

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

Committee of the Whole Meeting
December 11, 2018

A Committee of the Whole Committee meeting was held on December 11, 2018. Dr. Moore called the meeting called to order at 6:30pm 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: Michael Carioscio, Chief Operations Officer, Karin Sullivan, Director of Communications; Greg Johnson, Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; Chris Thieme, Senior Director of Technology; Roxana Sanders, Senior Director of Human Resources; Dr. Gwendolyn Walker Qualls, Director of Pupil Support Services; and Cyndi Sidor, Interim Chief School Business Officer.

Visitors

Sheila Hardin, OPRFHS Faculty Senate Chair, Jacqui Charette-Bassirad and Fred Preuss, OPRFHS staff; Lynn Kamenista and Mike Poirier, co-chairs of IMAGINE; Rick Young of Perkins + Will, Marty Bernstein, Patti Boblick, Nick Bridge, Mike Ciccarelli, Kitty Conklin, John Duffy, Linda Francis, Jenna Jacobson, Maurine Kleinman, Amanda Massie, Gina Harris, Allison Parrell, Gina Sennello, Monica Sheehan, and other community members; Robert Grossi, OPRFHS Consultant; Ryher Miller, Chloe Leach, Kennedy Wilson, Michael Anderson and students; Steve Schering of the *Oak Leaves*, and Michael Romain of the *Wednesday Journal*.

Racial Equity Curriculum Pilot

Throughout the past few years, students have come to administration with ideas of developing a Racial Equity Course at OPRF. Last year, several students from Students Advocating for Equity (SAFE) began working with two administrators to make the first draft of a course outline. SAFE students Naomi and Chloe Leach, Ryhen Miller, Michaela Anderson, and Kennedy Wilson provided a vision for a pilot for a course that will begin the Fall of 2019. These students wanted to create a curriculum that fosters open discussion on uncomfortable topics and goes deeper than just the slavery/oppression topics in class. They were doing this empower minorities in the school and allow everyone to talk with a better understanding of race in America and to give people spaces to talk, learn, and express themselves. They wanted to empower minorities in the school and allow everyone to walk out with a better understanding of Race in America. This would be opened up to the Muslim, Asian, etc. experiences.

The students felt some emotion when it comes to talking about race. For some students of color, these conversations force them to become the representative for their race, which is a reminder of how the distance from far from racial equity they are. Sometimes, white students and teachers feel guilty and attacked. Making matters more complicated is the common disbelief of minority disadvantage.

The pilot would allow students to take the course one semester and repeat it another time if they so choose. The course will open to juniors and seniors who will then push it out to freshman and sophomores, but anyone can take the class. A student repeating the class could be a mentor. Students would receive one credit per semester. In the course, students will develop a unit and facilitate the presentation of that unit in classrooms of freshmen and sophomores throughout the school. The course's focus would be to work with students in the course to develop a unit of instruction that students would help to facilitate to other students in the school. The model for doing so has not been decided, but they

are looking at the Spoken Word model where on Mondays and Tuesdays student leaders meet to plan and reflect on the curriculum and Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, the student leaders would push out to other courses to facilitate curriculum directly to underclassmen. This would be similar to the Leadership & Launch program. The topics would include Slurs, Identity, and Racial Consciousness. The focus will also be on providing a true definition of diversity. This will end the perception conversations minorities have had about being left out of the conversation.

The students quoted Haile Selassie, “History teaches us that unity is strength and cautions us to submerge and overcome our differences in the quest for common goals, to strive with all our combined strengths for the path to true... unity.”

By the end of first semester 2018, the administration will identify and begin to work with a teacher who can help develop and potentially teach the course. By mid-February, the course description, the outline would be developed and the logistics will be finalized. By the end of April, an initial cohort of students will be identified for next year’s course. By summer 2019, the course will be developed, potentially utilizing summer school as a means to work directly with students on its development. And, by fall 2019, the pilot will be implemented. This course cannot supplant a state required course and whether it could be added to an already existing history would have to be researched. State requirements do not come into a plan with an elective course.

All of the Committee of the Whole members appreciated the work of taking this initiative forward to the Board of Education. It was noted that some schools in New York have courses with a similar focus, but they are tailored to their own communities.

Dr. Moore was pleased with the amount of listening that this group has done at student-led workshops about the demand for more inclusive conversations where students could feel comfortable. Ms. Cassell felt that pushing this out to underclassmen would be important for all individuals to have this type of conversation.

Note: If the pilot goes correctly, it would then eventually be a one-semester course that could run both semesters allowing the original students to be the leaders in the subsequent semester and receive credit. The student authors of this pilot are trying to find students who would be qualified to not just talk about racism or say something inappropriately. These students were also seeking male students to teach as well.

Dr. Moore requested that an update on this pilot be given in April.

