

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

Committee of the Whole Meeting
June 16, 2020

A Committee of the Whole Committee meeting was held virtually on June 16, 2020. President Dixon Spivy called the meeting to order at 6:39 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members present were Matt Baron, Tom Cofsky, Gina Harris, Craig Iseli, Ralph Martire, Dr. Jackie Moore, and Sara Dixon Spivy. Also present were Dr. Pruitt-Adams, Superintendent; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board of Education and FOIA Officer.

Also present were: Greg Johnson, Associate Superintendent; Michael Carioscio, Chief Operations Officer; Karin Sullivan, Executive Director of Communications; Christopher Thieme, Senior Director of Technology; Dr. LeVar Ammons, Executive Director of Racial Equity and Student Success; Dr. Gwendolyn Walker Qualls, Senior Director of Pupil Support Services; and Cyndi Sidor, Chief Finance Officer.

Visitors

OPRFHS Faculty and Staff Lynda Parker, Janel Bishop, Fred Preuss, Jeff Bergmann, Carolyn Gust, Jason Lee, Jackie McGoey; Jason Hasko, and Andrea Neuman; Gavin Morgan and Megan Traficano of the Oak Park Township; Alyson Sternquist, Monica Sheehan, Lincoln Chandler Jan Arnold, Lance Tritsch, Josh Czerniak, Shalema Francois-Blue, community members and others

Public Comments

From Fred Arkin: “The presentation of the Construction Budget and Capital Project 1 becomes more confusing and less transparent from presentation to presentation.

“Let’s go back to Dec 20, 2018 when the board approved the Imagine OPRF Work Group Project 1. The components of this approved project included:

- 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)
- Student resource center (library and tutoring center)
- South Cafeteria
- Main entrance
- All-gender restrooms
- Three science labs
- Huskie Pups daycare facilities
- ADA-compliant elevator in the north end of the building

The entire project budget was an estimated cost of \$32,631,500. The board authorized a RFQ for this work.

Now the project has become so convoluted that nowhere in the currently presented budget for the work is the cost for these original elements. The administration now comes with a budget for the project of \$41,000,000. This project does not mirror the approved project. What is needed for full transparency is:

1. Current Cost vs Original Cost of each element of the original Project
2. Current Cost of each element that has been added to the scope of work (serverly, learning stair...etc.)
3. Current Cost vs Original Cost of each element removed from the scope (North ADA Elevator)
4. Current Cost vs Original Cost of each element noted as `Alternatives` which the administration suggesting being removed from Project 1 and deferred to a later date.

Taxpayers need to see what scope was changed and why along with the resultant change in cost.

“As for the 10 year maintenance plan...in Jan 2019, we were presented a 10yr budget of \$40,160,681. In addition, have of just over \$4,000,000 per year. Now this budget has swelled to \$20,000,000 a 25% increase in a little over a year and ½. The same cost comparison; original vs current must be done on each element of this plan with full explanation for the increase (cost increase of increase of scope).

“Finally why is there a \$2,272,000 contingency? The original Project 1 estimate had contingency built in. Now are we to understand the project is actually going to be \$10,472,000 over original budget?

“Frankly to have an \$8,200,000 (plus contingency) overrun on a \$32,631,500 project is outrageous. We need to see an element-by-element detailed comparison to have any understanding of what is going on. `Professionals` need to be held accountable.”

From Francis Kraft: “Dear D200 Board Members, I am writing regarding the revised Code of Conduct that will be presented at tonight’s meeting.

“As a member of CCB, I had an opportunity to review the document last week. While I appreciate all the hard work that went into the revised policy, I have concerns about the restorative practice portion. To be effective, restorative practices must:

- Be uniform and equitable across the entire organization so that one teacher is not “managing” an incident in a classroom using restorative practices, while another teacher down the hall is not. It cannot be optional.
- Tie directly into how teachers and staff respond to student behavior
- Include work at the beginning of the school year to create positive relationships between students/adults, students/students, and adult/adults
- Include training for every teacher, administrator, and staff member so it is embedded into every part of a school’s climate and culture

“I noticed that the document has been revised since the CCB meeting to include a restorative practices grid. In my opinion, this is a great step; however, I would like to see the district’s plan on how it will roll out training to every teacher and ensure that teachers are required to use these practices in every classroom and throughout the building.”

Approval of Minutes of May 19, 2020

Ms. Dixon-Spivy moved to approve the minutes of the May 19, 2020 meeting, as presented; seconded by Mr. Cofsky. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Presentation of Construction Budget and Funding

On September 17, 2019, we presented initial budget estimates to the Board of Education for the facilities master plan. In the March Board meeting, we discussed funding issues associated with the 10-year maintenance plan. In the May Board meeting, we discussed the funding gap associated with the Project 1 capital improvement project. The attached presentation provides an analysis of the total budget gap, with the District’s recommendation on how to move forward.

The presentation provided an update to the Board of Education on the status of the facilities master plan budget. As initial construction of the South Cafeteria and Student Resource Center had already begun, guidance was needed from the Board with respect to the deferral of scope. In addition, to the recommended scope deferral, the administration asked for an additional \$10.5M to close the funding gap.

The administration noted that the facilities master plan is designed to facilitate the education of the whole student, providing support for the full range of curricular and extracurricular activities that foster excellence, equity, and a sense of belonging for ALL OPRF students. Students need to be the center of learning, the equity lens should be used and a rigorous, needs-driven process is needed.

