the swimming requirements be reviewed and allow students to “test out” of swimming. She noted that previously the *Oak Leaves* reported that Mr. Iseli and Mr. Arkin had hoped that consideration would be given to the requirement of swimming based research and best practices, as IMAGINE had not been given that directive. She advocated for an 8-lane pool. She wanted property taxes in this community to be reasonable.

Monica Sheehan read the following statement, “I’m here tonight to respectfully request that you, the school board, review the school’s self-imposed, outdated and costly swimming requirement and update it according to evidence-based research and best practices of today.

“It’s just common sense that the 18-week requirement, that inflates the school’s “need” for pool water, be updated before building an expensive pool.

“I have requested that Imagine post online its evidence-based research and best practices that informed its pool recommendation, but apparently there isn’t anything to post.

“The administration reportedly instructed Imagine that it was not to consider any curriculum changes, which includes the swim program and its requirement.

“A couple of years ago now, I called some other schools, including Evanston, New Trier, Glenbard West, Fenwick, and Stevenson, to gather information on their PE swim programs. None of them required anything close to 18-weeks of mandatory swimming, and some had no swimming requirement.

“The Stevenson school official referred to its program as “the new high school PE swim model.” All students take a swim test. Those who pass it choose another fitness option.

“Students who need support to gain swimming proficiency take one session of swimming, ranging from three to six weeks in length depending on need.

“It makes sense. No swimming is required for those who already know how to swim, and Red Cross Learn to Swim lessons are provided to those who need them. The “actual” swimming and water safety need is met and in the most cost-effective way.

“Besides its swimming component, Stevenson’s PE program itself is a best practice. It centers around student choice. After the introductory freshman class in which they learn how to develop and apply a personal fitness plan, students choose the activity in which they will participate in each term. There is no mandatory rotation of classes.

“Stevenson’s program is designed for students to develop and maintain their lifelong wellness in activities of their choice. For, the best exercise program is always the one that you will follow. “Stevenson’s swimming and PE programs are best practices and well worth considering.”

Gina Sennello distributed a visual aid that showed an eight-lane X 25-yard pool was all that was needed for competition. She felt this was an adequate size and that a larger pool was unnecessary.

While Dori Bernstein appreciated the work of IMAGINE, she felt that no research had been conducted into the most expensive part of the facility plan --the swimming pool and best practices. A standard size pool was not provided as an option. She urged the Board of Education to review the swimming curriculum, reduce the number of weeks of swimming, build an 8-lane pool, and allow students to “test out” of swimming. She continued that the objectives were not clear and the proposals showed a disregard for the tax implications. A 25-yd 8-lane pool was adequate.

Marty Bernstein stated that IMAGINE was formed to present concepts. Because IMAGINE did not look at the swim requirements, the concepts were the same as the plan in 2016 except for the tearing down of a different building. The parking garage and the south end of the building should not be demolished. She asked the Board to instruct IMAGINE to research what should be current and get this community in line with what everyone else is doing.

Maureen Kleinman appreciated the work that IMAGINE had done, but it was disappointing that all three concepts involved demolition of the Fieldhouse. No consideration was given to building a standard pool in the Fieldhouse. That option is a loss for the community and perhaps more expensive. After reading the material, it seemed that more focus was given to the athletic facilities with less focus on the educational needs of the school. While the “talk” was about the need to collaborate, little had occurred about the educational and vocational needs, and the IMAGINE concepts did not address them. The swim

requirements were not reviewed, and she felt that doing so was logical. She asked that the District discuss amending the 18-week requirement for all students, providing a shorter program, and allowing students who can swim to test out of swimming.

Kitty Conklin read the following statement, “Section 6.4 of the OPRFHS Board of Education Policy Manual dated just 4 1/2 months ago on Feb. 1, 2018, presents Policy requirements applicable to the curriculum. The Development sub-section reads: “The superintendent shall develop a curriculum review program to monitor the current curriculum and promptly suggest changes to make the curriculum more effective, to take advantage of improved teaching methods and materials, and to be responsive to social change, technological developments, student needs and community expectations”.

Bruce Kleinman stated that the real issue to be addressed is who will be the highest paid in a technological society and who will be the servants. He came from Long Island and had learned how to swim on his own. For many community members, the rise in property taxes is unsustainable. IMAGINE will be an enormous project. It will affect many in the community, and if it goes to a referendum it will generate much adverse publicity; it will seem like the 2016 referendum was child’s play. He continued that the Board of Education should intervene before this spins out of control.

Michael Nevins reported supported the Board of Education’s service.

