The regular Board meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on Thursday, April 28, 2016, in Room 293 and the Board Room of the OPRFHS.

Call to Order

President Weissglass called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. A roll call indicated the following Board of Education members were present: Fred Arkin, Jennifer Cassell, Thomas F. Cofsky, Dr. Steven Gevinson, Dr. Jackie Moore, Sara Dixon Spivy, and Jeff Weissglass. Also present were Dr. Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; Frank Danes, Interim Director of HR; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant Clerk of the Board.

Closed Session

At 6:36 p.m. on Thursday, April 28, 2016, Mr. Weissglass moved to enter closed session for the purpose of discussing the appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of specific employees of the District or legal counsel for the District, including hearing testimony on a complaint lodged against an employee or against legal counsel for the District to determine its validity. 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(1), as amended by PA.93—57

Discussion of lawfully closed meeting minutes, whether for purposes of approval by the body of the minutes or semi-annual review of the minutes as mandated by Section 2.06 5 ILCS 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(21); The placement of individual students in special education programs and other matters relating to individual students 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(11) seconded by Ms. Dixon Spivy. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

At 7:38 p.m., the Board of Education resumed open session and moved to Room 293.

Joining the meeting were Michael Carioscio, Chief Information Officer; Amy Hill, Director of Assessment and Research; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; Dr. Gwen Walker-Qualls, Director of Pupi Personnel Services; Sheila Hardin, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair; and Hattie Grimm, Student Council Liaison.

Visitors

Sylvia and Lawrence Christmas, Connie Coleman, Joe Conway, Regan Cronin, Wayne Franklin Community, Bill Gale, Lynn Kamenitsa, Rich Kerstein, Bruce Kleinman, Dr. Ralph Lee, Mary Matticks, Matt and Jen McDermott, John Neu, Anthony Nowak, Zochi Nwoko, Mr. & Mrs. Ogunsanya, Daniel Pdraza, Ellen Pimental, Mary Colleen Roberts, W Senger, Karen Steward Nolan, Boaz Super, Cathy and Scott Yen, community, Mary Haley of the League of Women Voters, David Boulanger, Oak Park Township, Bandi Ambrose, Bonchita Benson, Janel
Bishop, Meghan Cahill, Jaqui Charette-BassirRad, Ginger Colamussi, Paul Collins, Jon Ecker, Julie Fuentes, Jacqueline Hanson, Darryl Hobson, Jen Hoffmann, Kris Johnson, Katie Madock, Lisa Makely, Esteban Medina, Mery Nwoko, and Scott Sponsler, OPRFHS faculty and staff; Brian Endless and Bill Sullivan, Oak Park Youth Baseball/Softball, Eizah, Craig Aderman, Susan C. Davin Coleman, Jilly Cronin, Jack Fisher, Deundre Garner, Brian Holloway, Anthony Madrigal, Kendale McCoy, Max McDermott, Udochi Nuopko, Peter, David, and Joshua Ogunsanya, Eddie and Mike Ordonei, Josh Super, Tab Washington, Chris Yen, Students; Cara Pavlicek, Village of Oak Park; Michael Romain of the Wednesday Journal, and Steve Schering of the Pioneer Local.

Recognition of Students

The BOE recognized the following students as the 2016 IHSA State Wrestling Champions and their coaches:


Head Coach: Paul Collins and Assistant Coaches Mike Powell, Joe Conway, Octavius Bellamy, Jeremy Powell, Ryan VenHorst, Jim Messer, Donal Collins, Craig Ackerman, Fred Arkin, Nick Nelson

The BOE also recognized the following students for their individual IRDI achievements as well as their teacher Allison Hennings:

Jilly Cronin, 1st Place at BioGENEius
Uzochi Nwoko, runner up at BioGENEius
Joshua Super, 3rd place Junior Science and Humanities Symposia

The BOE meeting recessed at 8:00 p.m. and resumed at 8:07 p.m. in the Board Room.

Public Comments

Bill Sullivan spoke to the alternative pool option five brought forward by Dr. Gevinson. He felt the proposal was forcing everyone to review information once again. He did not believe the proposal would work because it prevents simultaneous play on the softball diamonds, the north field is too close to the fence of the baseball field, it puts players in harm’s way, and it moves tennis off campus.
Brian Endless with Oak Park Youth Baseball Softball spoke in opposition to option five as he too believed that its elements did not need to be revisited again. Green and field spaces are the most valuable resources and taking them away was problematic. He encouraged the BOE to review the minutes of every meeting in which people talked about field and green space. Option 5 would inconvenience multiple teams for one sport. While he supported aquatics, he asked that that the BOE not disrupt others to get a new pool. He suggested focusing on proposals that were more reasonable.

Tony Nowak noted that educating the community about pools had been the biggest challenge to this point and adding another option at this juncture would be confusing and would set back the process. He encouraged the BOE to explore the four good options they already had.

David Boulanger, Oak Park Township Supervisory, noted his appreciation of the high school’s support in continuing the Oak Park Township Program of Youth Intervention. This program thrives because of the collaboration it has with the 11 governing bodies. It reaches beyond the school to help youth in the community make better decisions about their lives. The Township exists to assist.

