

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

Committee of the Whole
August 15, 2017

A Committee of the Whole Committee meeting was held on August 15, 2017. Dr. Moore called the meeting called to order at 6:30 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; Amy Hill, Director of Assessment and Research; Brenda Horton, Director of Human Resources; Greg Johnson, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Michael Carioscio, Chief Information Officer; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; Karin Sullivan, Director of Communications and Community Relations; and Dr. Gwen Walker-Qualls, Director of Pupil Support Services.

Visitors: Jason Dennis, Assistant Principal for Instruction, John Stelzer, Athletic Director; Earl McLaurin, Steve Schering of the Wednesday Journal; Carolyn Roselli of Robbins & Schwartz, , Jan Arnold of the Park District of Oak Park, Mike Sletten of the Park District of River Forest, Burcy Hines, Rebekka Ward, Tanya White, Christopher Meister, and Kyle Gibson, community members.

Public Comments

Burcy Hines asked that the job description of the director of campus security position include helping to meet the needs of all students.

Rebekah Ward thanked the Board of Education members for their time, attention, and action on Policy 7:20. She presented a petition signed by many which read: “Our school policy must enforce that consent must be mandatory. Through education and awareness, people need to understand what is okay and what is not okay. People need to respect one another’s bodies. Intoxication is not a yes. Guilt is not yes” Coercion is not a yes. Hesitation is not a yes. Manipulation is not a yes. Silence is not a yes. A yes is verbal, voluntary, enthusiastic, informed, and mutual. Instilling this in the minds of teenagers is the only way to actively combat this pervasive rape culture that silences and harms millions of people across the world. The petition demanded: 1) A strict school policy in the handling of students involved in sexual misconduct; 2) holding everyone despite background or school involvement to the same standard, an effective enforcement of IHSA (athletic) contracts; 3) an effective enforcement of IHSA (athletic) contracts; 4) a school required yearly consent curriculum; 5) zero tolerance of rape culture in schools; 6) Awareness opportunities; 7) Purposeful support programs for students in need (small/large group/1-on-1, help line).”

While the Handbook had already been printed, she raised the issue of use of the word “sufficiently” before the word “serious” on page 1, number 1, noting that doing so was highly subjective and dismissive of reports. She spoke about the Rape Victims Advocate’s recommendation for language that more thoroughly explains a hostile environment and measurement of it, as victims should not continue to have their power taken away. “Culture” does not clarify these aggressive and damaging behaviors. She spoke about an early experience she had in the first grade and her reaction and asked if that would have been considered a “sufficiently serious incident.”

Tanya White became aware of Sexual Misconduct and Harassment Policy Revision Committee last winter. She was dismayed that the present version had come such a long way. She understands that the Handbook was already printed and could be subject to continuous revisions. She urged the Board of Education to make that suggestion as provided by RVA, including who can be present at investigations.

Kyle Gibson, a member of the group Empower from Euclid Avenue United Methodist Church, appreciated the time and effort the Board of Education and School District had taken to ensure the language included in the new handbook and policies were as helpful as possible and that any language that might infer victim blaming is removed and the efforts last spring to promote a sex-positive school which is aware of what occurs in and out of its halls.

Mr. Gibson felt his comments were futile because the Handbook had already been printed and yet he knew policies evolved. The situation will continue to be monitored. He asked the Board of Education how it planned to educate the student body as well as their families on the new sexual harassment policy. He thought it is most important for every student to know that the Board of Education, the school staff, and the entire district were looking out for their well-being and that changes have been made toward this effort. He also asked what professional development was being planned for the faculty and staff to implement these new procedures and was everyone equipped to handle the current atmosphere of sexting, Snapchat, the definition of consent, and more. Three Empower members showed up to make comments as well as listen at the July meeting, but, of course, this did not take place and it was pushed back until now. He hoped that the Board of Education felt this topic was “sufficiently” important.

Joyce Taylor taught her last class of preschool children and those 2-year olds will be here in 2025. She considered them her children and she wanted them to be safe, protected, and respected, no matter what their identities. She had taught these children to treat each other with respect. She knew this Board of Education could be the pacemaker to set the policy that is forward as advanced and progressive.