Public Comments

Amanda Massie read the following statement: “I appreciate and want to thank the administration for its initial recommendation that focuses on improvements for academics, equity, ADA and non-gender facilities.

“In reviewing the “Facility Master Plan Recommended Initial Components” and its diagrams, the word “Component” replaces the word “Sequence” used in the Imagine plan. Yet, it’s confusing as many “components” make up your initial recommendation, which appears to be largely the former Sequence 1, and a single “component” continues to define the former Sequence 2 or the pool and aquatic center and the other elements in the 4-story sports complex. For the sake of transparency and clarification, it would be instructive if we knew what’s specifically included in each of the new “Components” and from which sequence it originated.

“Also, the memo and schematic design lack detail. It would be beneficial if each item included a full description. For example, “Component V”, all gender toilet room— is it 1 room or multiple rooms?

“Next to “Component P 1-4”, it says classrooms (64). What specifically would be done to those classrooms? Are they being rehabbed, moved, refurbished, painted? What are we getting for \$6 million dollars over multiple summers? In determining needs versus wants, it's important to know what's being proposed for every expenditure so that an informed decision can be made.

“Lastly, while I would like more information on the proposed recommendations, I largely favor them. However, I strongly oppose the administration's suggestion that you might want to consider pushing through Component D without voter approval. It needs to go before voters in a referendum. Please don't repeat the mistake of the past. Thank you.”

Kitty Conklin read the following statement: “Good Evening. In the five-year Financial Projection that Tod Altenburg prepared in Oct, 2017, two things stood out to me. The first is that \$20 million was to be set aside as Other Finances Uses in 2019. My assumption has been that this amount was for the school renovation work. The second is that, due to continued planned deficit spending along with the \$20 million set aside, D200 would need to start planning in 2021 to come to taxpayers for an Operating Referendum in 2023. At that time, the current reserve would be exhausted relative to fund balance requirements.

“Fast forward to tonight’s agenda, which presents a number of documents, especially the renovation recommendations along with a 5 year Financial Analysis which outlines a number of considerations. Yes,

“I know the Financial Analysis is not a Financial Projection.

“As I read the documents, I see a few things that I would like to call out:

1. A spend of \$32.6 million is recommended to start on the renovation work.
2. A recommendation is made to move \$20 million to a Capital Projects Fund. Is this a continuation of the same \$20 million called out in the Oct. 2017 5 year Financial Projection?
3. The historical growth rates of 4.5% for Salaries and 3.2% for Benefits. The salary increase rate exceeds the actual salary growth rate which was included in the Oct. 2017 Financial Projections.
4. The termination of TIFs will result in a net revenue increase of \$800,000 annually to D200.
5. Deficit spending is expected to continue. It is clearly stated on pg 7 of the Financial Analysis document that D200 will have a structural annual deficit of \$7 million within 5 years.

“My question for this board is simple, and I hope you will discuss the answer this evening – when will OP taxpayers be voting on the next operating referendum? Thank you all for serving our community.

Monica Sheehan read the following statement: “Three years ago today, the community filed the Petition for Referendum to force the D200 School Board to put its non-referendum bonds on the ballot to finance a \$37.5 million, 50-meter, Olympic-size pool and demolish the 12-year old garage.

“Ironically and sadly, not much has changed. You, the school board, will discuss tonight the latest oversized pool proposal, the third such accepted proposal in as many years, and it’s the most expensive of them all. Moreover, a conservative, half million to three-quarters of a million dollars have been spent since 2013 trying to build a too large pool on a too small campus, a waste of our educational dollars.

“In Imagine’s Sequence 2, now called Component D, \$65 or \$67 million would be spent on demolishing and rebuilding the southeast corner of the structurally sound building to house a pool that is double the size of a standard size high school competition pool in a 600-seat natatorium. While Imagine stated that this pool only costs \$2.5 million (digging the hole, its mechanicals, and liner), in reality, Sequence 2 or Component D’s entire \$65 or \$67 million price tag is an associated pool construction cost. It is cost prohibitive to build this pool within the existing building, based on two estimates of \$80 million and \$87

million in 2014, while the other elements in the proposed four-story sports complex could be addressed and accommodated through repairs and renovations.

“There’s been no mention of the routine operating and expected maintenance costs for this 17-lane practice pool. They should be discussed, and all costs made transparent before any decision is made.

“The genesis of the Imagine process was the failed pool referendum. And, an oversized pool was a predetermined outcome of Imagine. In your newly-accepted plan, we have essentially the same pool that was rejected by voters with even more seating 600 vs. 450 seats.

Imagine touts its research, yet where’s the research that supports the building of this pool and natatorium. Please share it. We know that swimming isn’t a federal or state high school graduation requirement. And, we know that Illinois has lessened PE requirements, and it is a trend that will continue. We also know that a pool isn’t a racial equity issue. My friends who are black are disgusted by that implication.