Larry Christmas spoke in opposition to the public comments made earlier. He stated that an attempt was made to introduce option five before the public meetings, but he was told he could not do it, and it was a mistake not to allow it. Under option 5, the softball field space is the same size, and the baseball field is larger. Neither sports would be affected. He wanted a better plan that did no harm to swimming, tennis, parking or any other sport.

Mary Roberts, 818 N. Grove, parent of an incoming freshman and friend and family of many with children who will be attending OPRFHS. She wanted to commend the BOE for the excellent work it has done moving forward with the four options presented at the pool conversations. She stressed the importance of the BOE’s good forward momentum that it has with the other four options that consider all sports, the community, and the green space.

Status of FOIA Requests

Ms. Kalmerton reported that 4 FOIA requests were received and three resolved.

Student Council

Ms. Grimm stated that new Student Council officers would be elected this week. Conversations are continuing about Homecoming next year. A senior shirt is being sold to fund a senior magazine. May 1 is college decision day. Last week students experienced block scheduling and liked it. Freshman and sophomore students appreciated being allowed to outside for lunch. This meeting being her last, she thanked the BOE for this experience. Mr. Weissglass commented on the great job she had done for Student Council.
Ms. Hardin thanked Ms. Grimm for her voice at the table. The faculty is also winding down. Ms. Hill helped make the testing schedule less stressful with the feedback she requested and received from the faculty. AP testing starts Monday. Faculty Senate was looking forward to planning for next year.

Dr. Isoye reported that three IRDI students recently swept the top three spots at Positive Impact: The Midwest Research Competition. This tough annual science competition asks, How can high school students use their ideas to have a positive impact on the world around them? Winners were Mary Martin in first place, Danny Martinez in second place, and Uzochi Nwoko in third place.

Dr. Isoye congratulated the student-athletes who recently signed letters of intent to play for the following colleges:

- Isaiah White, Ohio State University, Wrestling
- Robert Campos, Notre Dame College, Wrestling
- Genevieve Curry, University of Michigan, Water Polo
- Ellie Ziegler, University of Dayton, Softball
- Caitlyn Santiago, Roosevelt University, Softball
- Patrick Skrine, Holy Cross College, Basketball
- James Cousin, Augustana, Football
- Sam Francis, Augustana, Football
- Jamari Watson, St Xavier University, Football

Dr. Isoye reported the following:

Band teacher Anthony Svejda was one of six local teachers to receive the Chicagoland Outstanding Music Educator Award from Quinlan & Fabish Music Company, which recognizes excellence in the field of music education.

A Cappella Choir received a total of 113.4 points out of a possible 120 at the IHSA Organizational Music State Contest. All three judges awarded them Division I, Superior Ratings which gives them an overall rating of Division I, Superior Rating.

Senior Vann Harris won the 11th and 12th-grade division of the Poetry Society of Virginia Youth Contest. It’s a national competition with students entering from Virginia, Alabama, Maine, New York and Ohio, among other places. Junior Chanti Relf finished in 2nd place. Sophomore Kara Jackson finished 2nd place in the 9th and 10th-grade division.

The OPRF Show Choir competed at the FAME show choir championship series in Branson, Mo. Rory Schrobilgen won best male soloist and Alonte Williams won best male stage presence. Noteworthy has been invited to perform at nationals at the end of April.
Japanese teacher Yoko Schmadeke has received a $1,000 grant from the Los Angeles-based Japan Foundation to fund the next annual Japan Fest, to be held in February 2017.

The 2015 Tabula Yearbook has been recognized for excellence and featured in the 2016 Jostens Look Book, celebrating the best-of-the-best in yearbook design and coverage. Tabula is one of 494 yearbooks selected from approximately 3,000 to be featured.

Not only was the Tabula staff recognized as a whole for its design efforts, but student photographer Presley Cone also was acknowledged for the award-winning picture she submitted into the Jostens Photo Contest. Her photo placed second out of 5,000 entries.

**Student Services**

The Instruction Committee had recommended that the Student Services report is shared with the full BOE. Ms. Hoffmann stated that this report would be the same as was presented at the Instruction Committee meeting. She reflected on the Board of Education’s decision to hire three new counselors, one SID, and the six social workers who had been contracted previously through outside services. Student Services is very thankful and grateful for the possibilities of what they can do for the students. Much time has been spent looking at process and procedures because as enrollment continues to grow, students will continue to be served in the way that they are now. The addition of the 5th PSS Team has allowed many services to be added for the students, staff, parents, and community during the 2015-16 school year. The first six to eight weeks of the school year were spent with PSS Teams working together to understand process and procedure, as well as spending time developing and naming expected best practices. The collection of data used to demonstrate and capture the work that occurs within the PSS Teams was thoughtfully reviewed and based on that review; a new documentation system was implemented as a means to capture the work that occurs within Student Services. School social workers began tracking data at the beginning of the school year with the new system, and it has served as a barometer to determine validity. The tracking was determined worthwhile, and all counselors and school social workers began October 1st. This tracking has allowed all involved parties to converse better and monitor the services being provided to students. It should be noted that every student within the building has had a minimum of at least two contacts with a member of their PSS team throughout the 2015-16 school year.