Doug Springer read the following statement: “The Imagine workgroup, presenting its proposals next week, seemingly has but one constraint placed upon it - to work within the current curriculum and the guidelines therein. So my question is just how forward thinking can this committee be if constrained to the current curriculum, a curriculum which in many if not all disciplines will change over time?

“Each of the three Imagine proposals requires a complete teardown and rebuild of the structurally sound athletics wing of the current building. These proposals are not Imaginative. All three include a swimming pool twice the size of Illinois High School competition requirements which drives the teardown argument. Supposedly this size is necessary to meet the needs of the current OPRF PE curriculum, the 18-week swim requirement of all students. The state of Illinois does not mandate swim instruction. What if the OPRF PE curriculum was changed? What if students tested out of this requirement? What if those who don’t pass the test took six weeks of intensive swim instruction? Would a smaller pool adequately serve the needs of the student body?

“I really wish the BIG conversation was about the merits of spending appropriate time and resources on a state of the art STEM lab. Or expanding and strengthening required, inclusive and intensive coursework including trade, vocational, business and personal skills training taught by enthusiastic and supportive faculty and staff. Or other educational experiences that broaden abilities and lead to better outcomes.

“Per the school, the four-year college graduation rate is 60% within six years of OPRF Commencement. What do we know about the other 40%? Where are they now? Are they thriving? Are they doing something they had an interest in during High School? And... just how did those students feel on “College Shirt day” knowing they weren’t going on to a 4-year program? Each Imagine proposal includes many excellent changes to other areas of the building. However today, each proposed plan has turned into a structural legacy project. So please take a look at the true elephant in the room, then ask, would this be, and be viewed as, the best use of resources for ALL stakeholders?”

Leslie Sutphen, the parent of a rising senior, was disappointed to learn that every proposal put for by the Imagine community proposes a very large swimming pool that would require the expensive demolition and rebuilding of the Fieldhouse. After the controversy of the last D200 referendum, she had expected the

committee to propose at least one alternative with a smaller pool that would not involve destroying existing buildings. It is up to the Board of Education to reexamine the swimming requirements that are leading to the proposal of yet another large and expensive pool. In particular, the Board of Education should look hard at the requirement for 18 weeks of swim instruction for all students. She grew up in Glen Ellyn and went to Glenbard West that did not and does not have a swimming pool. Yet, she learned to swim well enough to teach swimming in college. Glenbard is on par with OPRFHS in academics and athletics, yet Glenbard does not see the need for a giant swimming pool. Other comparable schools have succeeded with a 25-yard, 6-lane pool or with utilizing community pools. She asked the Board of Education to carefully consider the swimming requirement before acting on yet another extremely expensive swimming pool proposal.

Lynn Kamenitsa, co-chair of the Imagine OPRF Work Group, read the following statement: “I know we will have time together next Tuesday to discuss the details and nuances of Imagine’s work. But I could not stand by while people impugn and misrepresent the hard work of the Imagine Team – a group comprised of fellow community members and OPRF staff.

“I’m sorry to hear so many of tonight’s speakers repeating inaccurate information that has been spread throughout the community by a small group of critics -- via social media, letters to the paper, and email chains -- in their efforts to (apparently) undermine Imagine’s work and reputation. There are too many misleading statements for me to address in three minutes, but I would like to highlight the following

“1) First, these critics continue to draw erroneous and false conclusions from the wealth of information that Imagine has shared publicly at every stage of our work. They continue to share this misinformation as if it were fact. For example, during presentations at our May Community Conversations, our consulting architects clearly stated that the size of the pool in Imagine’s conceptual diagrams is 25 yards by 40 yards. People who were in that room have repeatedly misstated that dimension. Happily, local reporters are catching on and beginning to fact check such false statements (which may be why they suddenly changed their dimensions tonight); but it’s hard to fact check informal email chains and the inflated dimensions continue to be repeated there. (You can fact check my statement at the 2:11 mark on the presentation video posted on the Imagine website.)

“2) Second, claims about how OPRF’s swim curriculum compares to peer schools are also misleading. OPRF requires students to spend 12 weeks in the pool over a two-year period: Freshmen and sophomores each take one 9-week class that includes six weeks in the pool with three weeks of CPR and AED instruction. That 12 weeks total and that’s comparable to peer schools.