“The Fako Survey is the only study conducted by a professional research firm, and its scientific, statistically significant findings revealed that a pool at the high school was not a priority for our community. Yet, the administration ignored this finding and has persisted in trying to force this oversized “want” and expenditure on our community.

“More than 1600 voters have signed an online petition to assert their right to vote on this capital works project. We respectfully request that you put any funding for a pool before voters in a referendum. The 40 members of the Imagine group and the administration do not represent the D200 community. Thank You.”

Marty Bernstein asked the Board to consider a plan that made sense rather than Component D.

Margaret, unknown last name, spoke about what the community was facing and the possibility of not being able to raise her children here. She grew up here. She was a concerned Oak Parker who wants to continue to live here, but she did not believe that the taxpayers could continue to pay for the limited number of students who use the pool. She did not believe it was equitable racially or academically. She had seen in her mother’s online groups that they were scared of what is coming down the pipeline. This discussion has been occurring for a long time, and there are bigger problems on which to focus.

Minutes of November 5, 2018

Dr. Moore moved to approve the minutes of November 5, 2018, as presented, seconded by Mr. Cofsky. A voice vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Five-year Financial Analysis

Mr. Grossi provided a financial analysis to address a specific question. What would happen to the financial condition of the District assuming the following two conditions?

1. The District will levy at its maximum allowable growth rate allowed under Tax Caps – which for projection purposes will be 2.1% (current rate of inflation)
2. Expenditures will grow at recent historical trend rates

He provided the historical growth rate of district expenses:

Salaries 4.5%

Employee benefits 3.2% for 10 years.

Purchased services 3.0%

Supplies and Materials 2.7%,

Out of District Tuition - This grew at a rate of 16% over the last 6 years, so a 5% growth rate was used.

Capital Outlay (building maintenance) Flat at \$4 and
Capital Outlay (technology, transportation, other Flat at \$2 million annually

The other Major Event That Will Impact Financial Future are the expiration of the TIF Districts in the Village of Oak Park

- The Village of Oak Park is expected to terminate its remaining tax increment financing districts (Greater Mall Area & Madison Business Corridor) in 2019.
- Since the inception of these TIF districts, the property value (in terms of EAV) has grown by \$113 million). Once terminated, this will become new taxable property to the District.
- Assuming that the District levies sufficiently to capture this growth, tax revenues will increase by approximately \$3.3 million annually. (Assumed in projections)
- However, the District will no longer receive TIF surplus dollars once terminated. The District received \$2.5 million in FY 2018 and is expected to receive the same in FY 2019.
- So the net impact to the District is a positive \$800,000 annually (\$3.3 million new r/e tax revenues - \$2.5 million less TIF surplus dollars)

What is not embedded in this projection is the ending of the 2018 TIF, based on the auditor's balance. If they expired, OPRFHS would get \$4 million in surplus. OPRFHS should be maintaining conversations with the Village of Oak Park on this.

The Future Revenue and Expense Levels chart showed that projected annual revenue growth would grow at 1.8%. Expenditures would grow at 3.5% per year.

The revenues versus expenses chart showed that Over the next five years, total expenses would exceed total revenues by \$20 million; by FY 2023, the annual structural deficit would be in excess of \$7 million (expenses over revenues); and with a levy freeze, \$7 million annual deficits would begin in FY 2020 and grow to over \$17 million by FY 2023. This deficit is not sustainable.

The key takeaways are:

- Since FY 2013, District expenses have grown at an average annual rate of 3.5%.
- At best, assuming maximum tax levies and 2.1% CPI, District revenues will increase 1.8% annually going forward.
- Assuming that District revenues grow at 1.8% and District expenses grow at 3.5%, the District will exhaust \$20 million of fund balance reserves, but more importantly, will have an annual structural deficit more than \$7 million within five years. This is unsustainable.
- If the District elects to freeze future tax levies, fund balances will drop by \$50 million and annual deficits will surge to \$17 million with five years.
- To avoid deficit spending, the District must align expense growth to revenue growth: This would require (1) a commitment to maximize tax levy and (2) a commitment to lower expenditure growth rate.

Board members asked that the administration to create a plan to 1) demonstrate its ability to achieve the goal of a balanced budget, 2) benchmark the costs of special education as compared to other districts including that of out of district tuition, 3) determine the implications of having a balanced budget, 4) determine how to deliver services more efficiently by living within a 2.1% tax levy, and 5) by growing expenditures at a rate of 1.8% or less, including personnel expenses. To not deficit spend, would not necessarily stave off a referendum, because of such possibilities of the forced property tax freeze and a pension liability switch. It is appropriate for the District to make a legitimate effort to align revenue with expenditure so that it theoretically never has to go to referendum. To control out of district tuition

expenditures is difficult because they are aligned to the students' disabilities and IEP requirements, If the District were to cap the amounts on special education expenditures, it would be out of compliance with state law. It was emphasized that all students, both regular education and special education, were OPRFHS students.