Christopher Meister thanked the Board of Education and staff for its public service, as it was a thankless task but vital to the American system of a democratic self-government. Soon his daughter will be coming to the high school; his family members are coming, currently attend, or have already graduated. Many of his family have attended Oak Park and River Forest schools. Mr. Meister was a member of the Finance Advisory Committee and the Pool Committee, and he favored a new pool facility, as it is essential to District 200 and it represents equity among an economically-diverse population. It is a community asset.

Mr. Meister favored intergovernmental cooperation and consolidation. Many local governments exist because the governmental debt was able to be capped for individual governments, a multiplication of local governments exist. He supported the memorandum of understanding for the pool concept and felt more of these types of agreements in these communities and in neighboring communities should exist. It is important to be collegiate and efficient in the allocation of local resources which have been highlighted in Illinois and at District 200; there are some well-known and efficient tools to do this, including notices regarding the Open Meetings Act, minutes, and posting things to the internet. As the Board of Education walks through this path of sister local governments, he felt that these ideas would build trust.

Mr. Meister also distributed a copy of Illinois SB 0794 regarding the events that occurred in Charlottesville, Virginia, which is posted on the Illinois General Assembly website. It passed unanimously and was well drafted. He hoped that the Board of Education, as the stewards of a diverse institution, take satisfaction that representatives in Springfield passed this resolution.

Minutes

Ms. Dixon Spivy moved to approve the minutes of June 13, 2017, Committee of the Whole minutes; seconded by Mr. Baron. A voice vote resulted in a motion carried.

[Student Participation in Extracurricular 2016-17](#)

The Student Participation in Extracurricular Report is done annually. The data is collected via Skyward and Data Warehouse for all clubs, activities, and athletics (sports). A school-wide survey is posted in the daily bulletin and emailed to each student in order to collect information regarding their choice to participate in extracurricular activities or not. The survey is subjective and the answers were attached to the report and were analyzed by the Director of Student Activities and the Athletic Director.

It was found that 1) students participating in extracurricular activities increased by almost 6% from 2015-2016, continuing a four-year trend of increased participation. In part, this increase is due to including unofficial clubs in this year's data; 2) Students enrolled in at least one extracurricular activity, on average, continue to significantly out perform their peers in GPA and attendance rate; and 3) participation in extracurricular activities for Black, Non-Hispanic and Hispanic students each increased by 10% from the previous year, the largest increases for any demographic group.

While this report is for informational purposes only, it suggests the following considerations. As the District looks to increasing student extracurricular participation for any and all students, the administration and Board of Education should deliberate on how these increases will prompt increased facility usage and how this might influence the long-term facility planning process. Similar consideration should be given to budget planning for facilities, equipment, sponsors, and coaches, especially if enrollment projections become realized, which may prompt increased numbers of student participation.

Discussion ensued about how Motivational Mentoring had significantly increased the percentage of participation students by approximately 4%. The District added this club at the Board of Education directive last year. Students join this club either by responding to advertising, the referral process, a teacher or counselor. The 143 students who meet every day are tutored and eat lunch together. They are identified through advertising or the referral process (i.e., teacher, counselor, or the coordinator of the program). The participation report accounts for all of the activities the students were involved in outside of the school day.

Discussion ensued and the Committee asked questions. How has Motivational Mentoring benefited these students? Have the students' GPAs increased? Have their absences decreased, etc.? How can the message be delivered to students that participation in student activities and athletics makes them feel a part of the community and that in itself will help their grades and make them be better students? The definition of club and activity could be the same. It is a matter of self-describing.

One member suggested surveying students to get a subjective response to ascertain what their interests are and how the District could use that information to enhance activities and athletics in the next year or two. The administration noted that students, too, are involved in work or in their religion and are sometimes unavailable to participate in school activities. The District cannot support 100% of the students participating in activities and athletics, and some students are more passionate about things outside of the school. The Committee asked the administration to reach out to those students who are not involved to find out the reason for their non-involvement and to then provide a report to the Board of Education.

Discussion ensued about the faculty/staff participation in other schools. The administration felt that it could compare contracts to ascertain whether teachers/staff were required to sponsor a club or an activity. Explore: What is the participation rate of faculty/staff as compared to other districts? What are best practices with regard to faculty/staff participation?

CTIP and Recognition

In 2016-17, each student was provided a dedicated device as part of the implementation of the Classroom Technology Integration Plan (CTIP). This was the culmination of a multi-year plan designed to augment the instructional environment through the use of technology. The list of key services and support provided included direct support for students during the Chromebook rollout, District-wide professional development on Google applications and the Chromebook, other professional development to support staff and faculty, celebration of technology innovation through the technology innovator awards, introduction of self-paced professional development challenges, direct classroom technology project support. A Google presentation can be found [here](#) to which Ms. McLaren narrated.

