

The regular Board meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on Thursday, May 25, 2017, in the Board Room of the OPRFHS.

Call to Order

President Moore called the meeting to order at 6:38 p.m. A roll call indicated the following Board of Education members were present: Fred Arkin, Matt Baron, Jennifer Cassell, Thomas F. Cofsky, Craig Iseli, Dr. Jackie Moore, and Sara Dixon Spivy. Also present were Dr. Joylynn Pruitt, Superintendent; Tod Altenburg, Chief School Business Official; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; Brenda Horton, Director of Human Resources; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant Clerk of the Board.

Closed Session

At 6:39 p.m. on Thursday, May 25, 2017, Dr. Moore 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 and Collective negotiating matters between the District and its employees or the representatives or deliberations concerning salary schedules for one or more classes of employees. 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(2); Student disciplinary cases 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(10); seconded by Ms. Dixon Spivy. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

At 7:36 p.m., the Board of Education resumed the open session.

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; Dr. Gwen Walker-Qualls, Director of Pupil Personnel Services; and Karin Sullivan, Director of Communications and Community Relations.

Visitors

Sheila Hardin, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair; Pat Cheney, Ben Cain, Paul Collins, Faculty and Staff; Jan Arnold and Paul Aeschleman of the Park District of Oak Park; Mike Sletten of the Park District of River Forest, Ron Johnson, Director of Purchasing and Transportation; Mary Haley of the League of Women Voters; Michael Romain of the Wednesday Journal; Steve Schering of the Oak Leaves; Larry Christmas, Dan Potter, Kerry Cryer, Victor Ancieta, Marianne Birko, community members; and Elli Bourikos, David Snyder, Tyler Yokoo, George Dickerson, Adam Potter, Miles Kosik, Lindsay Moore-Fields, Lillian Tushman, Kyla York Grace Halvorsen Gabi Arnesen Ellen Morgan Stephanie Guralnick,

Student Recognition

State qualified students for the World Tournament of Robotics: David Snyder,

- Tyler Yokoo, George Dickerson, Adam Potter, and Miles Kosik and their teacher Ben Cain
- First place at the National 3P SPEECH Invitational for Informative Speaking: Elli Bourgeois, and her sponsor Patt Cheney

BioGENEius

The BioGENEius Challenge is the most prestigious high school science competition in the world for original research in biotechnology.

Twenty-three Illinois high school students were invited based on the quality their projects to present their research to our judges during the iBIO IndEx. The winner (Lillian Tushman) received an all-expense-paid trip to the international competition, which will be held at the BIO Convention 2017 in San Diego, CA. She will compete at this international symposium this summer. The BioGENEius Challenge provides students the unique opportunity of attending the iBIO IndEx, allowing them to gain valuable insights from biotech leaders, leading companies, scientists, and innovators currently transforming the scientific landscape. Lindsay Moore fields took runner-up.

The student competitors were evaluated on the quality of their research in biomedical, agricultural, and industrial/environmental biotechnology. Students were assessed on their presentations and ability to handle questions regarding their research and general scientific knowledge. Moreover, each student's research was judged on the potential commercial and practical applications of their project. The BioGENEius Competition in Illinois is managed by the iBIO Institute's EDUCATE Center.

Last year Illinois' winner, Jilly Cronin from Oak Park and River Forest High School, went on to win the BioGENEius International Competition. This is the second year in a row in which IRDI students have taken first place overall at this competition.

Lily Tushman studied the ability of *Caenorhabditis elegans* to detect trace concentrations of exhaled ketones in diabetic breath. The goal was to develop a noninvasive diagnostic test for diabetes. I made it to the national junior science and humanities symposium and the international BioGENEius challenge. She also placed third at the positive impact symposium.

Lindsey Moore-Fields's project was about unlimited and uncontrolled cell proliferation are hallmarks of cancer, the second leading cause of death in the United States. Telomere maintenance mechanisms may be the key to this unlimited cell proliferation. Telomere maintenance mechanisms are mechanisms used by cancer cells to prevent the shortening of telomeres, protective structures of repeating DNA on the ends of chromosomes, after cell division. Apoptosis is triggered in a cell when telomeres become too degraded which is an apoptotic check that cancer cells avoid using telomere maintenance mechanisms. The two mechanisms are telomerase, an enzyme, and alternative lengthening of telomeres (ALT), a pathway based on homologous recombination. This study used two natural compounds, ellagic acid and quercetin to inhibit telomere maintenance mechanisms and trigger apoptosis in human fibrosarcoma cells. Ellagic acid and quercetin were chosen for this research due to being natural and having no negative effect on non-cancerous cells which increased the possibility of a new cancer-specific treatment.

SAFE

Lindsay Fields-Moore and Kayla York represented Students Advocating for Equity (SAFE) shared how this group had formed. Originally, VOYCE in Chicago trained them on how to have discussions with peers about topics not

spoken of. Originally, more students were involved, but the interest waned. However, both of these students wanted to continue and so they did so by starting in the English classes. They wanted to focus on students telling their stories and creating safe places to share their stories. This year there have been 3-student led discussions: 1) sexual assault, 2) school experiences of students of color, and 3) the overall student experience. They displayed t-shirts with the words "Ask me who I am." Both Ms. Fields-Moore and Ms. York are seniors so they won't be attending OPRFHS any longer. However, one junior and two sophomore students intend to continue. Their vision is to start in middle schools to help bridge the gap. At the last one, honest feedback about what they want to be done and changed. It is about education, training, and communication among faculty as well as students.

