

November 16, 2017

The regular Board meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on Thursday, November 16, 2017, in the Board Room of the OPRFHS.

Call to Order

President Moore called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. A roll call indicated the following Board of Education members were present: Fred Arkin (arrived at 8:00 p.m.), 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; Brenda Horton, Director of Human Resources; Michael Carioscio; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant Clerk of the Board.

Closed Session

At 6:36 p.m. on Thursday, November 16, 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; Litigation, when an action against, affecting or on behalf of the particular District has been filed and is pending before a court or administrative tribunal, or when the District finds that an action is probable or imminent, in which case the basis for the finding shall be recorded and entered into the closed meeting minutes 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(1), as amended by PA.93—57; Collective negotiating matters between the District and its employees or their representatives or deliberations concerning salary schedules for one or more classes of employees; seconded by Ms. Dixon Spivy. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

At 7:35 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; Greg Johnson, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; Dr. Gwen Walker-Qualls, Director of Pupil Personnel Services; and Karin Sullivan, Director of Communications and Community Relations.

Visitors

Naomi Hildner, OPRFHS staff member, Bruce Kleinman, Gale Landers, Jeff Long, Andy McGowen, Michele Crown, Natalie Thompson, Holly Blake Steve Berggren, and Denise Walsh.

Dr. Moore noted that the Board of Education would only be voting on whether to extend the memorandum of agreement for the community recreation center at this meeting, not it's funding.

Hearing on Drivers' Ed

At 7:44 p.m., Dr. Moore called the Public Hearing to order on Thursday, November 16, 2017 for the Oak Park and River Forest High School Renewal of Driver Education Waiver, which requires that Driver Education courses provide at least 6 hours of practice driving in a dual controlled car. The requested waiver would allow 18 hours of practice driving in a simulator system in lieu of 2.8 hours of instruction in a dual controlled card. Notice of this Public Hearing appeared in the Wednesday, October 11, 2017 edition of the Wednesday Journal Newspaper. She asked for any

written or oral comments to be received. Hearing none, at 7:45 p.m., she closed the hearing.

Public Comments

Naomi Hildner spoke about the leadership of summer school, asking what was the purpose of summer school. She felt to assume it was a credit recovery exercise was a betrayal as that purpose is to reject the school experience. She spoke of a former teacher, Dale Craft, who had every student in his class showed up on time. The students in credit recovery have rejected “the game” and have not learned how to play it. If the District rejects this idea of teaching a classroom for expedience or to go on the cheap, it is defeated before beginning. She knew how tempting it was to go on a computer for credit recovery, but it does not do anything. She still hears from the students she had taught in summer school. At the end of the their six weeks, they had read 3 books and written 3 papers, received a grade of an “A” or “B” and showed up in the core class. They learned something they could continue. She asked, “What is the purpose of summer school?”

Andy McCowen, speaking on behalf of his daughter Sara Binder and owner of the new SPENGA Oak Park, which opened in April, said that she had put \$500,000 into her business and she feels a real concern about the potential for competition in Oak Park. He spent most of his working life in city management and had built centers such as this in areas where there was no competition with private businesses. He asked them to consider that as the Board of Education deliberated. He continued that running these operations are not cheap and the District may have to subsidize. It will have diminishing returns. He too was concerned about funding. He was concerned that she would have to pay business taxes that would fund something in direct competition with her business--it is a catch 22 proposal.

Michele Crown, neighbor, and mother, loves this community and hoped that the MOU would be extended. The idea of governments coming together to try and answer needs of those that do not have a voice, are underserved, young and in a different socioeconomic class was important. In addition, the school needs a competitive pool.

Natalie Thompson, the parent of 2 students and one 2016 graduate, said that 2 weeks ago the World History class was discussing the desegregation of schools and the famous doll test. She did not tell her teacher that her relative developed the doll test that had effects on Brown versus the Board of Education because she made the calculated decision that it was not worth it because she was the only African-American in the class. How, when her daughter spoke about race and education at the discussion, Ms. Thompson saw how deeply it bothered her. She has never had a black history teacher. She continued that students do not feel comfortable in their own school. She planned to continue to talk with her daughter about where she comes from and being proud of saying who she is. The Board of Education has work to do. She charged it to make the school more equitable for all students and provide role models. Teachers need to facilitate discussions, support those students who may be uncomfortable. The more students of color in an honors class, the more they will have to lean on and the better they will do.

Bruce Kleinman stated that the garage is undergoing major maintenance, in accordance 2003 IGA and he requested that OPRFHS meets its responsibility in that IGA, which focused on changing light bulbs and landscaping. It is an aesthetic issue

and this community values aesthetics. He urged the Board of Education to do its duty.