A new guidance tab allows Ms. Hoffmann to run data as to when and by whom contacts have been made with students. The data showed that all students were seen at least two times, and some students 7 or 8 times, excluding parental phone calls. Data usage will improve as the expectation now is that if student contact is made, it is tracked. Data showed that the department serves 1,400 students every month, and it is broken down by gender and race, which are comparable to the District’s demographics.
Response to Intervention data showed Tier 1 supports were provided to all students; Tier 2 supports were provided to 15-25% of the student population, and Tier 3 supports were provided to 3 to 5% of the student population. Freshman students will have eight contacts, sophomores will have four contacts, juniors will have four contacts, and seniors will have four contacts, at the minimum. An early warning system has been implemented for those students who have some absences, infractions, etc. and that is used to put plans in place to support the students.

Sara VenHorst, a counselor for 12 years, testified to the difference she has noticed in her ability to deliver services to all students due to the addition of the fifth PSS Team. She read the following statement.

“...I genuinely feel that one of the main functions of the PSS Team model is to provide a smaller team of professionals that can help address the needs of the OPRFHS students in a variety of different veins. As a counselor, the decreased caseload has allowed me to better address the needs of my students as well as efficiently address the concerns of their parents in a much timelier manner. This has led to me being more proactive in my approach rather than being forced to be reactive.

“Another extremely positive outcome of the additional PSS Team is the new perspective and approach of three new counselors to our division. I appreciate the variety of experiences and personalities that the additional counselors have brought to the division as I genuinely feel it allows us as a group to view curriculum and our overall goals through a new lens. Additional brain power is leading to increased creativity through discussions and a broadened scope in planning.

“I believe the addition of the fifth SID has also allowed for each individual SID to be able to address the needs of our students in a timely and efficient manner, rather than putting out the largest fires while having to hold some at bay. I appreciate their constant communication with one another and believe that they are able to keep our school safe as well as offer a supportive role to all of our students at all levels.

“With the support of my team social worker, I feel that we have been able to offer a much deeper level of intervention as well as prevention strategies to my students. We work closely together when a student jumps on to the radar and are able to quickly address concerns rather than responding once an issue has grown to a much larger scale. The social worker is always ready and willing to work with the families of our students which has also freed up time for me to be able to address the needs of my students on my caseload that are not necessarily in crisis, but certainly deserve my time and attention in terms of their experience at OPRFHS.

“I’d like to wrap up with an example. One of our students experienced an extremely traumatic loss of a parent earlier this school year. We have been able to address the needs of a family in crisis in a much more personal and diligent manner. This included home visits, attending the services, continued contact with the parent and support of the student. Additionally, we have continued to monitor
weekly the progress and healing process of the student and family in general. All of this was possible due to the increased support and collaboration that the new PSS Team Model provides.”

Joe Herbst read the following statement. “Last year I was heavily involved in advocating for a 5th PSS Team. A memory that will stand the test of time was the night of April 23, or actually the early morning hours of April 24, when the Board voted overwhelmingly in support of adding a 5th PSS team to better meet the needs of our students.

“Board members were quite clear that evening that the approval included a challenge to improve the quality of our relationships with every student on our caseload. Dr. Jackie Moore stated that experiences with counselors were too variable from one family to the next and challenged us to be reflective of the larger group of students in our purview, moving beyond a crisis model to one with relationship-building at its center.

“With confidence I can speak to how these challenges have guided our work this year. The energy, enthusiasm and responsiveness of the PSS model is palpable throughout the building. Here are a few examples of how my services have been enhanced by the expansion of PSS and a reduction in caseload by 60 students:

· By the end of September, I met with each senior individually for an entire period to discuss, or in some cases develop, a post-secondary plan and set goals/benchmarks for its implementation.

· By the end of the first quarter, I met with each freshman individually to process their high school transition and inform them of the support available through their PSS team.

“For the first time as a counselor, I was able to have individual meetings with 50% of my caseload, in a preventative and constructive student-centered way, by the end of the first quarter.

· In the second semester, I met with each of my freshmen for an entire period to develop an individualized four-year plan. I was able to get to know each of my freshman better as a result. In prior years, caseload demands required two students to be scheduled per period.

· Each junior had two individual meetings this year instead of one. During the first meeting (January) we explored the college search process. During the second meeting (April) we set post-secondary planning goals heading into the summer months. More individual time spent developing each junior’s post-secondary plan will lead to more successful outcomes as seniors.

· I was able to meet with all of my at-risk freshmen (earning D’s or F’s) during the first semester to fully understand the causes of their academic difficulties and provide resources to support their achievement. Due to having more time with these students, I had the opportunity to facilitate better communication between each student and the teachers of their classes.
Most of my students identified through Early Warning Systems (EWS) data are already being seen by multiple members of my PSS team. The remaining students are usually seen within 24 hours of being identified through EWS. Students who have a high number of excused absences are also identified as “at-risk” through EWS data, so I can more proactively address their needs as well this year.

I am part of a team of counselors that is creating a comprehensive senior assessment that will help us evaluate how effectively we are meeting the needs of students. Another team of counselors is working on a comprehensive assessment to be administered to the freshman class as well. We will use student perspective from these surveys to guide our efforts in the years to come.

“And I could go on….but most of all I want to thank you for saying “yes” to PSS!”

BOE members appreciated the report and looking at the comprehensive relationships with the students.