Dr. Moore had attended the forums and the student voice noted a couple of key areas: 1) they want support from not just the teachers, but the counselors, as well as some students, feel that the counselors do not push them to achieve, and 2) they wanted better relationships with faculty and security personnel. They want equal treatment with regard to wearing IDs, the dress code, students of color in AP classes, etc. In some instances, teachers have asked a student if he/she was in the right class. The students want to make this a better place for everyone. Dr. Pruitt-Adams noted that Ms. Fields-Moore and Ms. York were the first two students she knew by name and sight and that their work in leadership will go far.

Public Comments

Paul Collins, faculty/wrestling coach, and board member for the Huskie wrestling Family made the following statement. "This family and program have done much in terms of community service of the outside of wrestling and school, annual clean up and service trip with habitat for humanity. As such we applied for and received a \$50000 grant from Rotary to put in place a sexual violence prevention system in 3 parts; 1) Sarah's Inn will provide training in dialogue/discussions about sexual violence; 2) educate through experiential learning (small group sessions where we have the training for the adults and they work with the students to facilitate those conversations. The more that we can ...and the peers themselves will be able to create a more cohesive school community. The 3rd will be the empowerment of youth for 1 year, they will facilitate and push forward throughout the community. Focus on athletic programs and extracurricular. We want to move forward with the community; look to educate students on sexual violence, and in lines of communications between educators and students. As a coach, faculty member, coach, member of the village address this head on. This is a nationwide problem."

Grace Halvorsen, a senior, made the following statement: "Good evening. I am Grace Halvorsen, and I am a senior here at OPRF. First and foremost, I would like to thank you all for being here and for your role in this school. I am so grateful that you have chosen to listen to what my peers and I have prepared to say tonight. I would also like to mention that I had a hard time deciding what to say because it is so difficult to put into words the impact that IRDI has had on my life. I knew that I wanted to do cognitive psychology research when I was ten years old. However, before I was enrolled in IRDI I did not have the opportunity to explore this passion at all. I could read as many books and journals as I could get my hands on, but I could never do the research that was most important to me. I desperately wanted to contribute to the scientific community and explore

my own ideas and conduct my own experiments. I was so grateful when, as a sophomore, I found out that I would finally be able to explore my passions the very next year in IRDI. The first day of junior year, I entered the IRDI lab and I met Mrs. Hennings. She told us that we could research anything that was important to us, and anything that we were passionate about. I have been in IRDI for two years now. I own two birds, and I continue to observe their behavior and read about bird cognition. I have written papers and theories about cognitive development and interacted with experts in the field. Additionally, Mrs. Hennings emphasized that we were all capable of making a difference in the scientific community. And she was right. I have been so lucky to watch two years of students conduct their own research. In this class, I am among some of the brightest and most creative people I have ever met and every day I am so thankful to be a part of such a wonderful and supportive community.

“During the college application process, I was reminded of just how extraordinary IRDI is. A class at this level, that is this successful is incredibly rare and therefore very valuable to a student applying to college. It also taught me priceless life skills such as perseverance, creativity, and it provided me with an experimental background that many researchers do not develop until they are graduate students. I feel so fortunate to have been given the opportunity to conduct such high-level research. IRDI has been the most valuable high school experience for me. I am eternally grateful to Mrs. Hennings for making all of it possible and for her guidance every step of the way. I am so lucky to have had her in my life. However, none of this would have been possible had I not been able to fund my own project. Birds are a lifelong commitment, and they are expensive. But I would not do a single thing differently. I can assure you that my classmates feel the same way. Research is as expensive as it is important. In order to make a difference, we as scientists need to invest in our work. We should not be limited by the school’s budget, for it will limit our ability to conduct worthwhile experiments. I cannot imagine what my life would be like had I not been able to do what I did these past two years and I truly hope that the people that follow myself and my classmates in the years to come have the same unhindered opportunities. Thank you all for your time and consideration.”

Ellen Morgan spoke about the Investigational Research, Design, and Innovation class. We came here of our own volition, no one asked us to speak, but we felt it was necessary. IRDI, as you may know, is a year-long research class where each student creates and conducts their own original experiment. My own focused on modifying adult stem cell secretions to treat strokes, and my classmates have looked at topics in all levels of biology, agriculture, psychology, and computer science. That range of topics illustrates why IRDI is so successful. Each student has the freedom to explore their passion without compromising. Every single one of us loves our research, and our passion for our field fuels our desire to learn more. Now, as I understand it, there is a plan to change IRDI. It has been decided to remove a student’s ability to self-fund their project, and instead to provide the entire class with a lump sum of around \$3500 to cover all projects. The proposed plan prevents future students from experiencing the full benefits of the IRDI program. Certain fields are more expensive than others, so students may be forced to abandon their passions to do work that does not fit their interests. Since I was working with cells, my project was one of the most expensive, costing nearly \$2,000, and I know that several of my classmates also had expensive projects. I would not have reaped the same benefits from IRDI without the

opportunity to work in a field that interested me, I think that every single student at OPRF deserves to have the amazing experience that I did in the field of their choosing. Without the ability to self-fund, almost none of the students in the class could have conducted the advanced research we were able to. The caliber of research in the IRDI program is of the graduate student level, but that quality would fall drastically without the access to materials that self-funding grants. I understand the concerns about allowing as many people as possible to access IRDI. I appreciate the motives behind the proposed change, the program should not be available only to wealthy students, but there are many alternatives to the current plan, none of which inhibit a student's ability to self-fund. OPRF could offer financial aid to those IRDI students who need it, while still allowing students to self-fund. In fact, the ability to write grant proposals is one of the most valuable skills a scientist can attain, so encouraging students to apply for aid through grant proposals only further strengthens the program. The good intentions behind the changes are unfortunately going to result in the degradation of the entire program. The suggested funding would not allow students to conduct experiments of significant scientific merit. Students from many other walks of academic life are allowed to self-fund their endeavors, and IRDI should be no different. IRDI has given me the confidence to enter a STEM field, it has taught me perseverance, flexibility, and how to pronounce words like lipopolysaccharides. I hope the board reconsiders its decision to revoke the ability of students to self-fund their projects. The work we do in room 291 is serious, meaningful science, and may indeed change the world. If you believe that dedicated, empowered students are the future, then you will continue to allow them to self-fund their research.