The administration is starting the budgeting process in January with the goal of having a balanced budget.

Tax Levy

It was the consensus of the Committee of the Whole members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approves 2018 Tax Levy at its regular meeting in December to capture the full growth allowed under the Property Tax Extension Limitation Law, which for this 2018 tax levy represents a 2.1% increase in tax dollars, plus a nominal increase for taxable new property in the District. The total tax levy request is \$68,036,000, which represents an increase of 2.1% versus the final 2017 tax extension of \$66,657,009. Based on historical data, the District is projecting total new taxable property to be \$2.5 million. This would generate an additional \$77,000 in tax revenues. This levy would increase the annual taxes of a \$400,000 market value home by approximately \$68. The third option was provided at the table.

2017	2017 Extension	2018 Tentative Levy	Estimated Final Extension
IMRF Fund	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 1,206,208
Social Security Fund	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,256,467
Liability Ins. Fund	1,00,000	0	0
Transportation Fund	940,000	940,000	944,863
Education Fund	50,219,008	48,946,000	49,199,207
Building Fund	9,934,834	12,000,000	11,808,345
Working Cash Fund	903,167	900,000	904,656
Life Safety Fund	500,000	2,000,000	2,010,346
Special Ed Fund	800,000	800,000	804,139

Total	\$66,657,009	\$68,036,000	\$68,134,231
--------------	--------------	---------------------	--------------

Using the Building and Life Safety Funds is transparency in levying, versus historically using the Education Fund as a bank.

To avoid or minimize deficit spending, the District will need to attempt to match future revenue growth to future expenditure growth. A long-term scenario whereby expenditure growth exceeds revenue growth by 2% annually will result in a decrease of fund balances more than \$25 million and annual deficits more than \$8 million. This is not sustainable.

A decision that produces a deficit spending gap of this magnitude, such as a decision to not increase tax revenues, is a de facto decision to utilize fund balance reserves primarily to pay for deficit spending rather than for capital projects. Additionally, a decision to allow growing deficit spending is a decision to accelerate the timetable in which the District will need to go to referendum for an operating tax increase.

By adding \$2 million to the Life Safety Fund, OPRFHS will have \$5.2 million for current projects--\$3.5 million for a new fire alarm system, etc. As the next phase of IMAGINE is developed, more projects will be included, and whether it is IMAGINE or life safety work, it is still life safety dollars.

When asked why not use bonds to pay for life safety projects as they are long-term capital investments that would lend themselves bonding, Dr. Grossi noted that a bond issue would be an additional tax on the taxpayer. Rather than borrowing money and paying interest on that money, the District would use the \$2.9 plus \$2 million of 2.21% levy for life safety issues. At the December meeting, the Board of Education will consider the property tax relief grant which would lower the tax levy by \$5.8 million. For reference regarding impact for the homeowner, the CPI increase being asked to approve will cost a \$400,000 homeowner about \$64. The reduction will create a \$280 decrease so the net increase if approved, would decrease that home's taxes by \$213.

Discussion ensued about the tax relief grant. Dr. Grossi noted that the state requirement is to abate one time. If so, OPRFHS would get \$3.8 million. As long as state does not cut funding to education, OPRFHS would get \$3.8 million annually. If it is the intent of the Board of Education to provide a tax abatement to the district, it could provide tax relief every year. He recommended the OPRFHS not trust the state and if it gets the grant money, then consider abating that every year. Eligibility would be based on the current tax rate.

Capital Reserve fund

It was the consensus of the Committee of the Whole members to recommend to the Board of Education that it establish a capital reserve fund of \$20 million that had been recommended previously at its regular December meeting. Mr. Grossi stated that it must be paired with a commitment by the District to align future expenditure growth to future revenue growth. This would require both maximizing the growth in the annual tax levy and reducing expenditure growth to a level at or below the future rate of revenue growth.

The District has major capital needs in the building, some currently undefined.

Dr. Pruitt-Adams is committed to a balanced budget, but the Board of Education must be committed to what to levying for capital projects. The goal will be for the administration to come back in 18 months with a plan to pay for other projects. Mr. Arkin was interested in exploring fundraising for capital projects. Dr. Grossi believed that a donation to a school district would have an equivalent tax break if a

503(c). He would explore establishing a capital foundation fund and whether the donations would be tax deductible.

The Committee recessed at 8:12 p.m. and resumed at 8:21 p.m.

Initial Masters Plan Recommendation

Dr. Joylynn Pruitt-Adams stated the following.