The original 10-year maintenance plan had inadequate escalation and owner soft built into it. The dollars estimated ten years ago determined what was spent, not what was needed. That result is that a significant backlog of maintenance work is needed and the yearly maintenance budget was insufficient to complete the necessary work. The master planning work for Project 1 was used to determine the project budget. The key assumptions, which have driven variances, are Renovation of South Café structure vs. new construction and Consideration of existing building infrastructure in estimates (e.g. placement of elevator, foundation issues – bad soil, mechanicals, existing plumbing riser condition).

Decision criteria applied to Project 1 was the Board feedback on non-negotiables from the May Board meeting and adherence to the original vision of the Imagine team. The decision criteria applied to the 10-year maintenance plan was essential/urgent maintenance and the impact of Project 1 construction. Health Life /Safety is assumed to be within the budget and was not included in this analysis.

The big picture analysis of the 10-year maintenance plan most recently discussed in the March 19, 2020 Board meeting is that the Current budget is \$4 million per year. So from 2021-2024, \$16 million will be available. The current scope of the work required in that same time period is \$20 million. This is a \$4 million shortfall.

The big picture analysis of Project 1, which was most recently discussed in the May 28, 2020 board meeting, is that the Current budget is \$32.6M (per Imagine master plan). The current scope of the work required is \$41 million (May estimate). The additional funding required is \$8.4 million. The deferred scope for Project 1, and most recently discussed in the May 28, 2020 board meeting, was to defer the main entrance and the Student Commons at a \$4.2 million savings and thus the ultimate funding required would be \$4.2 million. Mr. Carioscio will correct the math inaccuracies.

The Base bid / Budget allowance alternate(s) for Project 1 were:

Project 1 Base Bid

- SRC/South Café
- Library infill – classrooms and labs
- 63 renovated or new classrooms ● Remodel Special Education Spaces
- All gender toilet rooms
- Servery Alternate(s)
- Main entrance
- Student Commons
- Renovation of 13 classrooms

Base bid / Budget allowance alternate(s) – 10-year maintenance plan Base bid

- Roof replacement / masonry repair
- Excavation to fix foundation issues/Basement
- Plumbing risers replacement to support all gender toilets
- Tennis court replacement
- Accessibility enhancements
- North ADA elevator Alternate(s) (deferred past our 4 year window)
- Stadium work (interior and exterior)
- Field house repairs – flooring
- Sports field upgrades
- Computer labs repurposed as classrooms (not in Project 1 scope)
- Auditorium enhancements (e.g. lighting)

The take-aways were:

- Funding gap through completion of project 1 (2021-2024) is \$10.5M
- Funding gap from 2025-2031 is \$21M Both these estimates include 4% ownership contingency

Ms. Sidor stated that if the fund balance were used for these projects, the District would spend down its fund balance to the 63% range in 2024--which is sufficient to adhere to policy. The money would be spent in 2021 and 2022, as that is when the projects would be completed.

The next step if the Board were to agree in concept to 1) Scope deferral and increased funding for 2021-24 timeframe, the plan would be finalized based upon Board feedback, a detailed review of the 10-year maintenance plan would be completed and the timeline would be updated based upon the revised plan.

Discussion ensued and the responses followed. Mr. Cofsky asked the following questions:

1. What are the costs of the alternatives in the 10-year maintenance plan, as that is deferred activity?
2. How are you confident the costs over the long-term will go down, as he had no recollection of future costs going down? While the remark was a misstep, Mr. Carioscio stated that knowing the scope of things identified would give a better picture of what and when something needed to be done.
3. Two comments were made on the long-term maintenance plan that were attributed to the present information. Why was there a change? Was it escalation or soft costs over time? The response was that the District was spending on what it had versus what is needed.
4. What should the district be spending on facilities maintenance? Mr. Cofsky trusted that the administration was saying it should be spending \$5.5 million in maintenance costs rather than the \$4 million currently budgeted. This would mean that the District would have had \$6.7 million for additional infrastructure for Project 1. Taking the original \$32 million budgeted and then adding to the \$41 million \$6.7 million would equal \$47 million for Project 1, which would then be 15% over budget. Mr. Cofsky supported Fred Arkin's comments. He did not support including an owners' contingency as had been presented. Mr. Carioscio stated that conversations previously to COVID-19

aligned with the estimate of monies that should be spent on facilities of \$5.5 million per year. The question was asked how one would decide if there was an opportunity to do something once the building is down, is that undertaken and if so associate it with Project 1. He did not think it was fair that other things were part of the scope of Project 1. It is a judgment call.

Lance Tritch stated that the scope is the best indicator as to what was a reasonable maintenance budget. Ms. Sidor stated that the District has been working on the 10-year plan and adding dollars and a timeline. It averages out to be about \$5.5 million with one year spending more and some years spending less. While Mr. Tritch had provided a report completed by three different groups about what the average spend is for a school on maintenance, most schools spend at the 1 to 2 percent range of the current replacement value (OPRFHS's current replacement value is \$415 million), but would do more if they could. However, this school is old and has deferred maintenance projects.

Mr. Cofsky did not believe that just because there was an opportunity to do a project, it did not mean it had to be done. Project 1 did not call for adding a basement, which, unfortunately, is a significant amount of dollars beyond the scope. Project 1 only called for enhancements aimed at student-centered issues.