Ms. Tushman made the following statement. "As you know, IRDI students have swept many of the regional, national, and international competitions we have attended in the past few years. OPRF's research program is known at a national level to be one of the finest in the country. Mrs. Hennings' lab has received some of the most sophisticated equipment of any high school in the country, including a cell culture hood, a carbon dioxide incubator, and a cell culture deep freezer collectively worth tens of thousands of dollars, which we were ecstatic to receive last year. This is one of the things I would like to elaborate on: when I had the opportunity to attend the Department of Defense's Junior Science and Humanities Symposium in San Diego this past April, I talked to other students from across the country about their research experiences. A simple mention of our cell culture hood consistently elicited audible gasps. It's unprecedented to have a piece of equipment like that in a high school lab, and work with cells comes with a cost. A cell line alone starts at \$300-400, and can easily surpass that. That price does not even include additional chemicals and equipment paramount to successfully culturing cells. IRDI students have conducted high caliber research with our cell culture equipment this year that has helped to reinforce our standing as one of the top science-oriented high schools in the country. I hope that the hood won't collect dust next year, as it surely will if the next generation of IRDI students lose the right to self-fund the projects they are passionate about.

"Although it is possible to conduct research at a lower cost, as a few IRDI students do each year, hidden costs accumulate quickly and a \$3500 limit for the entire class would significantly hamper our research. Without access to specific organisms, sterile equipment, solutions, and other scientific apparatus, IRDI

research can easily be deemed invalid, and we will no longer be competitive in national symposia. BioGENEius posters alone, required to compete in this symposium, cost around \$80 apiece. Therefore, if 20 students enroll in IRDI next year, we will reach \$1600 just to pay for BioGENEius posters. Without conducting a single experiment.

“I understand that OPRF does not have unlimited funds, and may not be able to provide more than the \$3,500 it has already been so generous as to offer, but please do not restrict student’s abilities to self-fund projects beyond that allotted amount. For many of us, this class has been a gateway to elite universities, scholarships, connections with leading researchers, internships, and experiences that most high schoolers could only dream of. I like to think I have taken advantage of many of the opportunities OPRF has to offer, which is why I can say with utmost confidence that IRDI is this school’s crown jewel. I hope you will consider giving it the funding and freedom it deserves.”

Gabi Arnesen also supported continuing the IRDI Program as is.

Stephanie Guralnick, a student, a senior, is an IRDI student. Now, as a student planning on going into the humanities and arts (who definitely never thought of never thought of herself as a “STEM kid”), I definitely did not think I would be doing graduate level research my senior year of high school. Before taking the class, I was concerned that only students with high budgets or students with rigorous STEM experience would be successful. However, I found that every single student, regardless of previous STEM or academic experience, was given equal support and encouragement that went above and beyond any level of support I’ve ever experienced in an academic setting. The only words we heard from our amazing teacher were “the sky’s the limit,” regardless of any challenges that manifested, whether they be personal, conceptual, or financial. Those words meant the world to me and it is my hope that we can continue making those words as meaningful and true to future IRDI students as they were to me. However, by limiting student budgets, our research is also limited. Therefore, a grant system like my classmates described would be most fitting. Personally, my project only cost around \$75. And even though it found success and advanced to a national science symposium along with four other IRDI students, a good portion of the research done in IRDI wouldn’t even be *possible* without a high cost, as many of my fellow students have already said. No one’s research is any less valuable or successful due to cost, but the cost is undeniably a factor in the research process. It’s similar to a situation that I’ve seen in my four years in OPRF orchestra. The school has very generously provided instruments so that any student can play if they want to, but no one will prevent you from bringing in your own personal instrument if you so desire. Letting students self-fund is the exact same thing-- it provides a cushion of support for every student but also encourages flexibility if one needs. Therefore, it is vital that we reach a financial middle ground, to preserve the breadth and intensity of the research we do.

Victor Ancieta made the following statement on behalf of his wife, Sule Kivanc-Ancieta, a current employee of OPRFHS.

“As she noted in her summary update of April 27, considerable progress has been made to date with elements 4 and 5 of the adopted plan currently progressing to completion. With regards to element 4, TRS is yet to validate accumulated contributions and issue a written statement on the matter. With regards to element 5, the parties are yet to agree on a mutually acceptable path to address for tax liability implications and scope of the proposed agreement to confidently move beyond the dispute issues.

“My wife and I want to personally thank Messrs. Prale and Altenberg for being a part of the solution to the problem. Their continued support over the course of the last 3 years has made it possible to formulate a path for a resolution that is responsible. We view this responsible disposition and implementation of specific corrective measures to current practices within the District as critical to prevent a relapse in the future. The source of the problem was and continue to be inherently related to the way information is exchanged and shared between human resources and business systems within the District.

“It is precisely this concern that supports our position of disagreement with the proposed version of the agreement. The agreement is not reflective of the actual dispute issues and fails to address the need to establish responsibilities within the District to follow on progress and prevent a relapse in the future. We see the consideration of these elements in the agreement as critical to manage the risk of a relapse and move beyond the problem with confidence. Their exclusion from the agreement results in a one-sided view of the resolution that does not necessarily provides for a long-term solution to the problem.