Marci DiVerde was honored as the Instructional Technology Teacher Leader for the past two years and Doug Hill is replacing her.

Alternative Learning Opportunity Program

Mr. Dennis noted that many schools around the state have taken advantage of the Alternative Learning Opportunities Program which is a dropout prevention program funded by the State of Illinois. The number 3 goal of the Strategic Plan, Goal 3--Supportive Learning Environment, is to create a learning environment that supports the unique learning needs of the students and provide a system that is flexible enough to meet the evolving needs. A student is placed in the ALOP program through the Pupil Support Services (PSS) Team recommendation process. The general guidelines for inclusion are: Credit deficient and in danger of not graduating on time, multiple course failures, Extended hospitalizations, Transfer students who come in credit deficient, and Students who have dropped out and chosen to return. Interventions prior to inclusion are:

- Referral to PSS Team
- Teacher-student and Teacher-family meetings
- Counselor-student, Counselor-teacher, and Counselor-family meetings
- Social worker-student meetings
- Academic Enrichment course focused on Executive Functioning and Social and Emotional Learning
- Tutoring
- Mentoring through our Motivational Mentorship program. The program itself is a Continuum of service from 1 period per day up to 3 periods per day
- Students remain in their other classes including electives and P.E.
- Retain support of their counselors, social workers, and other teachers
- Add support from the ALOP Coordinator and Student Advocate
- On-line learning through APEX Learning
- Courses aligned to our current OPRFHS curriculum
- Support of tutors in every core subject
- Regular family engagement and quarterly events.

The student demographics are as follows:

Seniors

- 57% Black, Non-Hispanic
- 15% Hispanic
- 15% White
- 8% Multiracial
- 4% Asian/Pacific Islander

Sophomores & Juniors

- 38% White
- 38% Black, Non-Hispanic
- 19% Hispanic
- 5% Multiracial

In this program, eighty percent of the seniors graduated on time. Forty-eight percent of sophomores and juniors completed requisite courses, exiting the program and returning to traditional classes, 29% transferred out of OPRFHS to other schools, and 24% will return to ALOP to continue credit recovery.

It was explained that the Average Daily Attendance occurs in the fall. The highest of the 3-month average is the last months of the year and extra funding received for that period is appropriate. The State will not reimburse beyond enrollment in the program. The budget is fluid, depending on the number of the students. This year the budget will cover the entire expense. If fewer students were enrolled, then the reimbursement would slide depending on enrollment.

Dr. Moore supported this program and asked for it to be reviewed two times next year in order to see the interventions that had occurred prior to inclusion in the program. What does that process look like? Were some students failing 3 classes, all of their classes, etc.? Why is this the last possible environment?

Policy 7:20, Harassment of Students Prohibited, for Second Reading

It was the consensus of the Committee of the Whole members to recommend to the full Board of Education that it approve Policy 7:20, Harassment of Students Prohibited, for first reading at the following Special Board of Education meeting.

The Sexual Misconduct and Harassment Policy Revision Committee met during the second semester of the school year 2016-17 to make sure that the District's policies and procedures were consistent, up-to-date, and clear. As such, the Policy 7:20, Harassment of Students – Prohibited, is being amended to more accurately reflect the feedback from students, community members, and the committee related to sexual harassment policies and procedures. This policy has also been vetted by the District's legal counsel.

The most notable changes are the inclusion of sexual misconduct, and definitions related to consent. Included is language related to unwelcomed advances and a definition of consent, and additional examples of sexual harassment (pulled information from Policy 2:260 – Uniform Grievance) to speak to how would the District investigate instances of Sexual Harassment. This policy has been included in the 2017-18 Student Handbook and an updated policy will be provided to students due to some minor errors. The school community will be provided information and resources relative to sexual harassment on the District's Website.

Dr. Moore explained that the meeting in July was a Board retreat. She apologized for those that came to that meeting, as it was not made clear that this would go forward and the Board wanted public comment. Dr. Pruitt-Adams reported that professional development was occurring with the staff on August 17 and 18, teachers were being informed of the handbook changes, and an additional meeting would be scheduled for all others in the building to go through this training.