Mr. Martire followed up on Mr. Cofsky categorization of costs and what needed to be incurred. Category 1: The gender-neutral bathrooms were an enhancement. Category 2: The existing capital is needed to replace the roof. Category 3: Necessary upgrades to the facilities discovered by beginning the work on Project 1 that supports the work of Project 1, e.g. the foundation, etc. He asked how much the plumbing risers cost. How much is in the essential supports needed to structurally make the building sound in order to enhance the learning environment? Mr. Carioscio noted that the tennis courts and the basement were in a Category 4: opportunity. Mr. Martire asked how much overrun was involved in the structural matters that needed to support Project 1, e.g. the roof, as it would be illogical to go forward with learning environments if the structure does not support that. The architect and Pepper will have to extract that specific work from the estimates and the total. When the administration stated that the extra dollars came from the capital improvement dollars, Mr. Martire said it would have been helpful to know that as the Board could have done only those improvements that were essential to Project 1.

Mr. Iseli agreed with Mr. Martire that it was important to understand the costs. That is \$6.3 is Project 1 or Capital Improvements. He thought the basement was nice, but it was not required. He felt it was unfair for the administration to put the Board of Education in position of whether it has to choose between a basement and improvements in Special Education. This needs to be challenged significantly. Dr. Pruitt-Adams noted that the basement would free up classroom space now being used for storage. Mr. Iseli stated that there were lots of "ifs" and what might be needed. He was uncomfortable without knowing the need. The only alternative he saw being put on the table in terms of costs was not moving forward with the welcome center and student commons. The Board in a previous conversation talked about wanting those things. He did not feel he had choices about the deferral of scope of \$4.2 million. He did not have choices to defer scope and money to decide. If others do not agree, OK, he is in the minority. Mr. Iseli also wanted, if the Board of Education agreed to an owners' contingency, that any new items would ultimately be approved by the Board of Education.

Dr. Moore was confused about how the \$20 million was being recommended for maintenance before the Board of Education received the 10-year maintenance plan, which was due in August. Mr. Carioscio was confident that because of the maintenance plan, Project 1 was looked at closely. Dr. Moore stated that since the roof was not something to be determined to be a crisis in the last school year, there is clarity about things that have been deferred. Mr. Carioscio stated that the roof was estimated, but when it was opened up, it was very bad due to moisture getting in. When asked if there were checks and balances in the maintenance plan so there are no variances, Mr. Carioscio stated that the roof set off the electrical panel in February, the pool is in sad condition, the administration was approaching maintenance as a district.

Dr. Moore continued with the items that were "nice to have." The basement was never put forward as an option and given that the first slide is about the goals in terms of needs and what this project is supposed to be about, it is

interesting that the basement costs \$3.6 million and the Student Resource Center is \$4.2 million. Saying that this is the time to do storage when also on the list were computer labs waiting to be transformed into classrooms because of Project 1. Since going 1:1 3 to 4 years ago, they said they were going to hold off on that. What things are urgent and optional? Regarding the IMAGINE group and Project 1, Dr. Moore felt that Project 1 has become something other than what it was when it first started. The Board of Education has emphasized the need for itemization. The maintenance issues have been conflated and muddied the waters. Part of that was discovering that the 10-year maintenance plan was deficit, not updated, not elaborated upon in a way in which the Board of Education would have expected with such a huge building and so many resources.

Ms. Harris noted that Dr. Pruitt-Adams had noted a connection with one of the pieces that would allow more classroom space. Not enough information has come forward on that and it did not inform the Board of Education's decision making decision. As part of the Board of Education, she noted that at every meeting there is something different. If she were challenged by the information, she can only imagine the shift to the public and how they received it. For her, the original conversation about Project 1 was clear and the Board of Education moved forward with a clear understanding and made that decision. Now, this information makes it not as clear and, more money is needed. She felt lots of conversations have not been clear and upfront. She is challenged by the numbers that changed before the process, and the process has really not begun. She was unsure how the information should be presented so it is clear, but it needs to be. The idea of not knowing and pieces of contingencies are built are part of the conversation that keeps coming up and changes either the 10-year maintenance plan and/or Project 1. When will definite numbers be presented without variation from month to month.

Mr. Baron noted his preference for completing the student commons for both the students and the community, as that was their lynchpin. This is a community building and he wanted them included in Project 1, as it was a pay now or pay more later. It will never be in alignment with the new building. This discussion is drifting away from the IMAGINE report to bring forth a vision of thousands of hours. The capital project awareness while disconcerting, is a hard truth. Mr. Carioscio noted that he could not speak to whether Project 2 would go forward either.

Mr. Martire requested: 1) itemization of new cost factors (risers, plumbing, and foundation) that were necessary to support Project 1. Isolated would be those projects found to be opportune to do, like the basement. It was about reporting the cost factors to understand what changes are essential to support those items that were approved by the Board of Education, rather than improvements like the basement. He agreed with Mr. Iseli and Dr. Moore that no discussions had occurred about them with the Board of Education.

Mr. Carioscio reiterated that the Board of Education wanted a menu of items for which it would say yes or no. Ms. Dixon Spivy reiterated that the Board of Education wanted to know the pieces that are structurally foundational and must be done for the subsequent work and that work be prioritized. The Board of Education made clear its priorities: 1) ADA elevator, classrooms, and Special Education. The Board of Education needs to know whether the filler under the cafeteria is necessary. Mr. Cofsky again agreed with Mr. Arkin as to what needed to be done: Breaking it down by the original elements and the changes that were beyond the original elements, and the same for the maintenance plan.