“In view of what has been previously stated, the next step is for the parties to meet soon to review tax implications and agree on the scope of the agreement. Thank you.”

He also thanked Mr. Prale and Mr. Altenburg for being part of the solution to the problem.

Status of FOIA Requests

Ms. Kalmerton reported that 9 FOIA requests were received and 4 were resolved.

Superintendent Report

Dr. Pruitt-Adams announced the following:

1. More than 100 students were honored at OPRF annual Student Recognition Celebration. Awards were given for Outstanding Improvement (for raising their semester grade point average by 1.0 or more), Student of the Quarter, Human Relations (for positively affecting school culture), and Academic Learning Program (for personal growth, leadership, and resiliency).
2. The Junior-Senior Math Team placed ninth at the Illinois Council of Teachers of Mathematics State Competition.
3. History teacher Ixtla Arceo-Witzl and English teacher Jesse Stovall were named the OPRF Technology Innovators for April, while counselor Joe Herbst and history teacher Matt McMurray won the awards for May.
4. Junior Ellie Bourikos is the winner of the Ernest Hemingway Foundation of Oak Park’s second annual student writing competition. She will receive a \$1,000 college scholarship and a writing mentorship

with the Foundation's 2017-2019 writer-in-residence during her senior year.

The following consent items were removed from the agenda: C: Monthly Financials, G. Approval of the Memorandum of Agreement Between OPRFHS District 200 and Faculty Senate, IEA/NEA and K. Personnel Recommendations. Non-affiliated salaries were not brought forward.

Consent

Dr. Moore moved to approve the following consent items:

- A. [Check Disbursements and Financial Resolutions dated May 25, 2017](#)
- B. [Monthly Treasurer's Report](#)
- D. [Gifts and Donations](#)
- E. [Board of Education Budget 2017-18 School Year](#)
- F. [Audit Engagement Letter](#)
- G. Approval of Memorandum Of Agreement Between OPRFHS District 200 and Faculty Senate, IEA/NEA
- H. [Abatement of Emergency Days](#)
- I. [Provisional Textbooks](#)
- L. [Policies for Second Reading](#)
 - 1. [Policy 5:100](#), Staff Development Program
 - 2. [Policy 7:250](#), Student Support Services
 - 3. [Policy 7:260](#), Exemption from Physical Education
- M. Open and Closed Session Minutes [April 27](#), [May 2](#), and [May 15](#) and a declaration that the closed session audiotapes of October 2015 be destroyed

seconded by Ms. Cassell. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Monthly Financials

Dr. Moore moved to approve the Monthly Financials as presented; seconded by Mr. Cofsky. Mr. Altenburg reported that the health and dental claims payments were larger this time due to timing. Discussion will ensue about a calendar of reports at the Special Board meeting July 13, including when monthly financials should be brought forward. Mr. Altenburg stated that because the audit was late, the Business Office was somewhat behind in recording bookstore and food receipts; however, the reports were accurate. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

IMAGINE OPRF Contract

Mr. Arkin moved to approve the contract with Unicom@A as presented; seconded by Mr. Cofsky. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Johnson reviewed the process that was used to solicit bids and ultimately for the selection and recommendation that the Board of Education approve UNICOM•ARC to provide OPRFHS with the following scope of services:

- Assist in developing and/or reviewing a charge statement for the program
- Assist in identifying/enlisting community leadership for the program
- Facilitate the work of the program chairs/community leadership
- Provide guidance to customize a program to achieve OPRF goals for the program

- Assist in developing/reviewing branding and communication vehicles for the program
- Attend/coordinate all meetings called to design and implement this program
- Provide guidance in development of informational presentations
- Assist in summarizing and documenting program proceedings/community feedback
- Assist in developing a report of final program summation and recommendations
- Assist in communicating final recommendations to the community
- Provide training to community volunteers working on this program

UNICOM•ARC was recommended for services relative to community engagement, and as such, it would be illegal for UNICOM•ARC to be part of the referendum process. Dr. Pruitt-Adams had personal knowledge of this firm as she had worked with it in St. Louis on a community engagement research project. Its work includes research, public relations, communications, public engagement, and elections.

UNICOM•ARC will help pull together a long-range facility plan. The primary people for this project will be Rob Wright and Jena England. Ms. England is out of the Illinois location.

Mr. Johnson noted that the review process was discussed at the COW meeting. UNICOM•ARC was the only firm that met all of the requirements, i.e., qualifications, specifications, dialogue, etc. The District had looked at some of the institutions who had used this firm. They included:

- 1) Elmhurst High School and its Focus 205 Project, which identified the priorities of the district relative to its strategic plan. It planned, facilitated, and reported out at large community engagement meetings.
- 2) St. Charles High School spoke highly of it.
- 3) Wheaton High School and its Vision 2018 Project, a similar community engagement process.
- 4) Naperville School District on community engagement and identifying priorities.

Dr. Pruitt-Adams reported that UNICOM•ARC had led a community engagement initiative at UC where it looked at the district as a whole and developed priorities tied to grading configuration, aligning attendance areas, community transparency, building trust and decision-making process and facilities. It conducted a utilization study and architects reviewed facility usage, the life expectancy of the buildings, renovation opportunities, tear downs, new schools, and green facilities. Part of the work included developing a large community group with the citizenry from all of the community. The committee then identified two individuals who met with her, the members of her team and UNICOM•ARC to about the topics would be developed over time. The administrators provided information to the larger community. Large community engagement meetings were held twice per month which were lead by the co-chairs and the experts provided information. Ultimately, the whole community looked at the priorities, finances, bonding capacity, etc. and UNICOM•ARC then helped prioritize. The committee presented the ideas to the Board of Education, which ultimately made the final decision about what could be done. Another firm

helped with the referendum. UNICOM•ARC will process the information, do the public opinion calling, electronic polling, and submit a list of developed priorities. In St. Louis, people had the opportunity to see what the buildings would look like via gallery walks. The community was allowed to have a voice in what the buildings looked like when they went out for a referendum.