“3) Finally, the critics continue to make unsubstantiated and inaccurate claims about how the Imagine Team has arrived at the concepts we will discuss with you next week. Two examples: A) The size of a pool is not “the underlying reason” for Imagine’s concept of rebuilding the south end of the building. Such a claim is pure conjecture, and it is false. B) Contrary to what the critics claim, the size of the pool has not been a key driver in Imagine’s master planning process – let me repeat that: the size of the pool has not been a key driver in Imagine’s master planning process. Whether a pool is a few yards longer or shorter matters to users, but it would not have a significant impact on a future aquatics facility location, size, or cost within a newly constructed south end. Nor would it significantly impact the layout and size of that south end facility. Critics claims the contrary are, again, conjecture and falsehoods.

“Thank you for your time. I look forward to a vigorous discussion with you next week. You can count on it being based on accurate information.”

Kevin Peppard reported that the debt limit is 6.9% of EAV, based on the last report. That should increase for the next levy based on what Mr. ElSaffar says is the final new EAV. The District does have a cash balance and he suggested refinancing the cost of IMAGINE with bonds and consulting with Mr. Altenburg

and Mr. ElSaffar about what to do at the next levy: They can verify estimates on the new debt capacity. To go for a referendum in November, a decision must be made in August, or the referendum will be pushed to April 2019. The original intention was to have an IMAGINE proposal by August and go for a referendum in November. That timeline now looks doubtful. If the monies are received in April that would allow construction to start in June, naturally. He asked the Board of Education to consider the timelines, the debt limits, *The School Code of Illinois* and the election timeline. As, in the past, all estimates are subject to a wide range.

### **Approval of Minutes**

Ms. Sara Dixon Spivy moved to approve the minutes of May 15, 2018, as presented; seconded by Ms. Cassell. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

### Faculty Attendance Data

The administration presented the Faculty Attendance Data of classroom teachers for the 2017-18 school as compared with the 2016-17 school year. In comparison, overall absences are up approximately 5% with a significant increase year over year in the staffings category (an increase of over 35%). Professional leave also increased over 12%. These absences represent 3.5% of the total teaching opportunities. The new Director of Human Resources may be able to provide guidance on slowing absences. When comparing at OPRFHS' numbers to other schools, it was noted that they might have different attendance requirements, so it is difficult to have benchmarks. Absences do have a cost to the District. Several Committee members asked to have the context to these numbers to make better decisions. Also, Hanover Research provided a report on staff attendance and how to improve it. An absence rate of 10% for students meets the state's threshold for chronic absence. If faculty members are out 10%, how does that differ from chronic student absenteeism? How many faculty exceed the threshold of 10%?

It was noted that faculty attendance had been incorrectly reported on the report card in the past. The administration stated that the state uses data from 3 different sources, which are linked. The report contains raw data from AESOP, the program that manages substitutes and absences and is pulled from Skyward. A subset is then transmitted to the state with a different filter. The intent is to recognize this and pull the puzzle pieces together.

One member was more interested in the trends and wanted to know how many times teachers were pulled out of the classroom to attend Strategic Plan meetings and training, etc. What is that impact on instruction?

### Update on River Forest TIF Agreement

The Committee of the Whole discussed whether to recommend that the River Forest TIF Agreement regarding the North Avenue Corridor Tax Increment Financing ('TIF') District moved forward to the Board of Education for action at the June 19, 2018, Special Board of Education meeting.

The Committee's discussion included the following. The District had received information on the Joint Review Board meeting (JRB) with all of the taxing bodies scheduled for May 31, 2018, but not in time for the Board of Education to have a full discussion about the TIF at one of its meetings. Mr. Altenburg attended that meeting, and he had a choice of abstaining or asking for a continuance of meeting so that OPRFHS could vote. Both Mr. Iseli and Dr. Pruitt-Adams were also in attendance. The continuance is scheduled for June 21, 2018, at 5:00 at the Village of River Forest. Mr. Altenburg's memo provided the basics regarding the consequences of building residential versus commercial and the impact of having more students attend the high school.

The Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act (the ‘TIF Act’) allows municipalities to designate areas within a community that have become blighted or threatened with blighting as those concepts are defined in the TIF Act. If an area satisfies certain statutory criteria under the TIF Act, the municipality may establish a TIF district for up to 23 years that may ultimately generate incremental taxes. For an area to be identified as a “conservation area,” at least 3 of the 13 mitigating factors must be identified. The Village has determined that the North Avenue Corridor is threatened with becoming blighted and that it qualifies as a “conservation area.” The TIF Act requires that the eligibility factors must be reasonably distributed throughout an area and present to a meaningful extent. The Kane, McKenna and Associates, Inc. (KMA) report concluded that six factors are reasonably distributed in the area and present to a meaningful extent. The factors are: 1) lagging or declining EAV, 2) obsolescence, 3) deleterious layout, 4) excessive land coverage, 5) deterioration and 6) inadequate utilities.