Presentation of Contract for Occupational Therapy Services for the 2020-21 School Year

It was the consensus of the Committee of the Whole members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve the Contract for Occupational Therapy Services for the 2020-21 school year, as presented, at its regular June Board of Education meeting.

Presentation of Contract for Physical Therapy Services for the 2020-2021 School Year

It was the consensus of the Committee of the Whole members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve the Physical Therapist contract with Supplemental Health Care in the amount of \$70,113, as presented, at its June 25, 2020 meeting

Presentation of Social Work Services for the 2020-2021 School Year

It was the consensus of the Committee of the Whole members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve the contract with Social Worker Lisa Garvin in the amount of \$33,880, as presented, at its June 25, 2020 meeting.

Presentation of Psychologists for the 2020-21 School Year

It was the consensus of the Committee of the Whole members to recommend to the Board of Education approve the contract for psychological services with the Center for Special Education Services (CSES) in the amount of \$48,400 at its regular June 25, 2020 meeting.

Mr. Martire questioned 1) why the cost was in thousands of dollars and not in the other contracts; 2) a problematic clause about professional staff and those who are not; 3) why is there a non-compete clause in this contract; 4) why is there a \$10,000 finder's fee; services and charges are outlined in appendix b and c; and 5) waiver clause regarding LEA participation. Ms. Sidor will have the business staff address.

Presentation of Annual Renewal of Property, Casualty, Liability and Workers' Compensation Insurance (CLIC)

Ms. Sidor asked the Committee of the Whole to provide input and she recommended that the CLIC insurance renewal of a total of \$572,739 for the 2020-2021 school year move forward to the Board of Education for approval at its June 25, 2020 meeting.

Oak Park and River Forest High School District 200 is a member of CLIC, the Collective Liability Insurance Cooperative, which was formed 40 years ago. As of the May 14, 2020 renewal meeting, CLIC now has 185 members, insuring over 800 school buildings, almost 500,000 students and just over 4,000 vehicles and property values in excess of \$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 Workers' Compensation training for the employee groups to mitigate risk exposure.

Discussion ensued about the original RFP, which had four responses. The other three bids were on workers' compensation and school board liability, but there was no real comparison. The next RFP will request they bid on all parts. It was noted that CLIC had not submitted a bid because they were out of sequence. This is its bid, after the decision had been made. Ms. Sidor noted that what changed from the RFP is a 15% increase. Ms. Sidor noted that the District has not looked at self-insuring on workers' compensation claims. Some of the claims have raised the percentage of out-of-pocket costs for the District. Ms. Sidor said the administration would look into this area of perhaps having a small policy and self-insuring the balance. She noted that if insurance companies were asked to provide bids on all parts, a comparison could be made and the District may end up with four different companies in these areas.

Recessed at 8:42 and returned at 8:47 p.m.

Presentation of Student Code of Conduct

Mr. Johnson and Ms. Parker presented the Student Code of Conduct for the 2020-21 school year. The fall of 2019 represented a shift in the approach to student discipline at OPRF. This presentation is the third part of a three-part progression. The first part, delivered to the Board in October during the presentation of the UMOJA contract, detailed the commitment to restorative practices. The second part, provided this past April, provided an update on the student discipline data, as well as an overview of review of the responses of student discipline based on restorative practices. The third part is this presentation of the revised student code of conduct.

Throughout this past school year, the team partnered with UMOJA to receive guidance and support as the administration worked to significantly revise the code of conduct. The goal was to develop a code that would aid the

implementation of a restorative approach to student discipline, providing a framework needed to improve the response to the systemic racial disparities that have persisted at OPRF. As part of the development process, the administration gathered and responded to feedback from the student leadership group, a committee of teachers, faculty senate, and Culture, Climate and Behavior Committee (CCB). In response to the CCB meeting, the following changes were made:

- Re-sequenced the sections to improve clarity and flow.
- Added a glossary of terms.
- Added bullying to the response grid.
- Revised the due process explanation for greater clarity.
- Added a line to teacher responsibilities related to reporting student concerns to the appropriate personnel.
- Added a restorative justice practices grid that we have and will continue to train the administration and staff
- Allowed for greater flexibility in responses by changing language from “will” to “may” for each of the five levels of response.
- Made more explicit the connection between the guiding principles and the overarching racial equity focus of the strategic plan
- Omitted “acts of defiance” as a response category

The Deans and Director of Student Services sought legal counsel and a number of faculty and staff participated in a series of workshops and training under the direction of the Umoja Corporation with the intent to shift mindset away from the old practices and thoughts about what disciplinary actions look like.

SB100 - The Law SB100 requires the examination of the guiding questions when considering using OSS as a disciplinary response. These questions are intended to be used in a progressive approach based on the severity of the infraction. Would student’s continuing presence pose:

- (a) a threat to the safety of other students, staff members, or the school community,
- (b) a disruption to other students’ learning opportunities,
- (c) Substantially disrupt, impede or interfere with the operation of the school?

The following questions were asked:

- 1) Who are these students?
- 2) How is the data used to inform the practice and help students?
- 3) What is the true understanding of the infractions being committed?