“On Nov. 15, 2018, the Imagine OPRF Work Group made its recommendations to the Board for a long-term facilities master plan. The Board accepted those recommendations. It's important to note that a master plan is not a construction project, where the design and financing of every portion are done at the start. Instead, a master plan is a living document that should be reviewed and modified as the impact of early projects is assessed, school needs change, and funding becomes available. In accepting the long-term facilities master plan recommendations, the Board accepted the facility needs that had been identified by the Imagine team; acceptance did not commit the Board to undertake any of the work nor the recommended sequencing of the projects. Now the Board of Education must decide what, if any, portion of the master plan to implement, when to schedule the work, and how to fund it.

In the packet was a listing of two projects that could potentially be done. The Initial Recommended Components project has an estimated total project budget of \$32,631,500 and includes renovation/construction of the following:

- 76 general education classrooms
- Classrooms, kitchen, laundry area, sensory room, and ADA-compliant restroom for the Special Education TEAM (Transitional Education with Access to the Mainstream) program
- First phase of student commons (east first, second, and third floors)
- Main entrance
- All-gender restrooms
- Three science labs
- Huskie Pups daycare facilities
- ADA-compliant elevator in the north end of the building

“While all of these components address important facility needs, only the TEAM items address issues that were identified as most urgent, based primarily on the physical condition of those facilities. The Initial Recommended Components will have the most significant impact on students regarding classroom spaces, ADA, Special Education, and Collaboration Spaces, etc. Additionally, consideration was given to maintaining the Districts debt-free status on this initial project. If the Board wishes to commit to rectifying the most urgent facility needs, it also could consider doing Component D (see Future Additional Component, second page in attachment), which has an estimated total project budget of \$65,367,600.

“This component comprises:

- Pool replacement (urgent)
- Locker rooms (urgent for boys and all-gender)
- ADA-compliant elevator in the south end of the building (urgent)
- PE/Athletic offices Strategic Plan: Goal 6, Strategy 3 Board Goals: District Policy:
- Dance studio
- Multi-court gymnasium
- Weight room

“While several of the items listed in Components D are identified as important rather than urgent, the most cost effective way to complete Component D would be to do all the work as once rather than

delaying the non-urgent items until later. At this time, however, the Administration is recommending that the Board authorize issuing a request for qualifications (RFQ) for design services only for Initial Recommended Components, at a total project cost of \$32,631,500. Doing this project would have a significant and immediate positive impact on students while taking into consideration the District's financial uncertainties, previous Board discussion, the size and scope of component D, and community input. As detailed under separate cover, the administration recommends that the Board make additional commitments to ensure that the urgent facility needs identified in the master plan are addressed in future projects. This would come from the fund balance.”

Discussion ensued. The RFP's intended outcome only would be that of getting design services from architectural firms and there could be several design phases. Only then would the \$32 million estimated be spent on construction. It was projected that the 76 classrooms would be completed during four summers. The library was estimated to take 14 months, as it is a substantial construction project. Component D could be a summer project which would happen after the initial 14-month project. The initial work would start in the summer of 2020. The selection and management of construction phase details have yet to be resolved. The administration did not want to go out for bonds as it is trying not to impact the community.

Component D had no timeline, as the administration recommended it be the next segment of this work and paid for via a levy, using the \$20 million earmarked in the Education fund, and by raising donations. The District wants to build a reserve with the levy and get to a balanced budget. Ms. Cassell asked the Board to consider whether it wanted to do Component D as the most urgent needs were contained in it and she supported the recommendations. PE spaces and the pool are learning spaces and are an issue of equity. Six hundred sixty-nine students said one of the areas in the building that did not work for them was the pool. Dr. Pruitt-Adams agreed that the pool was an urgent need, but the administration heard the Board say to concentrate on what was critical—the classrooms, ADA compliant, and the least affect on the taxpayers. The administration will implement whatever the Board of Education decides. Mr. Baron was concerned about commencing projects that were out of sequence, specifically boys' locker room, and raising the costs associated with it. The administration stated that with South area, one could renovate the current space, but it would not provide adequate ventilation or lighting. Thus, renovation is not a viable option. The administration stated that the recommendations for the next sequence could be brought forward about halfway through the first phase.

About PE spaces, Dr. Moore stated that the school would be waiting four years to begin design work on the boys' locker rooms and PE facilities. How much longer will the pools last? What is the maintenance cost to keep them functional over that period? Dr. Pruitt-Adams did not want to minimize the urgency or the cost to continue the status quo. Dr. Moore asked whether the PE curriculum was part of the overall curriculum and if it was, it needs to have attention. Health and wellness are on the same level as academics. Opting out of a curriculum should be explored for all sports, i.e., football, soccer or tennis players would not have to take those as a learning unit. And those on the swim team or those who do synchronized swimming would not need swimming. If so, then what is the District's commitment to the PE program because that part of the building is in dire straits and not up to code. Not fixing the ventilation for four years is a long time. Dr. Pruitt-Adams noted that if the administration came forward with the SPED TEAM spaces, the boys' locker rooms, the all-gender locker rooms, the pool replacement, and a south elevator it would cost \$65 million plus. Perkins + Will stated that opening up the library allows classrooms and the science area renovation that would allow TEAM to expand.