While the JRB determines if it makes sense to recommend the TIF, it is not qualified to determine because it does not have experts. If the JRB votes to move this forward, the Village can approve it by 51%. If the JRB doesn't approve, the Village would then need 75% of those present to approve it. Should the high school vote no, the Village can approve with a 2:1 ratio, a simple majority. The JRB issues recommendations to the Village, and it would recommend that it move forward because of the eligibility factors present. The Village is asking for feedback only from OPRFHS. Mr. Altenburg feels that the TIF meets the eligibility requirements.

The purpose of having an IGA with the other taxing bodies is historical. In 2016, when the Madison Avenue TIF was established, there was a proposed revenue sharing agreement. Ultimately, no agreement was struck. Now there is renewed interest in a North Avenue Agreement. This agreement would wrap up the Madison discussion and fold it into the North Avenue discussion.

The 2016 final EAV of the proposed TIF District is approximately \$18.86 million. The budget for the proposed TIF District calls for spending of up to \$50.0 million with an inflationary adjustment factor over the life of the TIF District. KMA estimates that over the 23-year life of the TIF District, the EAV will increase to approximately \$40.0 to \$55.0 million. This projected increase in incremental EAV reflects both enhancements brought about by development within the proposed TIF District and triennial reassessments of all property within River Forest Township. At the end of the 23-year life of the TIF District, any incremental EAV is treated as ‘new property’ under the Property Tax Extension Limitation Law (‘PTELL’ or the ‘Tax Cap’). The District is permitted to levy on this incremental EAV one-time outside the Tax Cap, thus permitting an increase in the District’s limiting rate.

As part of the process of establishing the North Avenue Corridor TIF District, the Village has circulated an IGA that would create certain benefits to the District from both the proposed TIF District and the recently established Madison Avenue TIF District. The IGA would require the Village to declare a portion of the incremental revenue from both TIF districts ‘surplus funds’, to be distributed to all taxing districts pro rata, based upon relative tax rates. The surplus funds would come from incremental revenue generated by the TIF districts after payment to the Village of certain costs and expenses. The categories of expenses that would be a priority payment prior to the declaration of surplus are: 1) Village debt service obligations and reserves attributable to the TIF districts, 2) administrative expenses of the TIF districts including architectural, engineering, legal, and planning fees, and 3) any commitments relating to a development agreement, redevelopment agreement, property acquisition, or public works. After the Village had deducted these costs and expenses from the incremental revenues generated by the TIF districts, only then would surplus funds be available to the District. The surplus payments would not commence until Year 17 of the term of each TIF district, with payments at the following percentages: Years % of Incremental Revenue (as defined by Village) 1-16 0 17-19 25 20-23 30 There is one exception to the schedule above. For taxes levied in 2032 (and collected in 2033), the surplus payment would be equal to 60% of the Village-defined incremental revenue. The payment year for this provision is

estimated to be equal to Year 14 for the Madison Avenue TIF District and Year 16 for the North Avenue Corridor TIF District. Also, the Village is pledging that it will not utilize incremental revenue generated from one of the TIF districts in the other TIF district. And, the Village commits to not extend the life of either TIF district beyond 23 years, without the District's consent. Practically speaking, this last commitment reflects the current requirements of the General Assembly to not allow for a TIF district extension without the written agreement of all impacted taxing districts. Finally, the TIF Act includes within the definition of 'redevelopment project costs', a provision for the payment of a student impact fee depending on the type of school district. For secondary schools with a 1995-96 per capita tuition charge equal to or greater than \$5,900 the payment is "no more than 13% of the total amount of property tax increment of this Act." 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-3(q)(7.5). The number of students that would trigger the payment is determined by the "increase in attendance resulting from the net increase in new students enrolled in the District who reside in housing units" that have received assistance from the TIF district. To secure these payments, after July 1st and before September 30th of each year, the District must provide the Village with "reasonable evidence to support its claim for reimbursement." This is normally done with a listing of the student (by their initials) and addresses along with the District's per capita tuition charge less the increase in General State Aid attributable to these new students.

Mr. Iseli expressed concern that the presented TIF expenses were relatively undefined. The purpose of the TIF would be to construct residential units. He was concerned that there was no distribution of funds during the time of the TIF to support additional students. Mr. Dalianis stated that the payment of student impact fees, highly subscribed, was limited to 13% of the incremental revenue generated on the housing units, which is very low. Mr. Iseli did not feel there were any grounds for saying no to the JRB, but that the IGA was stingy in providing any offsetting of expenses. OPRFHS would get a higher percentage--no more than 27%--of the incremental dollars generated from any unit getting TIF assistance. The JRB is required to meet every year and present what has been done and the expenses. That information can be found on Mendoza's website.