The District listed the RFQ with the Illinois Bid Procurement Registrar, advertised in the newspaper, reached out to individuals, and extended the time for proposals to be submitted. A fixed fee seems standard in this field. While Ms. England's name had come up in reference checks, it was uncertain how long she had been with UNICOM•ARC.

UNICOM•ARC uses DNR as an architectural firm, and it does recommend it, but the District must issue an RFP for these services and it would be open to any architect who chooses to apply. UNICOM•ARC is illegally not allowed to subcontract with an architectural firm.

UNICOM•ARC understands that the District has secured much information already and it will receive all of the reports, plans, etc. that exist. Buildings and Grounds members of IMAGINE OPRF can help provide some information. This is about educating the working team, fine-tuning it, adding to it. It is not about starting from ground zero.

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

**Additional
Math FTE**

Mr. Baron moved to approve the additional .2 math FTE allocation; seconded by Mr. Cofsky. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

This request was made because an error was made in the sectioning allocation for math. The Plane Geometry section allocation was short a .2 FTE. The District will offer 17 sections of Plane Geometry next fall, 8 of which will be co-taught classes. Last year the district offered 7 co-taught classes. The enrollment in these classes has a maximum of 18 because of the amount of differentiation needed to support students in these courses. This would mean that the remaining 9 sections of the course offered at the college prep level have enrollment numbers around 26. This .2 in math will be put towards another geometry section. This .2 would be added onto a potential TBD hire that is currently available in math and science. Instead of hiring someone for a .8 teaching position, they will be hired at 1.0 FTE.

**TriBoard Committee
For Equity
Appointee**

Dr. Moore nominated Ms. Dixon Spivy to be the Board of Education's representative on the TriBoard Committee for Equity; seconded by Mr. Arkin. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

**Every Student
Succeeds Act
(ESSA)**

The BOARD OF EDUCATION learned that the Every Student Succeeds Act was signed by President Obama on December 10, 2015, and it is designed to provide equity. This bipartisan measure reauthorizes the 50-year-old Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), the national education law and longstanding commitment to equal opportunity for all students. ESSA includes provisions that will help to ensure success for students and schools. The law:

- Advances equity by upholding critical protections for America's disadvantaged and high-need students.
- Requires—for the first time—that all students in America be taught to high academic standards that will prepare them to succeed in college and careers. Ensures that vital information is provided to educators, families, students, and communities through annual statewide assessments that measure students' progress toward those high standards.
- Helps to support and grow local innovations—including evidence-based and place-based interventions developed by local leaders and educators
- Sustains and expands this administration's historic investments in increasing access to high-quality preschool.
- Maintains an expectation that there will be accountability and action to effect positive change in our lowest-performing schools, where groups of students are not making progress, and where graduation rates are low over extended periods of time.

Included in the packet was a link to a webinar as well as a PowerPoint about the Illinois State Plan for ESSA. The summative designations are:

Tier 1: Exemplary School: A school that has no underperforming subgroups, a graduation rate of greater than 67 percent, and whose performance is in the top 10 percent of schools statewide. Schools that receive a Tier 1: Exemplary School designation may apply to serve in the IL-EMPOWER network of partners.

Tier 2: Commendable School: A school that has no underperforming subgroups, a graduation rate greater than 67 percent, and whose performance is not in the top 10 percent of schools statewide. Schools that receive a Tier 2: Commendable School designation may apply to serve in the IL-EMPOWER network of partners.

Tier 3: Underperforming School: A school in which one or more subgroups is performing at or below the level of the “all students” group in the lowest 5 percent of Title I schools. Schools that receive a Tier 3: Underperforming School designation will receive targeted support.

Tier 4: Lowest Performing School: A school that is in the lowest-performing 5 percent of Title I schools in Illinois and those high schools that have a graduation rate of 67 percent or less. Schools that receive a Tier: 4 Lowest Performing School designation will receive comprehensive support through IL-EMPOWER.

Lengthy discussions are occurring about continuous improvement and appropriate assessment at the elementary level. The state is doing an RFP for the K-8 Test. This may be a part of the report card. The ISBE will be developing a Q&A fact sheet and will be shared with the BOARD OF EDUCATION when complete.

Discussion ensued. Relative to subgroups, the belief is that the more subgroups a district has, the more hurdles it has. The same student could speak another language, be in Special Education, etc., and the district could be “dinged” multiple times. Discussion about having super subgroups, so the district would

only get dinged. Clear communication as to what ESSA means needs to occur and should be posted to the website and Huskiemail, etc.

ESSA will start to impact OPRFHS in the 2017-18 school year. ACT data will be applied in the new scoring. Accountability measures include graduation rates, ACT/SAT, ELA, math, science, college and career ready, and attendance. Science will be problematic for the high school. Districts are no longer held to a 4-year graduation rate and that will not count against the school. The new college and career ready regulations give districts four opportunities to be designated as college and career ready based on SAT and ACT scores.

Will ESSA cause OPRFHS to adapt what it is doing in the Strategic Plan or in the Culture, Climate and Behavior Committee (CCB). The administration sees it as being a tool for the climate piece, etc. The transition to 8 to 9 and post-secondary could help in areas of 9-grade on track and chronic truancy and could be addressed in CCB. OPRFHS made AYP due to Safe Harbor. It is just tougher to make AYP. While the strategies currently in place do have a positive impact, additional data points may be needed depending on what is required.