Mr. Arkin concurred that a review of best practices in PE was needed. Based on what he had heard about the PE curriculum were not relevant as it was not about learning a sport or having skills, it is was about a lifetime commitment. He wanted to hear that from the professionals. In talking about the items that are of urgent need, especially in component D, the athletic portion that those go along with the other non-

urgent needs cannot be separated, i.e., relocating the boy's locker rooms. The PE offices, dance studio, and weight room are not urgent. It was stated that was more effective and created a domino effect. Dr. Pruitt-Adams reminded the Board that if it wanted to do Component D and the TEAM spaces, it would have to be paid for by taking funds from the fund balance or going out for debt certificates for non-referendum bonds. If so, this would mandate a commitment to a balanced budget, and there would be no reserves left unless generated by surpluses going forward. Financial uncertainty and unanswered questions still exist. She did not believe it was prudent to take the monies from the fund balance for these projects. The administration considered all of the comments made about PE being an academic class, classroom and ADA spaces, flat levies, and being good stewards in its recommendation. It also wanted to impact as many students as possible, and the first segment does that. Based on the cost involved, the second segment does not affect as many students. While understanding that it is not fiscally responsible to approach this on a piecemeal basis, she was unprepared to commit to spending \$100 million on only an initial phase of a larger long-term plan.

Mr. Baron read the following statement, “Regarding the swimming requirement, following concerns expressed by members of our community, I asked our administration a few months ago to explore a path to allow some capable student swimmers to opt-out. The response that we got is that the swimming requirement is part of a six-year curriculum review. With Imagine being charged with looking to prepare our students for the future, I am disappointed that we seem to be institutionally holding onto a relic of the past. I question if a swimming requirement makes sense any more.

“It’s troubling to me that there is not even an openness to exploring the issue, which seems to be the complete opposite of an innovative, forward-looking approach that we want to embrace. I ask fellow board members to join me in calling for at least an exploration of that issue.

Dr. Pruitt-Adams noted that the administration was not resistant or refusing to look at the PE curriculum. It is part of a six-year curriculum review. IMAGINE was not given the task of looking at curriculum as that is the educator’s role. It looked at facilities. Even if there were a swimming opt-out, it would not influence the size of the pool. The curriculum does not impact its size, and that has been a miscommunication throughout this process. The term Olympic-sized pool was never used by IMAGINE.

Mr. Cofsky stated that the urgent needs along with the other needs embedded with urgent needs exceed the resources available. The District needs to prioritize and demonstrate financial competence and the ability to control costs to get community support. He supported the choices for the first phase of the needed project work and was concerned that the locker room and pools would come later.

Mr. Iseli supported the recommendations and the rationale. IMAGINE focused on using the footprint of the building, but there are many entities who have facilities offsite. He was not ready to support \$64 million until all other compromises had been exhausted.

The administration was asked to consult with fundraisers about accessing the community, the timing of the referendum and how much. In 18 months, the administration will provide the mechanism on how to pay for the next stage by seeking private donations, using the \$20 million earmarked, maintaining a balanced budget and underspending, and using the levy. Board members concurred noting that more direction might be had on pension reform, etc.

Mr. Arkin knew the urgent needs, and they are classroom space as well and in 18 months know what can or cannot be afforded. He supported the administration’s recommendation as it is important to work to alleviate special education and have common areas because students need that space to sit, collaborate, socialize, and be a safe space. They need access beyond the school day. Students do homework in the Fieldhouse because they have no other places to go.

Ms. Cassell concurred that the District needed to demonstrate responsibilities fiscally, but she was troubled with the other comments about whether there is a swim program or extracurricular program on campus. She felt this was a repetitive conversation and she thought IMAGINE was to provide research and expertise to demonstrate the students' needs regarding PE and extracurricular programs. She did not understand what that looks like for the administration to come forward to pay for a project with no commitment from the Board that it wants the type of project to be recommended. Dr. Moore concurred. The District has already looked at partnerships and other spaces. The realities have not changed and waiting to see if a potential partnership will occur or a special piece of land be available is not an option. Was the Board willing to wait four more years to address the south end of the building and continue to put money into stopgap measures? She hoped the Board would give more commitment to PE and athletic spaces.

Mr. Baron stated, "Imagine was given no financial limits, and we are here to set limits that we can come to a consensus on. I do not favor spending \$65 million on that end of the building. I understand the different views, and it's a matter of priority. Board member Iseli's suggestion to explore an off-campus option is one potential avenue.