It was noted that the 60% exception was due to debt service being less and it would free up money.

About the extenuating circumstances in 2B, the law already provides that the agreement could not be extended without written agreement by each party.

District 90 approved the IGA on May 30 and had been active in the negotiations which resulted in taking out the language about "extending circumstances" rather than "agreement," while District 200 had not been asked to participate. If District 200 does not agree to a 3-party agreement, it will not exist. However, if District 200 does not agree, District 90 and the Village could subsequently agree between themselves. It was noted that if a surplus were declared, the County Treasurer would distribute it, as it is funneled through the Treasurer on pro-rata basis. If this agreement were not approved and District 90 and the Village of River Forest had a separate agreement, it would impact OPRFHS in the same way because taxes would be distributed just as it would to District 90.

Some Board members were concerned about the lack of communication in addition to the language in the IGA. Mr. Dalianis was not involved in the negotiation of this agreement. River Forest Village Manager Eric Palm was not in attendance at this meeting.

Mr. Iseli reiterated his concern about how the expenses could impact the school, and he did not want to levy Oak Park to cover expenses for students due to the River Forest TIF. Had the high school known about this agreement previously, it could have had a more robust discussion about it.

Presentation of Contract with Erskine Reeve’s Barber Academy

It was the consensus of the majority of the Committee members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve the associated funding for Erskine Reeves Barber Academy at its June 28, 2018 meeting. OPRFHS entered into a two-year contract with Ms. Robert’s Beauty Academy for seniors with Board approval for up to six students to enroll. Only five enrolled, and while the program was well received, only two of the students decided not to stay in the program during the second semester because of scheduling conflicts. The other three graduated. Two of these students intend to enroll next year in the second year of the program to pursue industry certification at their own cost.

The administration wanted to expand this program by adding a contract with the Erskine Reeves Barber Academy and open both academies up to juniors. Representations of both of these institutions presented on a Career Callers day in April. As a result, nine students are interested in the two programs combined, six for the existing program and three for the Barber Academy.

The total cost for these students is as follows:

Ms. Robert’s Beauty Academy	
Contract Term (already approved)	2017-2018 & 2018-2019 School Years Yearly
Registration and Barber Kit Fee:	\$6200 per student
Transportation (round trip to Academy):	\$13,376 (\$76 per day for 176 days)
Total requested funds for six students:	\$50,376

Erskine Reeves Barber Academy	
Contract Term	2017-2018 & 2018-2019 School Years Yearly
Registration and Barber Kit Fee:	\$6200 per student
Transportation (round trip to Academy):	\$13,376 total (\$76 per day for 176 days)
Total requested funds for six students:	\$50,376 Total request: \$100,752

This program is a pilot program for cosmetology. It is an additional pathway for students.

From an equity standpoint, it is important to make people aware of this possibility. When does it become more cost effective to keep it in-house?

Ms. Cassell supported this program as the high school should have more vocational programming. She stressed the importance of supporting students with their scheduling so that they can realize the full benefits of the program.

Originally the program was only open to seniors, and the students bore the cost for the second year after they graduated from OPRFHS. Now the high school is proposing to pay for the entire two-year program, beginning in the student’s junior year.

Presentation of Youth Football’s Use of Stadium

It was the consensus of the Committee members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve the OPRF Youth Football’s request to use the OPRFHS stadium and field gratis at its Special Board meeting following the committee meeting. This annual request is from this feeder group. The group will provide a certificate of insurance. It pays a reduced cost for the custodian and use of the facilities. The group has agreed to work with the community on start and end times, and the use of horns.

Presentation of Renaissance Learning Contract Renewal

It was the consensus of the majority of the Committee members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve the Renaissance Learning (RL) renewal subscription at its regular June 28, 2018 meeting

at the cost of \$4,062.40 for three years. The District has used Renaissance Learning's STAR assessment products since 2014. All freshmen are assessed three times per year using the STAR Math and STAR Reading tests, and students in a math or reading intervention are assessed two additional times. Initial test results are used very early in each school year to confirm or adjust course enrollments; subsequent results enable teachers and our MTSS coordinator to monitor student growth and adjust individual students' support in reading and math. Beginning in 2016, we have also assessed all incoming freshmen using STAR Math and STAR Reading and have used the results as one of several data points to make course recommendations.