A Tier 1 school could just be homogenous. The state will be challenged when it tries to identify an exemplary school, i.e., schools without brown or low-income students. Often times the strategies are not effective, but schools can learn best practices. The downside is that a Hispanic school making progress, could be categorized as a Tier 4 school. If this is not about comparing or competing against other school districts, a different designation model may be needed in order to be considered. The administration was unsure of how grants will support this work.

The intent is to address the issue of equity, as it relates to access and opportunity for students. It has the same premise of NCLB, which is to focus on the students with the greatest need and to not lose sight of those students who are not doing well and graduate every student to be college and career ready. Mr. Baron applauded that effort but this seemed to applaud some and shame others. Being a diverse school is used against OPRFHS. This may cause more testing. Is there a guard against test fatigue? Dr. Moore concurred with Mr. Baron that OPRFHS should keep its focus on the Strategic Plan and the progress and growth of all students should continue to be the focus, i.e., how a student moves through a series of growth assessments. She continued that Illinois is mandating the SAT. Because every state can figure out how to adhere to the recommendations, she suggested looking outside the state to adhere to the regulations, i.e., Massachusetts, relative to Title families and the family engagement mandate, as that is a provision of ESSA and has step-by-step instructions as OPRFHS is lacking in this. It was suggested that the Parent Outreach Coordinator be asked what can be done for underrepresented families and then follow their children through senior year.

**Pool
Collaboration**

Ms. Arnold reported that Park District of Oak Park published a feasibility study in 2016 which included a community recreation center which included a new Recreation center and indoor pool. In 2015, the Park District issued an RFP for The study. All 6 government entities were brought to the table. Dr. Isoye and Mr. Weissglass reviewed the RFP and interviewed the consultants, etc. Focus

groups were held with the District 200 BOARD OF EDUCATION as well as with students in the spring and summer of 2016. The result was that additional items of interest would be an indoor walking track, a pool, a gym, space for the community, and art spaces. The Park District had its retreat in July 2016 and had accepted the recommendation, but she was told to hold on this until District 200 had its referendum. Subsequently, Mr. Acshelman and Mr. Weissglass talked and initial conversations have occurred with Ms. Arnold and Dr. Pruitt-Adams. Mr. Sletten of the River Forest Park District also wanted to be included in the conversation.

Dr. Pruitt-Adams noted that the collective conversations have been about how OPRFHS would use a recreational building, the timing, the utilization time after hours, the location of swimming, could PE classes be held there. A field trip was made to Oak Brook to see its recreational center and how that was utilized. It was eye-opening as to the facilities that could be incorporated, i.e., the types of pools, etc. Funding resources could be District 200, the River Forest Park District, the Park District of Oak Park, the Mental Health Board, WSSR (special recreation) etc. Students wanted mental health services in community recreational center so not to stigmatize them coming to a place identified on as for mental health services. Over 20 plus sites had been looked at in the community. The feasibility study includes 3 bodies of water (lap, leisure, and therapy pools), 3 basketball courts, a multipurpose gym, wrestling space, a batting cage, lacrosse, a walking track, fitness spaces, art spaces, child care spaces, and space for mental health. Currently, 3 sites are being considered. One is smaller than the others and that would not allow all of the amenities.

Mr. Sletten stated that the Park District of River Forest completed a community survey in March and the responses were for indoor space geared toward an indoor track. While no questions were asked about a pool, 10% of the respondents wanted that to be explored. The Park District Board wants to continue this discussion.

Dr. Pruitt-Adams noted that this will serve both Oak Park and River Forest from infants to senior citizens and it will have an economic impact. The costs range from \$36 million to \$47 million. Every entity will bring money to the table. In December, OPRFHS becomes debt free and has the greatest bonding capacity. Discussions are occurring about funding, interest, financiers of the project, revenue, etc. Questions: Does OPRFHS want to move forward on this consideration. Is it willing to have students access something that is off campus? If OPRFHS is willing to continue to work with the Park District, the leaders of the Board will meet at least once per month. This is an opportunity to see if there is an interest within the community. The Park District has been successful in its IGA with the middle school project, i.e., two fields were turned from lacking to a great community asset. Many questions are still unanswered, however. An outline is being developed for funding, communication, timing, transparency, etc. This would be the first time for the Park District and OPRFHS to work together and it could be a model. Discussion ensued.

A memorandum of agreement would be drafted for all entities to sign as a commitment to the process. No funds would be committed. The parcels currently under review include Ridgeland Commons. The difference in the

pricing is due to what options are included. Parking has been considered. For Ridgeland Commons site, it would have to rely on parking in the OPRFHS garage. The District would continue to look at having a smaller pool on site in order to accommodate PE.

This exploration goes beyond the work of IMAGINE OPRF as that will look at all of needs of academics and the facility. However, the pool issue may move at a faster trajectory than this collaboration.

Discussion ensued about generating user fees. Ms. Arnold has proformas which shows that it generates a profit to pay for the capital improvements. Two of the three designs would be a good source of revenue. The smaller does not have as many amenities but based on the proformas created, there was confidence that the revenue would make the bond payment. The Park District had issued \$30 million in bonds with a payment is \$1.6 million. Since bringing on the new gym center and expanding the after-school program, revenue is \$2.1 million. She believed they had a financial understanding model.

The Park District surveyed residents in 2010 and 2014 and the community has shown a desire for an indoor space and a pool. Positive responses were also received at public meetings and questionnaires about space for meetings, art, bringing seniors and teens together and bringing an “eyes-on-you” aspect, which builds the village. Diving was not a requirement for this and the hope is that diving would be available at the high school.