"We received a report from the Imagine group, but we also heard from hundreds of community members expressing great concern about the costs involved. It does raise the question: is it feasible to have a swimming pool or pools in this building? If so, how do we chart a path that is within the means we are comfortable with?"

Mr. Arkin felt that significant money could be fundraised over the next 18 months. Dr. Moore asked for a commitment to the next phase. At the regular board meeting, the administration will ask the Board to 1) charge it with finding a way to pay for it, and 2) commit to levying the maximum.

While green roofs were not a high priority, in the design process they could be costed out and designed as an alternative. In the Sequence 1 component was VB over the student resource center, QQ over the north cafe, and RR over the west gym.

Data Framework

Ms. Jones walked through the development of the data framework, noting that it was both data awareness and data use. The data framework team included:

- Krystle Jones – Coordinator of Assessment & Research
- Kristen McKee – RTI/MTSS Coordinator
- Greg Johnson – ASCI
- Matt Kirkpatrick – AP of Teaching and Learning
- Helen Gallagher – Division Head, English
- Julie Frey – Division Head, Math
- Janel Bishop – Dean (PSS)
- Neal Weisman – Teacher
- Mary Young – Teacher
- Jonathan Weintraub – Dean (PSS)

Its goal is to increase the effective use of data by educators to support a transformational teaching and learning community. The number one objective is to increase awareness and improve the articulation.

A data framework is needed because it establishes a system of accountability for timely awareness and targeted use of the district's most valuable information, eliminates data hoarding and arduous over-collection, prevents imprudent decision-making, reduces barriers to evaluating effective programming,

builds systematic standards and processes for the intentional use of data, increases and/or establishes on-going, effective practice in using data.

The key stakeholders include learning community members, board members, district administrators, school administrators, teachers, support staff, and students. Its first target is to identify the Key pieces of data that have value, by department or area of focus, i.e. discipline data, course performance data, SEL data, health data, SAT data, etc. Its second target is to create a data awareness framework to determine who needs to be aware of the information and how often. Its second objective is to provide a foundation for the district's development of data literacy and data use. Its first target is to develop a Data Use Framework to drive transformational teaching and learning and its second target is to develop Professional Standards (Norms) for Data Use.

Considerations for the District-wide Data Awareness Framework were:

- What do we want to know?
 - o What are our significant (essential) questions? How do we determine this?
 - What would have the biggest impact on our programs?
 - What changes are under our control?
 - What would our endpoints (destination) look like?
 - o What data are important, given the stated program goal(s) and objective(s)?
 - How will we know if we are moving toward reaching our goal(s) and objectives? (What are our indicators of progress?)
 - o What are our measures of success?
 - What are our “bright spots”?
 - What “small wins” can we accomplish in reaching our broad goals and SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, relevant and timely) objectives?
- What do we already know?
 - o What data do we already have through?
 - o What established data collection methods exist via our recordkeeping and reporting system?
 - o Are we collecting enough data? Too much data? The right data?
 - o Who collects the data? When is it collected?
 - o Who reviews it?
- What new questions do we have?
 - o What additional data might we need?
 - o What quantitative and qualitative methods (e.g., new data-surveys, interviews, and focus groups) will we use to get it?

An example of sharing information of student achievement and performance that were prepared based on the data awareness framework.

Question Formation: Which Questions can be answered with data? What is the nature and extent of the data needed to answer the questions?

- Data Quality: Are we collecting high-quality data that is valid, reliable, accurate, timely, and complete?
- Types of Data: What types of data is appropriate to answer the questions we have, qualitative, quantitative, longitudinal (cohort), or time-series?
- Types of Measures: What are the various types and purposes of assessments, surveys, and other measures?
- Data Sources: What are the different data sources we have and the benefits and limitations of each?
- Data Representations: How should the data be represented in a fashion that easily comprehensible and usable?

To date, the team has determined the Specific Goals of the Data Framework Team, begun the Data Awareness Framework Development Process and is developing the Team's Professional Knowledge and Data Literacy, has finalized the draft of the Data Awareness Framework Development and identified the key pieces of information needed at each level, focus on what is desired, question formation review potential models, i.e. Data Wise Improvement Process and A+ Data Inquiry Cycle

A matrix was developed using this information that included areas of focus, data source, targeted audiences, reporting frequency, specific information and the person responsible.