The administration will bring to the Board of Education a program evaluation timeline and ask it to approve program evaluations every two years, which can be aligned to contract renewals, etc.

#### Presentation of CLIC Renewal of Property, Casualty, Liability and Worker's Compensation

It was the consensus of the majority of Committee members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve the renewals of the Property, Casualty, Liability and Worker's Compensation Insurance at its regular June 28, 2018 Board of Education meeting.

Oak Park and River Forest High School District 200 is a member of CLIC, the Collective Liability Insurance Cooperative. CLIC was formed over 35 years ago. As of the May 17, 2018 renewal meeting, it now includes over 180 school districts ensuring over 800 school buildings, almost 500,000 students and just over 4,000 vehicles and property values more than \$21 billion. Each member school district has a deductible specific to the coverage. This insurance pool is partially self-insured, and then insurance carriers provide the remaining protection.

The CLIC administrator is Arthur J. Gallagher Risk Management Service. Each year Gallagher reviews the coverage with the member districts, addresses legal requirements for the plan and then releases the coverage to the marketplace. Gallagher also provides safety inspections and Worker's Compensation training for our employee groups to mitigate risk exposure. Training is provided to Buildings and Grounds and Food Service personnel on a regular basis. The total insurance package will decrease by \$12,690 or 2.28%. Also included summary report workers' comp for the last 13 years and as of 12/31 only one open claim.

Mr. Altenburg will explore:

- 1) Whether the two losses on the loss ratio and summary report are workers' comp or property liability, as they did not match the workers' comp loss ratio report, which does not show any reserves;
- 2) Why did the premium go down 3.5% as the payroll had increase and the experience modification went up .04%?
- 3) Is the \$1 million limit on cyber-breaching adequate?

#### Presentation of All-Ways Medical Carrier Contract Renewal

It was the consensus of the majority of the Committee members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve the contract with All-Ways Medical Carrier at its regular June 28, 2018 meeting.

The District has utilized All-Ways Medical Carriers since 2005. For the 2018-2019 school year, there continues to be medically fragile students who require medical car transport as dictated by the students' IEP. Three students will use these services next year at the cost of \$207.05 per day with no aide (FY 2019 Projected \$36,647.85; 1 full-time student); \$271.63 per day with an aide (FY 2019 Projected \$102,133; 2 full-time students). The total cost will be \$138,780.85.

Over the past four years, the services All-Ways was for no more than four students. Questions were raised about what it would cost to have the appropriate facilities and staff available to these students on campus, as it was a risk to move these students around so much.

#### Presentation of Grand Prairie Transit Special Education Transportation Contract Renewal

It was the consensus of the majority of the Committee members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve the contract extension with Grand Prairie Transit at its regular June 28, 2018 meeting.

At the end of last fiscal year, the Grand Prairie Transit contract for Special Education bus service expired. The contract was extended for the fiscal year 2018 with a 6 percent increase in cost. A school district is permitted to extend its contract on an annual basis if the district has not been solicited to bid out the service. To date, the District has not been solicited by any other school bus companies to bid out the service. Surrounding school districts have gone through the transportation bid process with the resulting increase ranging between 10 and 35 percent. Grand Prairie Transit is requesting a 9 percent increase over fiscal year 2017/2018.

One reason for the large increase in cost experienced by surrounding districts is a nationwide shortage of school bus drivers which has impacted the Chicagoland area. As a result of this shortage, school bus companies have had to offer incentives to retain existing drivers, i.e., hourly wage increases, attendance bonuses, safety bonuses and retention bonuses. Retention of experienced drivers is of paramount importance. First Student is going to pay their drivers \$20 per hour. Being greeted by the same person on a consistent day-to-day basis is of comfort to students and parents alike. In the event a driver leaves Grand Prairie Transit, the company employs a full-time recruiter so that their driver pool is sufficient to meet route demands.

Surrounding districts that have gone out to bid for this service found that the lowest increase was 10% and the highest was around 30%.

Mr. Iseli believes it is important to go out for bid periodically. Note: OPRFHS receives over \$1 million in transportation reimbursement from the state of Illinois.

#### Presentation of First Student Transportation for Field Trips and Extracurricular Trips Contract Renewal

It was the consensus of the Committee members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve the one-year contract extension with First Student at its regular June 28 meeting. The contract with First Student allows for additional one-year extensions. This contract requests a 2.5% increase to its hourly charge and price per mile for fiscal year 2019. The per mile cost only applies to trips over 150 miles away.