Holly Blake has a fitness center and just expanded it. She is a member of the community. She did not support a community recreational center.

Jeff Long, parent of a sophomore who swims at OPRFS, understands the need for a pool, but he was not willing to have his tax dollars go to a tax-exempt multi-municipal facility. It was challenging for him to have something taken away from something where he works, the Formula Fitness Center. He asked the Board of Education not to extend the MOU and understands the need for a pool. He hoped the BOE would not extend the MOU, understanding that it is not a good position.

Steve Berggren thanked the Board of Education members for all that they do. He noted that there were fitness options everywhere in the community. The Park District spent \$30 million to rebuild some of its facilities. The proposed facility is projected to cost \$45 million. More people will need to be hired and it will increase the budget. He cautioned the Board of Education against being an accomplice in picking and choosing which businesses it would destroy. The Board of Education should focus best on how to educate students and not give money to the Park District.

Gale Landers, founder and owner of Fitness Formula Clubs, FFC, with ten locations, one of which of course is located here in Oak Park at 1114 Lake Street, read the following statement. "As mentioned last time, I'm also a past Board President of the International Health, Racquet, & SportsClub Association, commonly referred to as IHRSA, which is the leading trade association serving the health, wellness, and fitness industry in the United States and Internationally.

"When I was here at your October 26th meeting, I mentioned I was here representing not only my company, but also on behalf of the many fitness facilities, fitness boutiques, fitness franchise models, and fitness studios throughout Oak Park and River Forest. As you have heard this evening, they are passionate, highly talented and experienced, and they love what they do.

"We have come here this evening to both be informed and to express our views collectively, in unity. We have created hundreds of jobs, many of whom live in Oak Park and River Forest. Collectively, we represent a huge part of the fabric of this community and pay hundreds of thousands of dollars in real estate taxes.

"By example and as a reminder, FFC paid \$670,000 in real estate taxes this year. Since we opened ten years ago, FFC has paid over \$4,368,000 in real estate taxes. A Park District fitness facility would be tax-exempt, paying no real estate taxes. And as we all know, a large portion of the real estate taxes that FFC and the other fitness operators in this room pay, goes to this wonderful OPRF High School. The idea of the real estate taxes that all of the commercial fitness facilities and studios provide to this high school being turned around and used to fund a tax-exempt Park District fitness facility through direct contributions, loans, and/or additional bonds is deeply troubling to all of us who have taken the risk in creating fitness offerings of various types to serve this community. That is simply wrong by any measurement, no matter how you slice it.

“About one in four Illinois residents use a fitness facility of some type. A significant percentage of Park District fitness facilities do not operate in positive cash flow. When tax-exempt government fitness facilities duplicate services already offered by tax-paying health, fitness and recreation facilities, then all taxpayers, one way or another, end up bearing the ongoing costs. That cost is born out across 100% of the residents, even though only a small percentage of the residents would be regular users of the facility.

“In summary:

1. Loaning to a park district fitness facility, many of which operate in negative cash flow year after year, creates tremendous uncertainty in the ability to repay those loans or bonds.
2. It's clear there is far more risk to the High School than potential reward.
3. This would create erosion of the OPRF Reserve Fund and based on prior comments would likely cause the need to go out for referendum, the outcome which is also uncertain
4. The OPRF fitness market is a very mature fitness market, with literally dozens and dozens of choices. Duplicating services that already exist in the marketplace and being last to market is the worst place to start a \$45 million venture and layers on even more risk.
5. As you have heard this evening, a park district facility would be jeopardizing the tax paying businesses that pay the real estate taxes that are received by this great high school
6. Lastly, what is the backup plan when a park district facility can't operate? in the black? It's the residents. It's the residents who get levied with even higher real estate taxes to fund the losses. Let's face it. Citizens are getting fed up with more and more taxes, regardless of the type. The quick abolishment, after just a few months, of the Cook County soda tax is the most recent example. Thank you.”

Denise Walsh noted that she was a 15-year resident, her husband attended OPRFHS and that taxes were difficult in this area. She wanted to see local businesses survive and she wanted to support them in any way possible. She wondered why the residents were not being asked to vote on the proposed CRC. Taxes have increased year after year and she believed in support these great schools, but some residents have had to move because the amount of taxes became unbearable and they were heartbroken to have left this area. A balance is needed as to what is needed as \$45 million is significant. She wanted to be sure tax dollars were being used in a way that had the most impact.

Status of FOIA Requests

Ms. Kalmerton reported that 5 FOIA had been received and 5 were resolved.