Ms. Cara Pavlicek, Manager of the Village of Oak Park, presented information regarding the 1-290 project. One aspect of the work is the potential for gaining space above the expressway. There is no commitment to resources at this time, instead it is about the possible Interest of continuing the conversation with the Illinois Department of Transportation about this idea. Materials were provided online. She reported that IDOT had been working on the reconstruction of the Eisenhower from Mannheim to the Interchange. The Oak Park Village Board of Trustees directed the staff to hold 7 Village Board Study Sessions regarding the 1.5 miles of construction that would occur along these communities which would include seven bridge decks and five access points to the CTA Blue Line Stations. IDOT provided concepts for East and Oak Park Avenues. The Oak Park Avenue concept included 158 feet of decking contiguous to the east side of Oak Park Avenue (for a total bridge deck of 220 feet) and is estimated to cost $7.5 million for substructure and foundations and $16.5 million for the 36,500 square feet area at a total investment of $24 million. The East Avenue concept was for construction of 410 feet of decking contiguous to the east side of East Avenue (for a total bridge deck of 500 feet) at an estimated cost of $21 million for substructure and foundations and $46 million for the 3.1-acre space for a total investment of $67 million. These costs do not include development costs for community recreational space on top of the decking. The high school will be asked between July and August to enter into an intergovernmental agreement that would reserve the option to seek substructuring or walk away from it. Hopefully, the Village will see IDOT submit its first phase in 2017. Approval will take 1 to 2 years and then the Village will seek appropriations of $20 million for design work for the total corridor. The Design conversation will take two years and then four years of pre-work for rebuilding all seven bridge deck crossings with another two years to finish. She offered to take phone calls, work with Dr. Isoye and talk about this with the entire Board at another time.
Consent

Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the following consent items:

- Check Disbursements and Financial Resolutions dated April 28, 2016
- Monthly Treasurer’s Report
- Gifts and Donations
- Personnel Recommendations
- NIIPC Bread Products RFP
- NIIPC Greek Yogurt Products RFP
- Rollover of NIIPC Primary Vendor Contracts
- Special Education Transportation Contracts
- Audit Engagement Letter
- Youth Interventionist Contract

Policies for Second Reading:

1. Policy 2:160, Board Attorney
2. Policy 2:250, Access to District Public Records
3. Policy 4:120, Bookstore
4. Policy 6:140, Education of Homeless Children
5. Policy 7:100, Health and Eye Examinations; Immunizations; and Exclusion of Students
6. Policy 7:130, Student Rights and Responsibilities
7. Policy 7:140, Search and Seizure
8. Policy 7:290, Suicide and Depression Awareness and Prevention
9. Policy 7:340, Student Records

Policies for First Reading

1. Policy 6:300, Graduation Requirements
2. Policy 7:150, Agency and Police Interviews
3. Policy 7:190, Student Behavior (formerly known as Student Discipline)
4. Policy 7:200, Suspension Procedures
5. Policy 7:210, Expulsion Procedures
6. Policy 7:240, Conduct Code for Participants in Extracurricular

- Open and Closed Session Minutes of March 24 and April 19, 2016, and a declaration that the closed session audiotapes of September 2014 be destroyed and a declaration that the closed session minutes from January 1, 1987 through May 1, 2016, remain closed

seconded by Mr. Arkin. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Policy 6:280

Mr. Weissglass moved to amend Policy 6:280, Grading and Promotion, as presented; seconded by Dr. Moore. In response to a question as to why PARCC was being named in the policy, Dr. Isoye reported that there was a resolution to use PARCC as the determining factor; it is not binding. The state has to have an assessment, and that is why it is named in the policy. PARCC is not a
determining factor in promotion, as a variety of things must be completed successfully and are named in *The School Code of Illinois*. OPRFHS does not use the PARCC assessment for grading and promotion; it is only an assessment. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

**Policy 6:300**

Mr. Weissglass moved to approve Policy 6:300, Graduation Requirements, for first reading; seconded by Ms. Cassell. When asked why the civics requirement was not included in this policy, it was explained that Policy 6:60 names the one semester of civics that is now required. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

**Approval of CTIP and Equipment Purchase**

Mr. Weissglass moved to approve Phase III of the CTIP project (1:1 dedicated devices for students) and approve the purchase of the necessary devices to support this project; seconded by Ms. Dixon Spivy. Discussion ensued.

About the issue of internet access having not been finalized regarding policy and cost, it was reported that three or four different policy options exist. A variety of possible solutions is being explored with different service providers to ensure that all students have equal at-home access to the Internet, as well as the extending onsite lab time in school. Students of the Community WIFI Committee are working with businesses on a student-welcome campaign. It is important to insure all students have the same experience before adopting a 1:1 policy. Conversations have been had about determining through the registration process just how many students do not have access. OPRFHS’s research shows that at this time, 98% of the students do have the internet and that will continue to be monitored. Several BOE members thanked Mr. Carioscio and the team for a thoughtful process.

BOE members were reminded of the contingency plan of FTE waiting for approval and that a discussion about fees would occur in May. Dr. Isoye remarked that this was an exciting moment in the school's development of this program. It will impact the school for years to come and he looked forward to growing technology in the educational realm.

A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

**Pool Option No. 5**

Dr. Gevinson moved to direct the administration to move forward with taking the westfield/Keystone design to the next step of analysis by requesting that Legat Architects do a formal, detailed drawing and have an independent cost estimator determine the expected construction costs; seconded by Dr. Moore. Discussion ensued.