In addition, information about sexual harassment will be included on the website. This policy is in compliance with Board Goal 3, Strategy 1 of the Strategic Plan, and Policy 7:20. Note: Student Handbooks are regularly updated as well as board policy, and the printing of the Handbook does not mean it cannot be amended throughout the school year.

High schools have not used the college model regarding Title IX, because colleges have a federal focus, the Department of Education Guidance.

Ms. Dixon Spivy supported approving the policy at the special meeting, as it could be revisited in the coming months. She felt that the statement about "false allegations" should be a separate policy as it was broader than just this policy. Ms. Cassell concurred. The Sexual Harassment Policy Revision Committee will meet bi-monthly about this policy. Ms. Cassell also asked why "pervasive." Ms. Roselli did not

believe that it made it more subjective or a higher standard; it is part of legal standards, guidance, and case law. These are “ors.” It might be so significantly severe, i.e., physical violence, rape, but only one instance can make it sexual harassment. It is important to delineate the terms. She felt removing “sufficiently” was being subjective. Case law gives some guidance that rape is so severe that it does not have to be persistent. She did not read the wording to say that a victim’s right was restricted. Dr. Moore’s concern was that this was a lot of words and students in the school community need action in communication and certain things need to stand out in common language. Ms. Roselli affirmed that giving examples is very important. A legal overview occurred and then, in small groups, various scenarios were discussed as to what one would do about if a student said this or that. “Reasonable person” is law, case law, and cause; it broadens the standard, and it is both subjective and objective. These are the legal requirements for Title IX.

While Ms. Roselli stated that OPRFHS does not restrict anyone from coming into an investigation, Dr. Moore wanted this stated more explicitly, as some families know they can bring others to an investigation and to others they are just words on the page.

Mr. Iseli stated that great progress had been made on this and he supported approving the policy at this meeting, but he also agreed with Ms. Dixon Spivy’s comment about making that one section its own policy. At a higher level, the people in the audience and students read it differently than those who write policies or are involved in legal cases around policies. Legally, if there is no strong argument against so doing, the language should be softened to make sure people are not put off by the legal statements. Ms. Roselli felt that some of that would be occurring in the educational efforts of students and staff.

[Policies for First Reading](#)

It was the consensus of the Committee members to recommend that the Board of Education approve these policies that included recommendations from PRESS for first reading at its regular August meeting.

Action and Policy	Explanation
Policy 2:100, Board Member Conflict of Interest	The policy, Legal References, Cross References, and footnotes are updated in response to the federal regulations requiring written standards of conduct covering conflicts of interest and governing the actions of those engaged in the selection, award, and administration of contracts in compliance with 2 C.F.R. 200.318.
Policy 3:70, Succession of Authority	The policy and footnotes are updated. New text states that superintendents may submit the succession plan versus the board approving it. This change provides the board an opportunity for the superintendent to manage the district and provide leadership for the staff while allowing the board to monitor this policy and stay informed. The former text regarding approval of the succession plan was moved to the footnotes as an option.

Policy 4:15, Identity Protection	The policy, Legal References, and footnotes are updated in response to the Personal Information Protection Act, 815 ILCS 5:30/, amended by P.A. 99-503. Policy text on compliance measures required under the law was updated specifically to new notification requirements if breaches of security were to occur: 1. Disclosing a breach of security involving personal information when a user name or email addresses in combination with a password or security question and answer, and 2. Notifying the Illinois Attorney General under certain circumstances. 3. Footnotes are updated in response to PA 99-503 along with continuous improvement recommendations from the members of the PRESS Advisory Board.
Policy 5:120, Ethics and Conduct	RENAMED: The policy, Legal References, Cross References, and footnotes are updated in response to the federal regulations requiring written standards of conduct covering conflicts of interest and governing the actions of school district employees engaged in the selection, award, and administration of contracts in compliance with 2 C.F.R. 200.318. New subheads Professional and Appropriate Conduct, Statement of Economic Interests, and Outside Employment are added to assist the reader with clarifying. The Prohibited Interest; Limitation of Authority; and Outside Employment subhead is renamed Prohibited Interests; Conflict of Interest; and Limitation of Authority.
Policy 5:285, Drug and Alcohol Testing for School Bus and Commercial Vehicle Drivers	The policy, Legal References and footnotes are updated.
Policy 5:300, Schedules and Employment Year	The policy, Legal References, and footnotes are updated. Footnotes reflect clarifications in the collective bargaining agreement instructions.
Policy 6:70, Teaching About Religions	The policy is updated to clarify that neither preferential nor derogatory treatment shall be given to any single religion, religious belief, or to religion in general. The footnotes and Legal References are updated.