About student performance student achievement, the following information was gleaned through the SAT Suite of Assessments - Spring 2018 performance:

- Figure 1 Cohort 2019 Mean of Total Score, PSAT 10 to SAT
- Figure 2 Cohort 2020, mean of total score, PSAT 8/9 to PSAT 10.
- Figure 3 Cohort, Mean English Based Reading and Writing (EBRW) PSAT 10 to SAT
- Figure 4. Cohort 2019, Mean of MATH Score, PSAT 10 to SAT
- Figure 5. Cohort 2020, Mean of EBRW Score, PSAT 8/9 to PSAT 10
- Figure 6. Cohort 2020, Mean of MATH Score, PSAT 8/9 to PSAT 10

SY2019- Quarter 1– Course Performance – A,B,C Rate

- SY2019 – Q1 - English A,B,C Rates
- SY2019 - Q1 - Math A,B,C Rates
- SY2019 - Q1 - Science A,B,C Rates
- SY2019 - Q1 - History A,B,C Rates

The next steps will be to:

- Review the Data Awareness Model and feedback
- Continue to increase the Data Framework Team's Professional Knowledge and Data Literacy
- Development of the Data Use Framework model
 - A+ Inquiry Model
 - Data Wise Improvement Process
 - A combination of the two

Ms. Jones provided an introduction to the two models.

Discussion ensued. The team is developing how people will be trained to know what question to be asked through the use of the two models. Teams will know how to ask the questions and provide strength to curriculum and instruction using the Data wise Improvement process. There are distinct differences between the original process (instructional and academic use) and the universal process which includes HR and other departments.

About classroom goals, different teams will analyze the data with different purposes, i.e., math, English, etc. As part of the A+ framework, one would ask a specific question and figure out the process of how to improve one's work, and set individual goals based on one's market. It will be nuanced. As the awareness level is heightened, it can be used at the divisional level regarding aligning classroom instruction with common assessments, at the classroom level regarding teachers and meeting growth targets. The key part is the level of awareness and divisions deciding what can be looked at, i.e., grading, but it does raise instructional questions about content piece. Data Wise will be used to work with divisions. This program is about having a district-level common language and what data points are important. Also, the goals are linked to the State Report card because of how the state calculates them. As communicated to families the goal is to be exceptional, and the District is learning more about how the

data is calculated at the state level. While each discussion has included disaggregating the data by race and gender, the District does not want to have a deficit mindset about at what it is looking. Data can have negatives. It is critical that the District is mindful of engaging people.

Summer School Calendar and Budget

It was the consensus of the Committee members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve the 2019 Summer Calendar at its December 20 meeting as presented.

The schedule is as follows:

Full 23-day session: Mon., June 10 - July 18

Period 1: 8:00 am – 10:30 am, one-semester credit

Period 2: 10:40 am – 1:10 pm, one-semester credit

Period 3: 1:20 pm – 3:50 pm, one-semester credit ed: calendar proposal.

There will be no classes on Thursday, July 4th or Friday, July 5th, 2019,

The recommendation was for a full-term summer session rather than half-term because it is difficult to provide the quality content. Families will be informed of this after this is approved.

Teacher stipends will be status quo. Summer School registration fees at other schools ranged from \$210 to \$250. OPRFHS is raising its tuition from \$210 to \$250 per class. The State Board of Education has given guidance that FRE lunch should be expanded to summer school. One member suggested justifying the increase to families by saying the District has been stagnant in its cost for a long time, yet the costs have continued to increase as well as saying that the 4 days per week was a quality improvement, and are hiring teachers who know OPRFHS’s system and have relationships with students.

A suggestion was made to partner with the middle schools on a communication strategy for black students and working with the counselors.

How much is the district subsidizing, i.e., student fees vs. the District’s ed fund?

Policies for First Reading

It was the consensus of the Committee of the Whole members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve the policies for first reading at its regular meeting in December as presented.

Policy	Explanation and Recommended Action
1. Policy 2:150, Committees	Since this policy was adopted, the Board of Education has combined the Policy, Instruction and Finance Committee in the Committee of the Whole meeting. Also, the Culture, Climate and Behavior Committee has been added as a standing committee.
2. Policy 4:80, Accounting and Audits	IASB recommends updating this policy in response to ISBE best practice recommendations concerning the prevention of fraud, waste, and abuse in the administration of grants covered by the Grant Accountability and Transparency Act (GATA), 30 ILCS 708/. Issue 98, May/June, 2018
3. Policy 5:30, Hiring Process and Criteria	PRESS recommends a more generic referral to the collective bargaining agreements.
4. Policy 6:240, Student Travel	PRESS recommends updating the cross references.
5. Policy 7:50, School Admissions and	PRESS recommends updating the policy per 23

Student Transfers to and From Non-District Schools	Ill.Admin.Code §375.10 which states that the student permanent record shall include basic identifying information, including the student's name, birth date and place, and gender, and evidence required under 325 ILCS 50/5(b)(1).
--	---

Future Agenda Items

- Universal property
- Proposal for balancing the budget
- Periodic Reports from each division
- Best practices PE curriculum report
- Report on districts that have opt-outs for swimming

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.