Dr. Gevinson moved to forward with taking the westfield/Keystone design to the next step of analysis by 1) requesting that Legat Architects do a formal, detailed
drawing of the west field part of the design; 2) collaborating with the RFPD’s
architect for the paddle tennis project on a formal, detailed drawing of the
Keystone combination paddle tennis/tennis plan; 3) exploring with the OPPD the
possibility of building a seventh tennis court at Taylor Park; and 4) having
construction cost Systems (CCS), an independent cost estimator, determine the
expected construction costs; No second.

Dr. Isoye thanked Katherine Christmas for the ongoing work on this proposal.
This proposal came to the superintendent committee first. Two rough designs and
concepts were presented at the Special Board meeting and they have now been
refined to a single design. This design places a stretch pool on the OPRFHS west
field, configures the baseball and softball fields, develops new tennis courts at the
River Forest Park District’s Keystone Park, and retains four (newly built) tennis
courts on campus. The rough designs illustrate how the pool may fit in the space
along with the various sports and also indicate how the tennis courts could fit at
Keystone.

Mr. Weissglass referred to the timeline in the packet. The question as to how this
would fit with the LTFP was asked. The District was reaching out to engineer on
the garage to assess its condition. At the community meeting it was suggested
that another option might come forward and the BOE might be asked if it would
want to pursue that concept. On May 26, a report from the consultant on the
community meetings and answers to FAQ is expected. The working group asked
the LTFP to integrate the two options that received overwhelming community
support, options #2 and #4, and to develop two alternatives plans to consider
these options.

The Park District feasibility study had not include a 8-lane, 25-yard competition
pool as currently envisioned based on the what the consultant is saying the
community wants in its needs. In June, the BOE will be talking about funding
options. The goal is to be in a position to pursue a financial plan by late July, and
a few weeks later the BOE will need to approve a resolution for a referendum in
November.

Dr. Gevinson appreciated the opportunity to vet this idea further. He wished this
proposal had been a part of the earlier presentation to the community. He wanted
to correct some of the question/answer information that contained some
misunderstandings. He did not feel that it contained the answers to the questions
or the statements from coaches as a result of their being interviewed.

Dr. Gevinson referred to the resolution the BOE approved a year about building a
pool somewhere on the west fields by identifying either tennis, softball, or
baseball would move off campus and only as a last resort would the pool be put
on the garage field. His preference was for a sport to move off campus. This
The proposal would make it possible to fulfill that resolution and tennis would be the sport that would move somewhat. The reason it looks like softball is short, the drawing is current than the baseball field. While the baseball coaches say in the Q&A that the right field fence is 242, and it should be 315 ft., they are misreading the diagram: 242’6” is from the fence to the baseline between first and second; it is another 90’ to the third baseline. To accommodate softball’s needs, the baseball dimensions should be reduced to the current ones or possibly diminished slightly. Further, the arrangement of extras on the sidelines should be changed so that the first base sideline space is much deeper, and the third base sideline space is shallower, which would be better for accommodating a fairly square field. Such a reduction and rearrangement would recapture much space for softball and quite possibly allow for a 5th tennis court. Square footage for baseball and distances from home plate to the right and left field fences would be virtually the same.

Another thing missing in the discussion was the proposal of a temporary bubble being used for over the tennis courts or an architectural membrane and it would create the possibility of tennis being offered throughout the year. I don’t think the coaches were asked about that, but it is a positive possibility if this option is pursued. Was PE asked about the temporary bubble (sometimes called an architectural membrane) possibility? Was there a discussion of possible creative solutions, such as rotations combining tennis and swimming, as they would be in proximity, and it would reduce the number of students in the pool at a time?

Dr. Gevinson did not understand the need for 20 courts on 3 sites as a requirement or suggestion by tennis.

Dr. Gevinson said would be lost due to transportation, but only about 10 minutes. It would take the same amount of time to walk to Scoville Park as to drive to Keystone. If Taylor Park added a court, it would be less transportation time.

He read an email exchange with Rob Wobble regarding cost estimates. “Cost estimates for pool options 1 through 4 were provided by Construction Cost Systems (CCS). CCS provided a unique and relatively detailed estimate for each of these options. Comparatively, my estimate for Option 5 was based on a Henry Brothers estimate created two years ago and my intent was to give you a very quick “back-of-a-napkin assessment on what the cost might be.

“Comparing the construction of interior renovations to additions to new construction is like comparing apples and oranges. Interior renovations are trickier, but exterior walls, foundations, floors, and roofs can be reused instead of being built from scratch as with additions and new construction.
“Comparing the cost estimates is similarly difficult because they were prepared by different companies with very different approaches to their estimating. I recommend CCS be given the opportunity to provide an estimate for Option 5 so all of the options are prepared to the same level of detail by one company.”

Dr. Gevinson spoke of the proposal’s advantages.
1) It will not harm baseball or softball.
2) It provides a multiple sport solution at once.
   A. The baseball and softball fields need improvement, either turf or seeding.
   B. The tennis courts are on 80-year old cement.
   C. No disruption will occur, if doing the internal options.
      Swimming would be gone one year perhaps.
   D. While Option 2 would cause a loss of power for up to 6 weeks, this would be minimized if staged well in Option 5. This is an academic institution. If the pools can be moved out of the building, when it comes time to renovate the south end of the building, it would be great not to have the pools. The amount of corrosion there and what work would have to be done internally is unknown.