Culture, Climate and Behavior Committee

The Board of Education will be asked to appoint members to the Culture, Climate and Behavior Committee at its regular August meeting.

The Committee recessed at 8:00 p.m. and resumed at 8:10 p.m.

[Presentation of 2017-2018 Tentative Budget](#)

For the Committee of the Whole to review and recommend that the FY18 Tentative Budget is moved forward to the full Board of Education for approval at its September 28, 2017, meeting.

The tentative budget contains several revenue estimates based on the information currently available. However, most state and federal sources of revenue have not been determined and/or published. The hope is that this information will be known by the September 28 meeting.

Mr. Altenburg provided background about the budget history and finances, including the convening of the Finance Advisory Committee (FAC) which met from July 2013 to December 13. That committee was charged with addressing five goals:

1. Recommend target range for size of fund balance;
2. Recommend timing of an operating referendum;
3. Recommend level of future tax levies;
4. Recommend communication strategies; and,
5. Recommend next task for Finance Advisory Committee.

As a result, it made two recommendations in December 2013: 1) reduce the 2013 Tax Levy by \$10 million and 2) abate the 2013 Bond and Interest Levy for debt service in the amount of \$2.5 million. That Committee and the Advisory Leadership Team (ALT) were dissolved. Now the Board of Education with input from the Chief School Business Official and the Superintendent makes recommendations in terms of appropriate tax levies, fund balances, and cost containment strategies.

In December 2014, the Board approved a 2014 Tax Levy of \$54.7 million. This was \$250K less than the 2013 levy. The Board also resolved to abate the 2014 Bond and Interest Levy for debt service in the amount of \$2.6 million. Based on the original December 2013 recommendations made by the FAC, the Board was aiming to bring the total operating fund balances below 100% of expenses in two to four years and below 40%, but not under 25% in eight to ten years.

Because Illinois law limits school districts' ability to preserve their taxing capacity after three years of increasingly lower tax levies, the Board utilized a mechanism in the Property Tax Extension Limitation Law (PTELL) and set the 2015 Tax Levy at the 2012 level. The 2015 Tax Levy was approved on December 17, 2015 in the amount of \$66.4 million. The Board of Education also abated the 2015 Bond and Interest Levy for debt service in the amount of \$2.5 million. On November 19, 2015, the Board of Education adopted a revised Board Policy 4:20 – Fund Balances as a part of improving financial practices as discussed in the 2013 FAC meetings. Last year in FY2016, the Board of Education adopted a levy of \$66.6 million on December 22, 2016. The Board also adopted a resolution to abate the final amount of outstanding debt on the books, \$1,023,414.

The FY 18 Tentative Budget includes total revenues of \$78.9 million and total expenditures of \$83.4 million. Revenues are down mainly due to property tax receipts. A detailed explanation is included on the last page. \$778,989 or 1.0% less than the FY17 unaudited actuals. Expenditures are \$1.6 million or 2.0% more than the FY17 unaudited actuals.

Oak Park and River Forest High School receives 91.2% of its funding from Local Property Taxes and other local sources such as Corporate Personal Property Taxes, Investment Income, and Student Fees.

In FY18, 5.1% of total revenue is provided by the State of Illinois for General State Aid, Categorical State Aid, Food Service, Transportation, and Special Education. The federal government provides 2.7% of total revenue for Title grants and for Special Education in FY18.

Mr. Altenburg reviewed each of District's Fund expenditures, i.e., Education Fund, Operations, and Maintenance Fund, Transportation Fund, IMRF/Social Security Fund, Capital Projects Fund, Working Cash Fund, Tort Fund, Life Safety Fund, Medical and Dental Self-Insured Funds.

Mr. Altenburg provided a comparison of the Operating Funds only (i.e. Education, Operations and Maintenance, Transportation, IMRF/SS, Working Cash, and Tort) of the FY 18 Budget with the PMA/Forest 5 Financial Projections.