Mr. Iseli supported it and the community was asking for it. The District should be making this kind of investment. However, use and management will be tricky to make sure everyone gets their fair use of the property.

Dr. Moore suggested that BOARD OF EDUCATION members should send their questions relative to this as the process evolves to Ms. Kalmerton so that answers can be provided to them through the pool collaboration committee at OPRFHS regular BOARD OF EDUCATION meetings. Mr. Cofsky was very supportive.

It was the consensus of the BOARD OF EDUCATION to move forward with developing an MOU.

Mr. Acshelman stated that the other taxing bodies had strong support when the feasibility study was being conducted, i.e., District 97 with specific needs for middle school children, the OP Library needs, and the Village of Oak Park. They had a direct impact on the studies. Friends and colleagues on other taxing boards were also supportive.

The BOARD OF EDUCATION recessed its meeting at 9:39 p.m. and resumed at 9:46 pm.

Hiring Protocol

Ms. Horton presented the protocols for hiring people in the future. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Arkin had voted no on the personnel recommendations at the previous BOARD OF EDUCATION meeting because of a lack of district-wide protocols

in hiring recruitment process, specifically for faculty and a lack of procedures for recruiting minority candidates. Referencing Policy 5:10 which addresses minority hiring, he noted that procedures were not in place to implement this policy. In addition, no adequate protocols or procedures existed in the recruitment/hiring of extracurricular coaches or sponsors. He felt the hiring protocols presented was a good start to an outline.

The BOARD OF EDUCATION only hires the superintendent; the BOARD OF EDUCATION only approves the personnel recommendations made by the superintendent.

Clarification was given as to who the hiring managers are, how they selected, and how they are trained. There are very specific federal and state laws that must be followed as to how people are oriented and trained. The “hiring manager” is anyone who supervises staff and is the lead person on filling a position along with a hiring committee. While there is no formal training, a committee is assembled and each candidate is asked the same questions. One member suggested including training or education for those on the hiring panels that would include cultural competency, marital status, religion, etc. And, cautioned that a committee member may be unconsciously biased when interviewing candidates of color.

A suggestion was made to reach out to state schools for candidates, not just historically black colleges and universities and to grow OPRFHS students, i.e., a Future Teachers of America Club. Many current faculty and staff are graduates. Some alumni have an interest in education as a profession and would be outstanding teachers. The community would be well served if these students were to continue their careers as Huskies and Mr. Arkin wanted to see that process formalized with a teaching track or classes and encouragement to be teachers.

DLT has discussed having an OPRFHS recruitment day. One caveat was given that the question about race on the application is optional and, thus, it is not always evident.

One member felt that HR should be more involved with the process, either it should be the center or the point of commonality. Previously HR was the front door in providing the initial screening, but there was dissatisfaction with the process and it changed. That involved can again be the front door. One member felt that the hiring guidelines and the budgetary model of hiring an average of Master Plus 5 salary had been lost. Now the District is hiring at MA 10. Teachers being asked for approval at this meeting at the MA 10 level, which \$80,000 and 80% of the teachers have been ranked as excellent. This hiring is out of sorts with the economic model.

Ms. Dixon Spivy, David Ruhland, the previous HR Director, Mr. Rouse, and Jason Dennis began an ad hoc hiring group and discussed the issue of creating a more diverse workforce. A suggestion was to have a pre-screening group to look for desired qualities and it would be made of people from all areas of the building. People are needed to want to work within the culture of the school. Consensus needs to be built as to what is desired. Ms. Horton stated that

Applicant has a module that allows the employer to customize for fit, i.e. culture, diversity, and then rates the responses. The person who looks at those applications and see the scores. Dr. Pruitt-Adams acknowledged that training for hiring committees is needed

Dr. Moore reflected on information that had been received in the past as to how many applications were received and the breakdown as to gender, race and how many candidates were interviewed. In some cases, the job descriptions did not match up with the resumes. One must consider the unintentional bias of hiring committees in terms of minority hiring. People look for like people, which may not have to do with an in-person look. She suggested having guidelines for composing a hiring team, i.e., cross divisional, a more in-depth understanding of the application pool, job descriptions, the Strategic Plan and the District's desired to have equity. The consulting firms were asked about their experience and equity and some choose not to participate. Software algorithms can be biased too. She encouraged having an orientation process for all employees to address the culture and climate of the building and making sure Title IX would alleviate that issue.

Ms. Horton will work with legal to see if the application can be modified to indicate that OPRFHS is actively seeking minority candidates and prompt them to self-identity. Unless candidates indicate their race, looking at where they went to school is not always reflective.

Being present at universities for job fairs is one avenue to capture candidates and there are other sources such as the Urban League or sororities and fraternities. It is a matter of having a face of being a positive work culture and allowing the candidates to hear from the current staff about why they work here. Dr. Pruitt-Adams suggested posting "a diverse school district could lead to drawing multi-ethnicity" such as corporate organizations.

Mr. Baron noted that no recipe existed for closing the equity gap, but from the communication viewpoint, the more OPRFHS can create case studies of those who fit the description, the better.

Mr. Iseli reflected that what is important is to have good control of the requirements and job description requirements so that hiring is not over or under what is wanted. Another good practice is to have HR in the room and to link the questions to the job descriptions.

Currently, there is an internal, informal process relative to the teachers participating as sponsors or coaches. Mr. Stelzer and Ms. Topf have relationships with division heads and they inform them of openings and ask Division Heads to let them know of anyone who might be interested. The application asks if there is an interest in doing this work.