Making sure that the Keystone option will work is challenging. The best way to proceed, as noted in the amendment, was to work with the architect chosen by RFPD on the paddle court. The Keystone side of this would be a combination paddle/tennis combination to see if OPRFHS or the Park District would be happy with it. OPRFHS would help with that determination. Simultaneously, Dr. Gevinson wanted to have conversations with the Oak Park Park District to have a seventh tennis court at Taylor Park. They have recently renovated six and Taylor Park is much closer and would be a less expensive easier fix. The timeline for these steps would have to be explored.

While Mr. Arkin thanked Dr. Gevinson and Ms. Christmas for thinking of this viable solution, he could not support it because the BOE’s process has evolved and the other options are superior. It is an extension of the process. The BOE heard from the community and stakeholder groups and it has changed the thinking process. The benefit to option 5 is keeping onsite parking, which was a major theme from the public. He felt the BOE would have public resistance to losing any outdoor space. The proposal does cramp the realignment of baseball and softball courts. I saw no provisions for batting cages and bullpens. The dugouts come east into the pool which would cut off a portion of the open field. Softball would be so cramped two games could not be played at the same time. Right foul balls would go out to Linden, and that is a hazard to street, cars, homes, etc. Tennis will be split and he did not believe that it would only take 10 minutes to travel to Keystone. The total estimated cost is more than option 2 and will equate to options 3 and 4, which do not have the displacement of the other
activities. Disruption will occur to outdoor activities as fields are being realigned and building is being built. Also, River Forest gives no guarantee for approval. It could run into resistance that could take more than six months.

Mr. Weissglass had been surprised at the passion with which Dr. Gevinson had pursued this option. From Mr. Weissglass’ two-year immersion in this conversation, he did not see how it would work, and he did not want to spend more time and money on an architect to move this forward. He made a pro and con list and on the pro list, like option 2, this option could move forward without having to buy the garage. In listening to the comments tonight, the disruption issue is worthy of consideration. The primary disruption of option 2 and 4 is to the swim program. If a pool were built outside of the building, it would not disrupt that program. The biggest con would be moving the tennis team off campus, and that was the motion made one year ago to save covered parking on campus. Options 2, 3, and 4 all had to do with that and so to him that meant moving a sport off-campus, i.e., girls’ softball. That had a very negative reaction because of not having home meets. When Mr. Galluzzo came to the pool committee, he expressed strong sentiment about not being on campus. Mr. Weissglass spoke with him recently, and he still expressed that concern. As we look at how things integrate with the LTP, repurposing costs have to be included and although there were questions about the estimates, the estimates obtained to make this about $5 million more, for a worse outcome. That combined with moving a team off campus, the loss of green space, the garage needs further repair, the unknown approval process, need a garage with further repair, the unknown approval process, would not fit in the timeline that would allow the school to go for a referendum. He felt a better approach had already been determined and did not feel option five should go forward.

Mr. Dixon Spivy thanked Dr. Gevinson, Ms. Christmas, and her family, for working so hard on this proposal and she took offense at the disrespect shown earlier to a Board member during public comments. She wanted more information about the following: 1) the true cost, 2) an IGA with River Forest may not give OPRFHS the court time desired, as it is not our property. 3) the life expectancy of the garage; 4) input from coaches on how this would affect their sports, and 5) power loss to the entire building.

Dr. Moore stated that the pro/con list was helpful. She wanted more information from the coaches too. She was also concerned about IGAs. OPRFHS has an agreement with Triton, but over the years, the usage has dwindled, even though the agreement remains in place. She felt that if this had been part of the community conversation, it would have allowed for more information to be discussed and would feel more transparent. Because there are so many unknowns is hard to make it a feasible option.
Ms. Cassell thanked Dr. Gevinson for his passion and hard work. She felt there were too many cons to support the plan, the biggest one being the timeline as it would take a minimum of six months to get approval. She and the community wanted to move forward. Her concerns were also regarding safety issues and moving tennis off campus.

Mr. Cofsky stated that many of these unknowns and concerns were brought up during the 2014 dialogue. A key factor is a disruption on all of the options on the facilities and what it will take and that may have some appeal, but he felt Options 2-4 addressed that issue. The complexity of involving other governmental agencies has been mentioned and gives more and more risks. The cons are heavier than the pros. The LTFP has to be brought into this process and the more divergence there is from this end, the more divergence bringing it to a common landing place. He is slightly on the con side and a no position.

Dr. Gevinson appreciated the responses. About Mr. Arkin’s comments on square footage, it does fit. This is just a good idea. Google Earth is a wonderful application, it can measure to the foot, but translating from concept to the drawing, we were not able to communicate it fully enough to look that way. The question of safety is interesting. There is no particular reason for home base to be where it is. Regarding foul balls, nets could be put up, and two mounds already exist. The downside of Option 4 is that it is two times the size of the garage now. It is very high, higher than the stadium and closes off the access. The consequences of that would be losing the ability to pick up kids and necessary access. He did not want to spend money for something that makes no sense, but one cannot know the unknowns unless one looks. It is completely unfair and unjustified to say this would cost $5 million more than the options as there is no basis for that. The BOE would have to decide to explore what the building would look like and use the cost estimator.