Mr. Altenburg noted that FY18 property taxes are anticipated to be significantly less this fiscal year because a unique tax levy cycle exists in Cook County, unlike any other county in Illinois. He provided an example relative to the Board of Education passing its tax levy in 2014, which was ultimately the basis for the LY14 Tax Extension. The LY14 Levy was reduced by tax cap (PTELL) through the Consumer Price Index (CPI) limits and the new construction in the District. This is the TAX EXTENSION, shown in green. For LY14, the tax extension for all funds totaled \$54.7 million of which \$40.8 million was billed in the Ed Fund for both the Ed and Special Ed levies. This is similar to all other counties.

However, in Cook County, the tax collection cycle for LY14 includes the March 2015 and September 2015 tax bills. The final calculation for the tax extension was not completed until June 2015, so the March tax bills must be an estimate, and the September 2015 bills make up the difference between the final extension and the March 2015 bills.

The County decided that the estimate would not be based on the LY14 levy, because that is in itself an estimate and usually overestimated. Instead, the March 2015 tax bills are based on the LY13 (shown in light blue) final tax extension, which was \$54.9 million for all funds, \$39.9 million in the Ed Fund. The March 2015 tax bill is based on 55% of the LY13 tax extension, and the amount collected in March 2015 was just over \$28 million (this does not equate because not everyone pays their March taxes by the end of the fiscal year). Then in September 2015, the County billed taxpayers based on the formula below: September tax bills = LY14 tax extension – March billing (which was 55% of LY13).

In its LY15 levy, the Board “looked back” to its LY12 extension as its basis for applying PTELL. This is an option provided in the PTELL statutes. In doing so, you can see that the actual tax extension is significantly higher in LY15 than it was in LY14. So in March 2016, during FY16, the County billed for 55% of LY14 tax extension. When September of 2016 came, the whole difference in the increase of the LY15 tax extension was billed. So last September, in the beginning of FY17, the District collected a lot more money than the previous year, a one-time increase due to the increase in the LY15 tax extension over LY14. March 2017 was billed at 55% of the LY15 extension. Now, looking at Fiscal Year 2018, beginning July 1, 2017, the process settles down into a normal pattern. But, because the District collected a much larger amount in September 2016 during Fiscal Year 2017, the amount we will collect in September 2017, during the fiscal year 2018, will be lower by about \$4.8 Million. The District did not lose any money; it is strictly a timing issue.

Waiting to August to do the tentative budget allows for the input of the unaudited actuals. While it may look like the District overspent in Capital Projects, some of this funding will be moved back into the previous year.

It was suggested that the PMA model be reviewed two times per year. Another suggestion was made to remove the \$25000 earmarked for the Strategic Plan because it was too low and it would send the wrong message.

[Presentation of Resolution to Put Tentative Budget on Display](#)

It was the consensus of the Committee of the Whole to recommend that the Board of Education approve the Resolution Authorizing Preparation, Placement for Inspection and Publication of the FY18 Tentative Budget at the August 15, 2017, Special Board Meeting.

[Community Recreation Center Collaboration Memorandum of Agreement](#)

It was the consensus of the Committee of the Whole members to recommend that the Board of Education approve the Community Recreation Center Memorandum of Agreement (MOU) at its Special Board Meeting on August 15, 2017.

District administrators have been meeting with representatives from the Park District of Oak Park (PDOP) and the River Forest Park District (RFPD) in collaboration on possibilities for a Community Recreation Center, which would include an indoor pool, recreational spaces for residents of all ages to provide health and wellness, as well as help support the D200 aquatic athletics program. This MOU will be used to ensure consistent communication between D200, PDOP, RFPD, and key stakeholders regarding project scope, timing, and funding. The end goal is to provide a Community Recreation Center to increase access to quality indoor recreational and community space to be used by residents of both Oak Park and River Forest as well as D200 athletics during non-school hours. If unable to secure commitments of necessary funds from local community organizations and potential partners by Dec 1, 2017, the MOU would become invalid and the community recreation center would not be constructed as described in the memo.

All of the boards involved in this agreement are informed of the same message consistently. District 200 would collectively finance a portion of the partnership. However, each entity would bring to the table \$5 million and then fundraise for another \$5 million. The total cost of this project is projected to be between \$30 and \$45 million, thus leaving \$25 million to finance. Consideration is being given to OPRFHS financing that portion and the Park District of Oak Park would pay that back with interest over a yet-to-be-defined time period. At present, OPRFHS could use funds from its fund balance. The Park District of Oak Park has no more capacity to bond and OPRFHS is debt free. This would have no financial impact on taxpayers.