Behavior Education Plan is driven by the word “education” and at its core is a teaching and learning plan designed to support every student in his or her social, emotional, and academic development. Behavior education is complex work happens in classrooms and cafeterias, on buses and playing fields, and even in offices and auditoriums. Whether one is a student, family member, community member, or staff member, all have a responsibility to embody the beliefs, the expectations, and the commitments. The administration believes in authentic relationships and a supportive community that fosters a sense of belonging in a thriving school environment where staff and students are physically and emotionally safe. It is important for the voice of students and staff to be involved in the decision-making. Families and school staff must be collaborative partners in supporting every student. The expectation is that students, staff, and families demonstrate respect to one another and hold high expectations for behavior. And, for students, staff, and families to build and sustain ongoing positive and authentic relationships. Students, staff, and families contribute to a safe learning environment. The District will utilize innovative strategies and supports to create a positive school community where students, staff and families feel safe. It will provide school staff with the necessary resources, professional development and technical assistance to implement the Behavior Education Plan.

Key guiding principles will be developed to drive this work. They are as follows:

- We are grounded in a strong focus on engagement and learning
- Whenever possible, we avoid exclusionary practices.

- We believe in teaching and intervention over consequences and punishment.
- We support progressive discipline, not “zero tolerance.”
- We believe that strong school-family partnerships are important.
- We will use disaggregated data to identify disparities, monitor progress, and drive decisions.
- We believe that every child, when provided with appropriate support, can learn and succeed.
- We support proactive problem-solving on behalf of students.

Supporting positive student behavior requires a high level of commitment from students, parents/guardians, teachers/staff, administrators, and members of the Board of Education. These stakeholder groups have the following rights and responsibilities that are designed to reflect both the mutual respect and accountability required of all people involved in supporting student behavior. Sometimes issues are brought to adults from students who are not reported on the student’s behalf. Sometimes students ask that their privacy be maintained. When a student gives permission and it is not a mandated reporting case, the administration asks for permission to refer for additional help. Sometimes those who were harmed do not want to participate in RJ. Oftentimes when the administration tries to talk with them, that offer is refused.

The Behavior Education Plan is founded on principles of Restorative Justice in Education. At the center of this model is mindset, including the belief that all people are inherently worthy and want to be in strong relationships. The school is being supported in and increasing the use of a variety of Restorative Practices. The District works toward the transformation of school culture so that all members of the learning community, including students, teachers, staff, administrators, families, and community members feel they belong.

The Restorative Practices to focus on are:

- Building and maintaining healthy relationships to create a caring culture where every member thrives.
- Engaging in repairing harm and transforming conflict
- Establishing communities of reentry and support after harm in order to welcome, integrate, and support students after an extended absence or for individualized support to build a more equitable learning environment

In order to do this work, staff and students will learn to teach and reinforce foundational beliefs and core practices. These include building and maintaining a just and equitable school community and culture, developing strong relationships, and using Restorative Practices such as a “circle process” as both a proactive and responsive strategy to prevent, identify, and repair harm through healthy dialogue. The administration also believes in empowering, encouraging, and supporting student, family, and staff well-being. A focus on resiliency can help regulate and respond to the challenging and complex realities and are directly linked to Restorative Practices. The use of Peace Circles will be expanded this year and some staff have been trained in hosting them.

Level 1 - Classroom management is not a referral that appears in Skyward Classroom intervention before progressing to

Level 2 Administrative facilitated restorative response, May result in removal from class May result in an In-School Reflection (ISR) for up to 1 day

Level 3 Administrative facilitated restorative response, May result in 1-3 days of In-School Reflection (ISR)

Level 4 Administrative facilitated restorative response, May result in 1-3 days of Out of School Suspension (OSS)

Level 5 Intensive Administrative Intervention, May result in 4 or more days of Out of School Suspension (OSS) and/or recommendation for expulsion

When a concern was raised about whether this seemed punitive in nature and the question was asked how the district was addressing the behaviors, it was noted that Response Level 1 is used when behaviors are supported within the classroom by staff assigned to those classrooms. Response Level 2 may require an additional staff member who might be provided in the classroom, outside the classroom, or in another environment. Behaviors assigned to Response Levels 1 and 2 do not need to be responded to at Level 1 prior to being responded at Level 2. In situations at Response Level 3 and 4 or when behaviors are repeated, it is important for Student Services staff to be involved to look more deeply at the student's needs to determine the most effective intervention.

Acts of defiance were removed from last year's Code, because African-Americans were overrepresented. The District is attempting to make sure that it is broken down with relationship building and not thought about as a disrespect and new education. Subjectivity is involved when it comes to issues of defiance or disruptive behavior; the behaviors fall differently on people. People are being asked to do more than they had in the past.

For most situations, the progression is to progress through different levels starting at the beginning and then stair step. While not in every situation with repeated behavior with an individual, the level can be adjusted.

If looking at alcohol drugs and tobacco, these start at a level 2, a referral is written to contact the dean. If it is one of the first three that start at a Level 2. Situations of repeat offenses of that nature would escalate to the maximum.