Dr. Gevinson agreed with the concerns about IGA; it would have to be negotiated so that OPRFHS gets what it needs. Indications from River Forest are that it would be a good deal as it would be an enhanced facility and they would have more options. He had hoped that the coaches would have been here tonight, as the information received did not reflect his conversations with the tennis coaches. He had hoped to be present during those coaches’ interviews. He acknowledged many communication problems throughout this effort, and it has been frustrating. He believed this option should have the hearing it deserves. Some things have gottenapproval quicker than six months, and he was unsure if the process could be expedited. Dr. Gevinson said the idea of the amendment was to work with the architect hired in River Forest to work on Keystone instead of Legat, simultaneously talk with the Oak Park Park District about Taylor Park, and have an independent cost estimate.
The power outage relates to option two only.

A roll call vote resulted in five nays and two ayes. Dr. Gevinson and Ms. Spivy voted aye. Motion failed.

10:25 recessed and resumed at 10:35 p.m.

**Policy 7:305**

Mr. Weissglass moved to approve Policy 7:305, Student Athlete Concussions and Head Injuries, which was tabled from last month, seconded by Mr. Arkin. Discussion ensued.

Dr. Gevinson was concerned with the policy and the safety issue in high school sports around head injuries. This policy, while an improvement over the previous one, did not address some of the issues that happen in high impact sports. It inadequately mentions subconcussive hits. One may have no symptoms of a concussion and still be doing permanent brain damage. He felt the video put out by the IHSA for parents and students to look at before any sport should be an embarrassment to the State of Illinois as it is not a video and it does not give a good sense of the dangers and the risks. By accident, someone mentioned that Steve James did a documentary on this subject called *Head Games*, based on a book, and Dr. Gevinson recommended that the BOE members look at it, as it was powerful and gave a perspective of students and parents who have suffered ill effects. He felt that movie should be shown to the parents and students. Concussions are famously under identified and under-reported. The Policy Committee received a report that OPRFHS was below the national average for concussions for a school of this which was 62, but OPRFHS had 59. He was shocked that the school was proud of that, and that was for only the ones that have been identified. It does not ask fellow players, who may notice better than anyone else, to identify/report. The BOE talks about safety netting if a foul ball goes over the fence and yet this is the brain. Eighty-seven out of 91 football players’ brains had CTE. Mayo Clinic did a brain bank and looked at 66 brains of people who had played contact sports, not professionally, and 21 had CTE. The 198 brains of people who had not played sports had zero CTE. CTE cannot be detected while alive. What happens to one is seen later in life and it is a real problem. His suggestion would be to show head games to anyone who is thinking of playing a contact sport, i.e., football, soccer, wrestling, hockey (but not OPRFHS sponsored). He did not feel competent as a BOE member to decide what the BOE should do about safety in this district. He proposed developing a panel of experts in the community to look at this and make recommendations to BOE to make better policy.

Dr. Moore concurred with Dr. Gevinson that the IHSA video did not get to the issues, and the BOE was not given the repeatedly of the science. Already her children are prohibited from hitting the ball with their heads. Issues also exist
with males and females and adolescents and recovering from brain injuries. The minimum is three weeks as opposed to 2. She suggested saying “If a student sustained a hit to the head.” Often students and parents are in denial about having concussions and attribute to not feeling well to other things, i.e., staying up late, etc. Sideline tests can be given such as reading numbers both ways and then re-reading the numbers has been beneficial in diagnosing concussions.

Ms. Cassell, acknowledging that the BOE needed the policy to be in place before the next school year, noted that the BOE needs to look at the experts and see what can be done to notify parents properly of the risks. She did not favor taking sports of the roster, but noted that parents must know all of the risks. She agreed the IHSA video was not good, but it was probably mandated. Additional information can be shared as well.

Ms. Spivy was not for removing sports, and she was concerned that if the BOE gave some warranty that students would not be hurt, the District would be open to liability as the parent would perceive it as a safety.

Mr. Arkin having been involved on the front lines of this issue for a long time has seen this subject evolve. Society today is much further along than it was even 2 or 3 years ago. Subconcussive hits are hard to measure. He did not believe that a public panel would add anything to the overall discussion. He did believe that every major resource, medical and university hospital, was doing research on concussions. He felt that the BOE’s duty was to keep abreast of the latest developments through the use of professionals. He concurred that the IHSA video is not as informative as it should be, but it will change. The National Federation of High Schools in its July 2014 publication had requirements for minimizing head risks and exposure in football. The District now does most of that, and it has considerably reduced the number of impacts that a football player takes today. It can be done through rule changes. The people highlighted in documentaries are those who have retired and today’s rules, and techniques and equipment are much different from when they played. Sports medicine and sports training are different. Students who play football have significantly less contact than even just five years ago. Regarding reducing contact, practicing was reduced. Years ago practice was for 2.5 hours; two-thirds were full contact; today it is 30 minutes of practice two times per week and in preseason is three times. The number of hits has been reduced. Now trainers are on site at games and practices. Students are taken out of games immediately when there is a hit, and they do not return. OPRFHS has access to one of the best medical facilities and physician. Protocols exist, and parents are much more informed today. The techniques of coaching have drastically changed. There is a substantial awareness out there. What the NFL did, and it was almost criminal, but subsequently it and the Federation have made the game safer. He felt the BOE
would be overstepping its bounds by having a panel. The BOE needs to listen to
the trainers, the coaches and perhaps the IHSA.