Student Council Report

Matthew Vietzen, the Student Council Board of Education liaison, wished everyone a Happy Thanksgiving. The Tradition of Excellence Assembly went very well. He attended the IMAGINE OPRF meeting and noted that great things were moving forward. Every teacher will receive a Thanksgiving thank you card. Mr. Cofsky thanked him on the excellent job that Student Council did on the activities for the Tradition of Excellence Award winners.

**Superintendent
Announcements**

Dr. Pruitt-Adams thanked those who attended the Intersection on Race and IMAGINE OPRF.

She noted that OPRF honored four new Tradition of Excellence Award winners. For biographical information, [click here](#). To see a video from Sarah Coglianese, who has ALS and was unable to attend, [click here](#).

- Sarah Coglianese, 1996, nationally recognized health advocate
- Daniel Kibblesmith, 2001, writer and cartoonist
- Lt. Col. Matthew Smith, 1994, decorated military officer
- State Rep. Camille Lilly, 1979, elected official

The Forest Preserves of Cook County recently dedicated the community art sculpture that art teacher Tracy Van Duinen and OPRF art students helped create for the park at Lake and Harlem from natural materials found on forest preserves land.

Math teacher Mark Pappalardo won another Sectional Diving Coach of the Year Award, having coached his first girls' West Suburban Silver Conference champion as well as two divers in the top spots at sectionals.

Consent

Dr. Moore moved to approve the following consent items:

- A. Check Disbursements and Financial Resolutions dated November 16, 2017
- B. Monthly Treasurer's Report
- C. Personnel Recommendations, including New Hires and Lateral Hires
- D. Approval of Open & Closed Minutes of October 26, October 31, and November 6, 2017, and a Declaration that the closed session audiotapes of March 2016 are destroyed and a declaration that the closed session minutes from January 1, 1987, through November 2017 small remain closed.

Seconded by Ms. Dixon Spivy. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

**Adoption of
Estimated Levy**

Dr. Moore moved to approve the Estimated 2017 Levy, as presented; seconded by Mr. Arkin. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

At this point in time, the 2017 Tax Levy request is 2.91% higher than the 2016 Levy Extension; 2.1% is from CPI and .8 is from new construction coming on the tax rolls.

**Community
Recreation Center
MOU**

Dr. Pruitt-Adams stated that as of November 6, 2017, Committee of the Whole meeting of the Board of Education, five financial options, two potential locations, as well as the identified needs for each partner district related to the CRCC (Community Recreation Center Collaboration) have been presented. As the December 1, 2017 expiration date approaches on the Memorandum of Agreement, the three boards must decide whether to let the MOU expire or vote to extend it. The administration recommended that the Board of Education allow it to expire based on the following. Scenarios 2-5 would have a financial impact on taxpayers, moving up the time frame for D200's operating referendum or increasing taxes to pay the debt service on a bond issue. In addition, facility recommendations by IMAGINE OPRF are at least six months away, and the cost implications of those recommendations are unknown. It is also unknown whether the community would support any of the financing scenarios as the best use of the District's resources. When a decision is made regarding IMAGINE OPRF, the administration could

possibly resume discussions with the Park District of Oak Park and the Park District of River Forest. Discussion ensued.

The reason to vote “no” rather than “yes” to extend the MOU is to not continue the discussion. Dr. Pruitt-Adams stated that at this point and the financial position of the Park District, it is not prudent for OPRFHS to continue. The financial concerns are too great and OPRFHS would be running IMAGINE and CRCC along parallel tracks.

Mr. Iseli stated that the reason for exploring CRCC was that there were things the District wanted to achieve, pool use, etc. However, it turned into including access to mental health facilities and, perhaps, a place where people could congregate. Can these discussions be extended in order to find an option? Dr. Pruitt-Adams noted that the District’s interest was not only about community service but also meeting the District’s current needs. Presently, OPRFHS collaborates with the Park District. However, this is not about programming needs for the District. It is about how to best use the District’s dollars. And, at this time many unknowns exist about IMAGINE and governance.

Ms. Cassell did not believe the MOU should be extended because of the concerns about finances, governance, and the work of IMAGINE. She would like the Board of Education to have further discussion about how to bring mental health services to the students, but not necessarily through an IGA.