Loss of Privileges replaces "social probation" Failure to serve outstanding detentions and certain conduct that falls within Response Level 4 or 5 may result in a Loss of Privileges for a length of time to be determined by the administration. Students with a Loss of Privileges are not allowed to attend any athletic or extra-curricular activities at OPRF or away from OPRF when our school is a participant. Students serving an In-School Reflection or Out-of School Suspension automatically receive a Loss of Privileges throughout the duration of their reflection/suspension

In-School Reflection (ISR) In-School Reflection Center is a disciplinary response in which a student is removed from the classroom environment and assigned to work in a different location within the school building. This space is designed to give students a chance to reflect on decisions that the student made that caused a disciplinary assignment to be issued but also help them in improving their decision making process in the future. Supports will also be given in the areas of academics, social/emotional, and restorative practices

Discussion ensued. Mr. Baron was appreciative of the presentation and added that many situational things can occur that are not covered by this perfectly. How does OPRFHS compare to other high schools with regard to student discipline? Ms. Bishop will research that. She continued that OPRFHS has been working under SB 100 since as early as 2014 and the hardest problem has been that the adults do not feel the students are not being held accountable. Students can learn behavior, but it takes patience. Ms. Parker stated that one cannot take things personally, as students can be their normal adolescent self. This is intensive learning for adults.

Mr. Iseli too appreciated this work as it had depth and needed. It was also overwhelming trying to understand it. As a board member, not engaged in this conversation, and as a parent, he reflected on this and he had the impression that he could talk to other parents and neighbors and get 100 different opinions on all of it. It seemed somewhat prescriptive as it is structured. While understanding why, it was hard to judge because it was so contextual. He appreciated the work as part of the journey, and it was a great start.

Ms. Bishop stated that they have committed to the work, but they need direction. They have to honor how people feel about this. They need to be prescriptive in case someone wants to be more punitive. The deans will have conversations about incidents together to look at the whole child, the situation and all contracts. The first couple of years it will take longer to develop these, but the process did begin this past school year.

Mr. Cofsky asked how this was not voluntary from a teacher's perspective and how from a recruitment standpoint can it be made clear as to expectations and relationship building. Ms. Parker stated that accountability is very important. At Level 2 - 5, the deans are involved. Time for calibration is important. Staff has to be more present in hallways and to assist teacher. Some do automatically without issue and others struggle to make sure working with appropriate implementation. This is not a process where feeling can take the top run. That could cause inconsistency. This document allows for more consistency.

A suggestion was made to use the advisory period to review this document with the students, e.g. why this direction, what is the intent of the document, and what is their part, etc. Teachers need to be acclimated as well, and they need to see this before school starts. It was suggested that it be part of the Institute Day agenda, because it is a very different approach. Students were introduced to this at the student advisory leadership meeting. Originally, this document would have come to the Board in May for approval, but because of COVID-19 disruptions and not getting the faculty and staff voice in time, it is being brought forward now. Parents on the CCB Committee reviewed this as well as UMOJA and the Deans. Parents will be made aware of these changes through parent groups, Community Council, and mass communications

Ms. Harris asked how tracing for first and second time infractions be handled and when does Level 1 infraction become another level. Consistently is needed so it is not applied to one student group and not another. She thanked them for this work. Ms. Parker replied that doing one's job should not be based on color of skin or race. This relies on the adults for implementation. Ms. Bishop noted that other work was needed by the school in thinking about behaviors that are more typical of a particular race. The BEP will drive people to react differently. Trauma informed practices would be used appropriately.

Because students come to the high school later in their educational careers, she suggested reaching out to District 90 and 97 about their behavior education plan.

Dr. Moore was concerned about:

- 1) The racial equity policy was not reflected in the document. It is stated in the introductory piece, but not the work of the Racial Equity Director's lens.
- 2) The discipline report did not contain tardies and they were the predominance of escalation of disciplinary action. Lincoln Chandler had looked at specific two through 8 that showed racial disparities. Tardies are not now part of Code of Conduct. Why are students not going to class?

3) How would race play into the level 1 behaviors being addressed in a classroom and would teachers put their feelings aside. The racial equity lens is throughout the Strategic Plan and while conversations about certain groups having certain behaviors, it has not been identified as race. Acts of defiance has been removed, but race is not. From thinking about the movie, “American To Me” that illustrated the changes and seeing the levels, she was not comfortable rushing this. She felt like it would be de ja vie. This was too rushed. Time is needed to vet this properly, to get an outside look. What are other school districts doing? What do the experts say?

4) She also felt that the CCB recommendations were not reflected in this. Senate Bill 100 needs to be looked at to ensure the District is following it to the letter. Teachers must receive professional development on culturally responsive and developmental disciplinary interaction, classroom strategies, etc. Has that been done? It sounds like the District is moving down the road, but she was not sure how this was connecting with the expectations of SB 100, as well as racial equity policy. Ms. Parker stated that the crux of what she said is what drove this work. The spaces of levels, the severity of the incident has to be there in order to experience those things. Level 2 is a range of ISR and OSR with OSR being much less. Some type of progression is needed to avoid getting to a severe level immediately. Level 2 may result in the removal of the student from a class but the deans have kept them in class. The ISR now has a curriculum to help the students reflect on why they are there. The recidivism rates are way down. Does the District not want to have an ISR or OSS as an option for anyone? This system is less punitive. The HERO system is also being revamped. OPRFHS is in alignment with SB 100 requirements, while training still needs to be conducted. More conversations are needed around tardies. Tardies do not result in in-school or out-of-school suspensions. Detentions for tardy infractions will no longer result in missing class time. More interventions will be attempted that do not cause a lack of class time. Dr. Moore did not understand how not having the tardy piece in the Code of Conduct would work. Something should happen when a student misses a class. Dr. Pruitt-Adams noted that being truant in and out of the being covers students not being in class. Those infractions will not result in a student losing more class time.