Teachers give 4 or 5 years notice of their intent to retire. That is significant time to have a succession strategy. The girls' golf and track team coach is retiring next year and that position affects 6% of the student population in those sports. Mr. Arkin felt that the process for replacing this coach should have happened 3 years ago. Experience in cross country track should be a desired quality in the

candidates. Having an outside coach does not have the kind of effect and influence on youth that an inside coach has by being a resource for those students all day. He believed that succession planning should occur. If someone is interested, either Mr. Stelzer or Ms. Topf will sit in on the interview. However, the intent is to hire a teacher first.

The hiring manager checks for licensure verification on the front end and then HR goes to ISBE as a final check. One member felt the process should be reversed.

This report will be reconsidered at the regular June BOARD OF EDUCATION meeting.

**Personnel
Recommendations**

Ms. Cassell moved to approve the personnel recommendations including new hires, lateral hires, and resignation; seconded by Mr. Baron. A roll call vote resulted in four ayes and three nays. Mr. Iseli, Mr. Arkin, and Mr. Cofsky voted nay. Motion carried.

**Strategic Plan
Update**

Dr. Pruitt-Adams met with community members and staff to remind everyone for the reason of having a strategic plan; this is a collaborative and ever-revolving process. The window for providing feedback was extended to May 17, at which time, the plan and the feedback were shared with approximately 30 committee members that consisted faculty, staff, administration, partners in River Forest, the River Forest Community Center, Triton College, etc.

At the June 22 meeting, the Board of Education will be asked to approve the working document. Accountability measures and implementation will be assigned to DLT and BLT members and the goal is to help to identify individuals to work on the implementation teams from the strategic planning committees, and then the cycle will start again. Quarterly updates will be given to the Board of Education.

No feedback will be thrown away. Whatever has not been shared with the board team will be shared with the implementation team. The members of the Strategic Plan Moving Toward Full Implementation Committee were given a choice on whether something should be included and where it should go, etc. One option was not available to members who voted was “no” because of the negative connotation that the suggestion would be thrown away. This process was results oriented and this piece was an action and that it really helped to look in the context. People were given an opportunity to provide additional feedback by June 2. The plan is to meet again on June 5, 2017, to review and to bring this forward for approval in June, having identified implementation teams.

Board of Education members asked for adequate time to review the plan before asking them to approve it on June 22.

A big concern for one member was that the plan is a depository for everything good that people want to accomplish, but not what has been chosen as to what it can be accomplished. Dr. Pruitt Adams felt this was a document of things that need to be accomplished but the timeframes have been elongated so that not everything is scheduled for year one. In addition, many things had already been

accomplished. If something had occurred and was no longer in existence, why? Did it not yield the results expected? The accountability piece is critical and the goal is to establish an accountability committee of people who did not write the document. The owners are the ones working with the implementation team and will inform the team that not everything in the plan will be done at the same time. The choice is to say this is the response to that barrier, i.e., a Likert scale. One member felt it seemed front-end loaded and best chance of success was to pick those that can be accomplished.

Another member felt that the results should be included in a measurable way. If these are all actions, destinations should be embedded in the plan. Dr. Pruitt Adams explained that they tried to incorporate that in the goal. The actions were the results they wanted at the end.

Ms. Cassell complimented Dr. Pruitt-Adams and her team for allowing thoughtful feedback on the suggestions. Her concern was about the language regarding transgender students, i.e., highlighting them, and not addressing race specifically. For people who are aware of racial equity challenges, that will strike them as odd. She suggested either being more inclusive or take that language out and include in an introduction to explain that when talking about culture and climate, it is not just racial, it includes LTBS and transgender students.

IMAGINE OPRF Update

Dr. Pruitt-Adams thanked the Board of Education for approving a facilitator for the IMAGINE OPRF Work Group. A total of 85 applications were received from across all areas of Oak Park and River Forest. The applicants answered questions about equity, whether they owned or rented, gender, race, children or no children, etc. The launch team supported making the work group bigger and thus 33 were chosen. It scored and ranked each applicant and Gil Herman facilitated that process. Ms. Sullivan and Dr. Pruitt-Adams did not vote so as to distil any notion that applicants were preconceived. Thoughtful dialogue about each of the candidate prior to the selection occurred. The District will reach out to the people who were not selected for other things. The demographics of the group are: residents of Oak Park and River Forest, rent or own, male and female, white, black, Latino and Asian, with and without children and children in pre-school, elementary and high school, alums, architects, engineers, and others. In addition, there are 6 Faculty Senate members, and 3 members from the Non-Affiliated group, CPA, and B&G. Mr. Arkin was the Board of Education representative and will be invited to attend the meetings. A desire exists to have conversations about parameters in the future. Some members of the launch team signed up to continue with the working group, but it was not automatic that they would be chosen and thus had to go through the same application and screen process as everyone else. Students will be identified in the fall to participate.

Mr. Arkin suggested that another Board member participates in helping with communication and feedback. It is a big job. Dr. Moore will confer with other Board members.

Mr. Baron suggested that the committee members be invited to hear the Board of Education's conversation about parameters. Mr. Iseli feared that an outcome of a

discussion about parameters and that data that does not exist will be needed in order to respond to a number of the questions in that survey.

New Business: Board of Education members were asked to consider having a booth at the Farmers' Market question.

District Reports None

At 11:06 p.m., the Board of Education recessed open session and returned to closed session. At 11:55 the Board of Education resumed open session.

The administration will explore the reason for changing the requirements of the IRDI class.

Agreement with Faculty Senate Dr. Moore moved to approve the Memorandum of Agreement with Faculty Senate; seconded by Mr. Arkin. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Adjournment At 11:59 p.m., Mr. Cofsky moved to adjourn the regular Board of Education meeting; seconded by Mr. Arkin. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

Dr. Jackie Moore
President

Jennifer Cassell
Secretary

Submitted by Gail Kalmerton
Clerk of the Board