One location being considered is already owned by the Park District of Oak Park and another location may be donated. The maximum location beneficial to both Oak Park and River Forest would lend to the economic growth of both communities. The goal is to continue to meet with the elected and appointed officials. Dr. Moore and Mr. Arkin represent District 200. In addition, two representatives each from the Park District of Oak Park and the Park District of River Forest as will Jan Arnold and Mike Sletten participate. The team meets every other week. DLT members are Dr. Pruitt-Adams, Mr. Altenburg, Ms. Sullivan and Mr. Johnson. A list of "must haves" are being developed by each of the entities involved. It would be a seamless transition for the Park District of Oak Park to do the day-to-day operations of maintenance and scheduling with the voice of the River Forest Park District and District 200, having priority usage. If OPRFHS finances the endeavor, it would have the largest ownership. During the time that money was being paid back, it would represent that OPRFHS had paid \$X to the Park District.

Ms. Dixon Spivy reiterated Mr. Meister's concern about the amount of money passing through the three bodies without more transparency. For the actual administration of this facility, more review as to how that body is organized is needed, as it is unfair to the students to abdicate these concerns. It was reported that the entities were considering the sponsorship of 3 town hall meetings, one on a Saturday, one in the evening, and one during the day. A meeting has been scheduled with the *Wednesday Journal* to talk about this. This is an effort to be transparent. OPRFHS will have a voice but the Park District of Oak Park would take the lead on day-to-day operations. Questions: How in five years will the District know that its needs are still being honored if it does not have a voice in its administration? A contract will be drawn up that ensures OPRFHS has a voice and will be clear in how communication will occur. It was noted that OPRFHS gave money to Concordia University for its track.

Mr. Iseli was very supportive of the concept but he was concerned that the statements in the MOU presuppose that OPRFHS will fund it and the OPPD to run it. While the statements are clear, he was not predisposed to that. He was fine with this conversation, but not what was written in the MOU. Dr. Pruitt-Adams noted that if the Park District was allowed to finance it, it would have to put \$30 million versus \$5M and it would have the majority ownership. Mr. Iseli reiterated his uncomfortableness with the MOU.

Mr. Baron stated that OPRFHS would receive a better interest rate than the Park District and it would be good for taxpayers. He appreciated Mr. Iseli's statements, but the Park District does not have enough

bonding capacity. The MOU does not commit to certain funds and the MOU is “at will.” In addition, the property is paid and purchased and paid off through user funds. The high school cannot generate income and the Park District can. It would have a small impact on taxpayers. Does the \$5 million investment get recouped through user fees?

Mr. Arkin too was concerned about putting a significant money at risk up front when it is going to be co-designed and constructed and OPRFHS would need to input into the design, engineering, and construction. Dr. Pruitt-Adams noted that the language on page 5 was included at this point because mock-ups of each location have been made and they have someone who is under contract. Mr. Arkin was also concerned about financing and how \$30 million would affect projections going forward. Right now, the District is looking at going for a referendum in 2021 to 2023. How would this financing affect the timing of the referendum and then what would be the magnitude of the referendum? How will this work mesh with that of the work of IMAGINE OPRF? The response was that this work would occur simultaneously and would not supersede any work that IMAGINE OPRF is doing. He supported governmental bodies being collaborative as the taxpayer can benefit, but he wanted more discussion about the payback of these monies.

Mr. Cofsky too favored the collaborative nature, but he didn’t like how financing prescriptive and he wanted to see less commitment from OPRFHS in the MOU.

Dr. Moore asked for more information relative to the agreement that OPRFHS had with Concordia regarding its track. She also recommended that community sees the MOU as being a dialogue as to the list of priorities or the perspective nature through December. She was concerned about how IMAGINE OPRF and the facility needs are kept at the forefront, not only in communication, and that the lines do not get too blurred. Human capital is an issue.

The basis of the collaboration is a pool facility and IMAGINE is the vehicle for redefining the facilities. The worst thing is to be involved with an MOU that will build a pool that will not meet the needs. The MOU opens the discussion.

Future Agenda Items

None.

Adjournment

At 8:56 p.m., Mr. Baron moved to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Mr. Arkin. A voice vote resulted in all ayes.

Submitted by Gail Kalmerton
Clerk of the Board