Mr. Ammons spoke to the racial equity piece noting that Ms. Parker had conversations with ISR and racial equity will be approached through the procedures. Collecting data to see how practices are informing discipline is part of the procedures. In looking at the BEH, procedurally they are mapped out in racial equity policy.

Mr. Martire thanked everyone for working on this document. He appreciated that they were trying to change an approach and there is a need for prescription. CCB members have complained about the lack of consistency in the discipline rules and this is responsive to that complaint.

Several members were uncomfortable approving this at this time because more understanding by everyone was needed.

Ms. Harris noted that there is disproportionate data on race for black students that shows them being targeted more based on defiance and disrespect. Yet teachers are being asked to make a difference. She did not predict that differences in the data will be seen until the adult practices are addressed. She also noted that RJP comes from African-Americans and Indians. These students should understand that this comes from their ancestors. That was missed and it is critical. This is not a program being applied, but a shift of culture. She also did not see the Culture of Warmth reflected. In what areas did UMOJA have input on and what questions did they answer. She felt the RJP chart had a framework. If looking at the discipline window, being done with one or two people, it is not considered or not being done for all. How much of this is being done to students versus with students. Where students involved with the creation of it versus just receiving it? SB 100 was signed into law five years ago. She wanted to look more fully at SB 100, and take the initiative to COW as the adult practices prevent that.

Ms. Harris continued, “How do we do this seamlessly across the districts?” Numerous things are happening in D97 and each building will have a cohort of teachers trained in what it means to shift the culture. While she appreciated how different this looks from before and when her daughter graduated, but to truly move, she did not see that there would be a difference in the difference in inappropriate data and what metrics will be made. What was the process of UMOJA into the levels?

Ms. Parker was appreciative of all of the feedback, and she spoke to this being year two at OPRFHS. OPRFHS is unique in terms of legacy, history and implementation of different things. This document will not be the one thing that makes it so. The actions of the individuals will make the difference. A person is hired to do a thing, they are trained and then it is free will. Everyone works under his or her own experience. Much conversation has occurred about reshaping students. Feelings must be put aside. While she did not want to dishonor the restorative work and its roots, she knew she had to take baby steps and that meant not including the talking piece.

Ms. Harris reiterated that a longer conversation was necessary and she wanted to be intentional about how it was being addressed. Ms. Parker had met with UMOJA and the Deans every other week on the creation of this. Then, COVID happened. UMOJA worked with OPRFHS. This originated with the dean group, as it is the one that has to activate this plan. She was confident with Levels 2 -5. Ms. Harris stated that having the deans being fully involved is a great piece, as whatever was happening in the classroom will stop with them. Ms. Bishop stated that she would welcome more feedback and that the document does speak to caring on the RJ page. This document will grow and improve and change every year.

Dr. Pruitt-Adams noted that if the Board does not approve this, the old one would be used in the Student Handbook. While again several members expressed concerns about having more information, the administration stated that if it were delayed, the choices for disseminating to students would be to have it electronically, print the handbook without it, or send a hard copy via the mail to students. It was noted that the questions to be answered would not change what will go into the document.

Ms. Harris asked how the process and restorative response be delineated across all levels, e.g. vaping. That was a missing part for her. Mr. Johnson stated that all levels have different levels of Restorative Justice responses as well. The more something is written, the more that someone says this has to happen. While it was noted that ISR has a curriculum and social workers have the BEP, Ms. Harris would not know this, as a parent. Much of this discussion is not showing up in the document.

Ms. Harris did say that she would approve this version rather than going back to the old Student Code of Conduct, even if pieces were missing, due to the timing. Mr. Johnson suggested a fuller explanation of this at the August COW meeting. Teachers will need to see this in the summer. Right now, only the focus groups have seen it.

Dr. Moore stated that this is about illuminating the work of the district and she struggled to understand what it meant. She didn't believe that in a week's time to bring this forward again would change anything. Dr. Pruitt-Adams agreed.

Ms. Harris asked if the focus groups included the teachers union and specific meetings with the union president separate from the focus group. Ms. Parker stated that the people in the focus group said yes. Ms. Harris would personally like to have this in the handbook as it does include some of the pieces and asked that CCB, stakeholders, teachers, ESPs, and others develop it further.

After further deliberation, it was the consensus of the COW members to recommend that the document be approved at the Special Board meeting following this meeting and then address the issues previously discussed by the Board of Education, including behavior, PD, adult teacher and learning practices.

Presentation of MENTA Contract Renewal

It was the consensus of the Committee of the Whole members to recommend to the Board of Education that it renew the contract with MENTA at its regular June meeting.

This past school year was the fourth year MENTA was utilized as an alternative educational provider. OPRFHS utilizes services from MENTA in three ways: First, MENTA provides an alternative setting for some of the students with IEPs. The contract to continue this relationship is included in this report. Second, as was shared during our fall semester intervention report, students who receive an-out of-school suspension are referred to MENTA for the duration of their suspension as an alternative to suspension (ATS). As part of our ongoing work to revise the student code of conduct, the new practices will reduce the number of days students spend out of school, limiting but not eliminating using MENTA for this purpose. Third, our PSS teams also assign students to MENTA on a permanent basis as an alternative provider of educational services. Because data on the use of MENTA for this final purpose has not been reported to the Board yet this year, it was included in this report for review. Additionally, all of the students referred to MENTA have received significant interventions at OPRFHS prior to the referral.