Mr. Cofsky noted that the message needed to improve as it is constantly
changing. He would support this policy and suggested more communication to
parents.

Mr. Weissglass had had personal experience with concussions as an athlete,
and they were bad. He felt the policy should be adopted. He was torn between
believing great progress in youth and professional sports was being made and
knowing that there is no safe cigarette. He worried about the deep attachment to
a sport that people can convince themselves they are doing what they can. While
he did not want to reinvent the wheel, be the researchers, get researcher reports,
etc., he did believe more can be learned about best practices for high schools, i.e.,
determine what is the floor and the ceiling. He asked who should frame the next
steps about how the BOE’s knowledge can be increased so that it can shape its
recommendation for the BOE to consider. Dr. Isoye clarified that first reading
did not mean the policy was approved, as it is an opportunity to send it out for
review and it was a recommendation from the attorney. He suggested that this
might be considered as a BOE goal.

Dr. Moore stated that the subject of concussions needed to be talked about more
broadly regarding all sports, and not focus on just football, regarding best
practice. Some parents are very well aware of the risks. Some will overstate the
symptoms, and some do not want to play. Between first reading and approval,
the District should look at best practices and talk with Rush Hospital as its
executive functioning department might be able to provide information. Dr.
Isoye reiterated that this should be a Board goal, as the time between now and
approval is not enough time for a project on best practices. Dr. Gevinson felt the
administrative workload was significant and would suggest what could be
another form of policy could be stopped.

Discussion ensued about the fact that there was a feeling that the BOE wanted to
end football, and it was causing stressing and concern among coaches. Ms.
Harden felt a panel would say things about prevention, not prohibiting sports.
One member asked why the concern of coaches had not been addressed sooner.
Ms. Hardin stated that she had communicated this to the superintendent and the
principal. Dr. Moore felt it was a broader communication issue, which is a
culture need in this system.

Mr. Arkin noted that there had been a protocol for return to the sport after a head
injury. The substantive change is adding a return to learning protocol so that
those issues brought up are being addressed in this policy.
Dr. Gevinson had contacted Mr. Hoerster in the fall, and he told me that he would not talk with me and that Mr. Stelzer would, but he never did. Are people not supposed to talk to board members? Mr. Weissglass stated that this was a topic for board protocols, agreements, as it is a huge issue and will start the discussion at the BOE’s self-evaluation retreat on June 13. There is no clarity on board agreements and board roles.

Ms. Dixon Spivy stated that it the District put extra measures in place, she was afraid it would provide a warranty as to safety.

A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

**Student Discipline**

None

**Woven Program**

The Instruction Committee members unanimously voted to move information forward about the Woven Program to the full BOE. In the 2014-2015 school year, faculty member Jessica Stovall took a sabbatical leave for the entire school year. During the current school year, Ms. Stovall has been following with additional teaching and learning activities creating a research-based and data driven teacher feedback program, WOVEN (With an Objective View, the Education-debt Narrows).

The administration noted that some professional development questions/ramifications were imbedded in the WOVEN proposal, and they need to be worked through before a meaningful response can be given. The process for bringing a proposal forward was reviewed so that any problems can be alleviated before it comes to the BOE. Does the BOE want to forgo that vetting process and vet things in the open session? Dr. Isoye felt it was better to have a conversation with the person bringing the proposals. The Administration knows of two additional proposals but is unsure as to how to handle them because the BOE had requested that all FTE be brought forward at one time and that was brought forward in March. It was noted that the proposal was quite different from the original one seen by the oversight committee. Mr. Weissglass and Dr. Isoye will talk about next steps on both the proposals for WOVEN and a coach for Shakespeare.

**Update on Culture, Climate and Behavior Committee (formerly PTAC)**

The Culture, Climate, and Behavior Committee (CCB) had its second meeting last week. The first meeting went into the data and discipline code and next week more data will be provided. No meetings are scheduled for June or July, but they will resume in August.

**Flexible Furniture Pilot Program Update**

The Strategic Plan Operations Committee recommended that the update on the Flexible Furniture Pilot Program is presented to the entire Board. No discussion occurred.
Election of Officers  Mr. Cofsky moved to elect Mr. Weissglass for a one-year term as Board President beginning May 2016. Hearing no other nominations, Mr. Weissglass was unanimously elected to a one-year term beginning May 2016.

Mr. Weissglass moved to elect Dr. Jackie Moore for a one-year term as BOE vice president beginning May 2016. Hearing no other nominations, Dr. Moore was unanimously elected to a one-year term beginning May 2016.

Ms. Cassell moved to elect Sara Dixon Spivy for a one-year term as BOE secretary beginning May 2016. Hearing no other nominations, Ms. Dixon Spivy was unanimously elected to a one-year term beginning May 2016.

District Reports  Reports from Huskies Boosters, Alumni Association, APPLAUSE!, and APPLE were imbedded in the agenda.

Adjournment  At 11:45 p.m. on Thursday, April 28, 2016, Mr. Cofsky moved to adjourn the regular Board of Education meeting; seconded by Dr. Moore. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.
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