As First Student is contracted only for extracurricular or field trips, part of their contract calls for a school run conflict fee in the event that a field trip or extracurricular trip pick up and/or drop off time falls between 7:00 and 9:00 a.m. or 2:00 and 4:30 p.m. The conflict fee is \$79.82 per occurrence at present. First Student representatives have agreed to lower that fee to \$30 per occurrence for the fiscal year 2019. To date, the District has paid 147 school run conflict fees. The lower conflict fee will result in savings to the District of \$7,323.54.

The term of this contract is from July 1, 2018, to June 30, 2019, at a new contractual rate of \$333,067.61 per year.

### Presentation of BOOM Entertainment Contract for Homecoming DJ Services

It was the consensus of the Committee members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve the contract with BOOM Entertainment as the DJ for the homecoming dance at its regular June 28, 2018 meeting. The contract reflects a 1.8% increase over the last two years.

2016 Cost: \$29,888.40

2017 Cost: \$29,888.40 (0%)

2018 Cost: \$29,345.90 (-1.8%)

The school has had very positive experiences with this company. OPRFHS students were charged \$20 per ticket and external students were charged \$30 per ticket. Student Council received \$40,000 in revenue last year and used some of its surplus to support other clubs with funds, etc.

### Presentation of Prom 2019 Hotel Contract

It was the consensus of the Committee members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve the contract with Hyatt Regency Chicago on Wacker Drive for banquet services and beverage and beverage for Prom in 2019. The total cost will be \$62,650, which is the same as this year's cost.

Each year Oak Park and River Forest High School juniors and seniors are invited to attend Prom. OPRFHS has been working with the Hyatt on Wacker Drive in Chicago for many years and appreciates the great service provided. In 2017 about 700 students attended Prom, and the cost was \$100 per student. In 2018 the cost of a Prom ticket for OPRFHS students was increased to \$110 to cover the costs of the evening, and 775 students attended Prom. This year is the first time in a few years the cost increased, and the plan is to maintain this price next year.

Any student who wants to go to Prom can do so through the support of Student Council, the use of Greer Funds out of the principal's office, etc.

This contract was bid out two years ago and it was found that no other venue could compare with the services that the Hyatt provides.

### Presentation of Center for Psychological Services Contract

It was the consensus of the majority of the Committee members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve the contract with Center for Psychological Services, LLC at its regular June 28, 2018 meeting.

Oak Park and River Forest High School Special Education Department provides services to a large number of students with special needs as defined by their Individual Education Plans (IEP's). While the District employs professionals to provide students with the services required, there are times when the nature and/or volume of services necessary exceed the capacity of our staff. The District contracts with outside service providers to cover the additional need. This past school year the special education enrollment increased, resulting in the need for additional psychological services. This increased enrollment trend is continuing for the 2018-19 school year.

Contract Term: July 1, 2018 thru June 30, 2019

Contract Amount: \$48,400; \$550 per day, 2 days per week for 44 weeks \*\*No increase in daily rate\*\*

Previous Contract Amount: \$24,200; \$550 per day, 1 day per week for 44 weeks

Over 633 students were enrolled in the Special Education this year and next year it will grow to 653 students. The number of social work services have also increased for 371 students and over 1,000 meetings were held as well as summer evaluations increasing to 16 this summer. Trend data was

presented for the last 3 years. The number of screenings has increased from in the 30's to the 50's. The administration needs to be proactive and have resources in place in order to stay in compliance. The current staff is working double time to get these services completed.

The actual usage was 41 days and the contract, not including the extended school year which is 16 days, is for 34 days. The contract has not been exceeded because funds are allocated for the summer work. Questions: is the Board of Education approving up to a certain amount? If that amount is exceeded is it based on rate or dollars? The additional day is being requested because last year an additional day of services was added, but that proved to be insufficient. The District has yet to exceed the contract, because funds were allocated for the summer. The purpose of this contract is to have consistency in personnel working with the students and families. Additional work has been supplied by in-house people by working at night and not getting paid.

#### Presentation of Occupational Therapist Services Health Pro Contract

It was the consensus of the majority of the Committee members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve the contract with HealthPRO Heritage LLC for occupational therapy services at its regular June 28, 2018 meeting.

Oak Park and River Forest High School Special Education Department provides services to a large number of students with special needs as defined by their Individual Education Plans (IEP's). While the District employs professionals to provide students with the services required, there are times when the nature and volume of services necessary exceed the capacity of our staff. The District contracts with outside service providers to cover the additional need.