PSS teams identify students who could benefit from a smaller or more self-directed setting than what can be provided on campus. Attendance and academic progress data is regularly provided by MENTA to OPRFHS staff. More frequent and additional contact occurs between MENTA and OPRF staff on an as needed basis. Over the course of first semester, six students were referred to attend MENTA for the following reasons: Four of these referrals were for attendance related concerns. Two were for credit recovery. Demographic information for these students is provided in the charts below.

Ms. Harris asked how the BEP was informing the recommendations. How did the Code of Conduct impact how students moved to MENTA. Mr. Johnson stated that the code of Conduct speaks specifically about student behaviors and it would have triggered conversation with the PSS Teams, etc., and it might determine that a smaller learning environment would be better for the student. It is about understanding who the student is. Ms. Parker added that in some cases, parental conversation and requests based on needs are considered, depending on the best environment and consult. MENTA is a place to go to act educationally rather than just being at home. The number of students assigned to MENTA next was anticipated to be lower.

Ms. Harris felt that OPRFHS seemed like a prison pipeline to this school, and if it were, how would the school break that down, combat or obviate the effects of this. Mr. Johnson acknowledged that 50% of the students who get suspensions do drop out and are in the prison pipeline.

Presentation of Tri-District Consortium Extension

It was the consensus of the Committee of the Whole members to recommend to the Board of Education that the Tri-District Technology Consortium Agreement be approved at its June 25, 2020 meeting. This agreement allows for joint purchasing of technology resources to increase savings and leverage cost savings options on behalf of the districts. The intent of the agreement is to ensure collaboration with a still in-progress fiber project with an eye towards other collaborative purchasing options as well. All three districts saw substantial savings in joint licensing for device management systems. This agreement is currently being used to secure licensing for all three districts in the midst of Remote Learning. The agreement term is set to expire on June 30, 2020 and allows for two one-year extensions. This is the first of these two extensions and is being presented at all three district boards in June.

Last year, District 90 saved approximately \$13,500 in licensing during the 2020 school year. District 97 saved approximately \$7,000 and District 200 saved approximately \$5,000. All three districts will realize further cost savings in the year to come. There is no cost associated with this extension.

Presentation of Intergovernmental Agreement for the Youth Interventionist Program 2020 - 2022

It was the consensus of the Committee of the Whole members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve the Intergovernmental Agreement for the Youth Interventionist Program for the 2020-22 school years in the Special Board meeting following this meeting.

The interventions will work with any youth who are residents of Oak Park and River Forest or attend the community schools. The interventionists will work with youth who need help with depression/anxiety, crisis and trauma, gang involvement, school refusal/attendance issues, and behavioral/aggression problems. To closely monitor youth, through a case management model, which focuses on the individual strengths and needs of clients and their families and helps in linking them to services, managing those services, and tracking outcomes.

OPRFHS will support the Youth Interventionist Program through referrals, offering space to meet with youth and families (including virtual access during e-learning school days), sharing information about youth behaviors and situations, participating in training events and planning meetings, and by providing outcome data. In addition, it will bring policy and operational concerns and recommendations to the Youth Services Director or Oak Park Township Manager or Supervisor and then, as needed, to the community's Council of Governments for discussion and response. The entities will work collaboratively and cooperatively in the common interest of helping youth develop, learn problem-solving skills and to become engaged positively in the community. The entities will also enter into data sharing agreements, where appropriate, so that the Township may collect and analyze data taken together for youth that are participating in the Youth Interventionist program.

It was noted that the Program now has a diverse staff with advanced degrees. They facilitated groups of individuals not on their caseloads but experiencing issues. They were hosted at the library. Some of the other changes include taking care of gaps and improving partner services. Another improvement is a new, more comprehensive database which includes transparency and reporting to the partners. The assessments are based on referrals from all park districts and schools. The funding model has changed. Each partner will pay a consistent quarterly amount versus a percentage as was done before. Each partner has paid less than the cost. Oak Park Village is not participating in the agreement. The Township covers the bulk of the cost. Staff will continue to reach out to partners in Oak Park and River Forest in serving youth whenever, wherever possible. Other funding sources, other than taxing bodies are be developed, i.e., \$5000 from the Helen Brach Foundation, etc. Throughout the pandemic and in response to the George Floyd murder, the Township has been working with students and families identified that need the support.

Dr. Moore appreciated the monthly reports and this work. As a board, it should continue to make the youth a priority for governing bodies. So, however, this Board of Education can provide input and pressure, it should be done. \

The database went live December 2019, and data will be able to be tracked going forward looking at students over their four years at the high school or transition from middle school to high school. Ms. Harris asked if the Board could see the diversity of the staff. The response was that information could be pulled for high school students, as she did for District 97. The two interventions are female, male, White and African. The supervisor is African-American. A Rise supervisor is available for community outreach and she is African-American.

Mr. Baron appreciated the role of getting on the front end of the issues. It is timely. He will abstain from the vote because of his intersections with the River Forest Township. He appreciated the Townships work.

Future Agenda Items

Mr. Cofsky asked to discuss the support and consolidation of various school-sponsored support groups.

Adjournment

At 11:24 p.m., Dixon Spivy moved to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Mr. Cofsky. A voice vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Submitted by:
Gail Kalmerton, Clerk of the Board