Contract Term: July 1, 2018, thru June 30, 2019

Contract Amount: \$68,376; \$74 per hour 3 days per week or 21 hours per week for 44 weeks

\*\*No increase in hourly rate\*\*

Previous Contract Amount: \$68,376; \$74 per hour 3 days per week or 21 hours per week for 44 weeks

#### Presentation of Physical Therapist Services Supplemental Health Contract

It was the consensus of the majority of the Committee members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve the contract with Supplemental Health Care for physical therapy services at its regular June 28, 2018 meeting.

Oak Park and River Forest High School Special Education Department provides services to a large number of students with special needs as defined by their Individual Education Plans (IEP's). While the District employs professionals to provide students with the services required, there are times when the nature and volume of services necessary exceed the capacity of our staff. The District contracts with outside service providers to cover the additional need.

Contract Term: July 1, 2018, thru June 30, 2019

Contract Amount: \$66,741; \$72.23 per hour, three days per week or 21 hours per week for 44 weeks

\*\*An increase of 3% in hourly rate\*\*

Previous Contract Amount: \$65,429; \$70.81 per hour, three days per week or 21 hours per week for 44 weeks

Supplemental Health has provided the same person for multiple years, so there has been consistency for the students. While a suggestion was made to explore consolidating these services with the feeder districts, the number of minutes required by the IEP may limit the availability of one person; however, sharing the cost of multiple therapists might be something to explore. Also, these types of positions would typically be on the teacher salary schedule.

Presentation of Social Worker Services (Lisa Garvin) Contract

It was the consensus of the majority of the Committee members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve the contract with Lisa Garvin for social worker services at its regular June 28, 2018 meeting.

Oak Park and River Forest High School Special Education Department provides services to a large number of students with special needs as defined by their Individual Education Plans (IEP’s). While the District employs professionals to provide students with the services required, there are times when the nature and volume of services necessary exceed the capacity of our staff. The District contracts with outside service providers to cover the additional need. This past school year, the special education enrollment increased, resulting in the need for additional social work services. This ithe ncreased enrollment trend is continuing for the 2018-19 school year.

Contract Term: July 1, 2018, thru June 30, 2019

Contract Amount: \$33,880; \$55 per hour, two days per week or 14 hours per week for 44 weeks \*\*10% increase in hourly rate\*\*

Previous Contract Amount: \$15,400, \$50 per hour 1 day per week or 7 hours per week for 44 weeks

Discussion ensued about whether in-house social workers could supply this service. Social workers can do 504’s, but they are not trained to do IEPs. Collaboration is needed for them to address these needs. However, they do have Type 73’s, and Dr. Walker-Qualls will collaborate with them to help out with initials because many students are coming from the regular education track and the social workers have better connections with families. This is part of the goal to bring special education and general education under one umbrella, rather than separating them. The District needs to explore the cost of having social workers on site. Previously the in-house social workers were unable to help in Special Education because of their day-to-day workload. Social workers see all students and are a part of the IEP process, which is the vehicle that determines the number of minutes students receive. The District needs to collaborate the workload of regular education social workers so accommodate these additional duties, which they are willing to do. Social workers have full caseloads, and yet more feeder school students with needs are coming.

Update on Architect of Record Process

This is the recommended timeline for the District to have an architect of record in place for 2019 to begin planning Summer 2020 capital improvement work:

<b>Timeline from the April 17, 2018 COW Meeting</b>	<b>Date Completed or Progress</b>	<b>Action</b>
June 1, 2018	June 8, 2018	Send out RFQ for District architect of record
July 18, 2018	On Target	RFQ’s are due
July 25 thru July 27, 2018	On Target	Review RFQ’s to identify a short list of three firms
August 6 thru August 10, 2018	On Target	Interview a short list of firms and narrow down to one finalist
August 15 thru August 17, 2018	On Target	Interview with finalist
September 18, 2018	On Target	Present recommendation for District architect of record at COW meeting
September 27, 2018	On Target	Board of Education approves District architect of record

**Future Agenda Items**

- 1) How to fund IMAGINE OPRF. Explore during the finance committee polling funding scenarios as to this work.
- 2) Amendment of Policy 4:60 that would state that mandate time for going out to bid on a project/contract.
- 3) Best practices or review of swimming curriculum and the testing out of swimming. What is the incremental costs of a two week or 10-week programs, if that matters regarding pool size?

- 4) Review of the needs of the Special Education department, perhaps at a retreat. What is mandated by law?

**Adjournment**

At 9:06 p.m. on Tuesday, June 19, 2018, Dr. Moore moved to adjourn; seconded by Ms. Dixon Spivy. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

Submitted by Gail Kalmerton  
Clerk of the Board