Mr. Arkin, the Board of Education member on a committee representing the 3 parties, said that he was happy this work had been undertaken. It is important to collaborate and he thanked the staff for doing the work that showed whether something could be accomplished. None of his 3 concerns had been resolved relative to 1) governance, 2) tangible benefits to River Forest, or 3) finances. This process morphed into OPRFHS’s project, which it was not. It was a feasibility study and a request from the Oak Park Park District to have conversations. This is not about building an OPRFHS pool; it is not OPRFHS’s project; and, it is not about IMAGINE, which is totally separate. It should not affect what IMAGINE would do but be something that OPRFHS could go to in the future. He found great frustration in these two things. He believes the benefits would be a recreation space, a safe place for them to go to between 3 and 7, mental health services, a space for the CITE program, and childcare (from infant to seniors). However, the Board of Education cannot go forward and approve the MOU as written because of the financial statements. He hoped to work collaboratively, perhaps, on a project similar to this with other governmental entities. There was the possibility that it could benefit students and taxpayers; perhaps that can be readdressed in the future.

Mr. Baron stated that if the Board of Education does not extend the MOU, it means that this is not the right time to do so. This has been a collaboration. The dollar figures involved for the Districts, especially with long-term costs, are too risky. Government bodies should not be taking the risk, yet the principle of discussion and exploring the potential of the collaboration is a good one. He was confident that the time is not right and dollars are too steep. Voters should also have a voice.

Mr. Cofsky had difficulty unbundling this from IMAGINE and he needed to see that unfold more fully and make sure the students’ needs were focused on that. That was

key to him and the reason he did not support extending the memorandum but asked to continue the habit of reaching out to governing bodies.

Ms. Dixon Spivy stated that the Board of Education needed to be sensitive to the needs of the taxpayers and to transparency.

Dr. Moore moved to extend the Community Recreation Center MOU extension; Seconded by Ms. Dixon Spivy. A roll call vote resulted in all nays. Motion failed.

Dr. Moore stated that this project morphed into one driven by the high school and it was for using District's dollars without taking it for a vote. The intent was never to write a check. In listening to discussions in since May as well as hearing the concerns of local businesses and community members, she felt what got lost in the discussions when it started to be called a recreation and fitness center rather than community recreation center to have a place for everyone in the community. She did not want to lose the necessity of building the community in ways that prevents governing bodies from benefiting the community from cradle to beyond. That discussion needs to continue. However, as stewards for the students, another pathway must be found.

IMAGINE OPRF

The IMAGINE OPRF Work Group is charged with making recommendations to The Board for a long-term facilities plan. The workgroup comprises 42 members, with 31 of them from the community and 11 from the faculty and staff. The goal is to present the Board with recommendations in June 2018.

The Imagine OPRF Work Group met on Oct. 23, 2017. The four subgroups (Academics/Student Achievement, Athletics/Extracurriculars, Performing & Fine Arts, and Physical Condition/Safety & Security) reported on their initial research, noting that more will be conducted in the coming weeks. Among other work, groups have created detailed spreadsheets to capture the facilities that fall under their Purview, the current capacity of these areas, and anticipated future needs. Detailed and ongoing interviews with faculty and staff will reveal more information. Nearly all Imagine members took one of several scheduled tours of the building.

The district is hosting a community engagement meeting, open to all stakeholders, on Wednesday, Nov. 15, 2017. The event has been promoted via a postcard mailed to all residential addresses in the district, two rounds of newspaper ads, fliers, HuskiEmail, the website, staff and student intranets, social media, requests for communications staff at other taxing bodies to promote, etc.

The event will include a presentation by consulting architects from Perkins + Will on future-ready learning spaces as well as small group discussions about Priorities stakeholders would like IMAGINE to consider. This qualitative data will be captured and presented in a future report. The next large workgroup the meeting will be held on Monday, November 20.

Dr. Pruitt-Adams introduced Ms. Kamenitsa and Mr. Poirier as the co-chairs to IMAGINE OPRF. Ms. Kamenitsa spoke about the 3 stages of this process. One is intensive research. Teams focus on one of 4 functions. Their assessments are beginning to be submitted.

Mr. Poirier spoke about building the process. The first meeting occurred on September 11 and much progress has been made. Two of the teams are at the end of Phase 1 and the other two are continuing. On January 8, they will report their initial preliminary conclusions, not, however, solutions or proposals. The community engagement meeting was held November 15, and 45 community members attended. Twenty IMAGINE members attended who spoke about the purpose and work, and a short presentation was made on what is meant by “future-ready learning”. Feedback was collected. Mr. Poirier felt they were on track in this endeavor.

When asked what the Board of Education could do to support the workgroup, Mr. Poirier felt that knowing the appropriation amount would be beneficial but not necessary. Ms. Kamenitsa, however, felt that IMAGINE OPRF should not be limited by an appropriations amount. She felt everything should be considered and an appropriation amount should not be named.

Both co-chairs were pleased that everyone was engaged in the process from the beginning. Its next meeting will be in late January and the conclusions will come forward. The full team meets on a monthly basis and has an interchange of ideas.

The community engagement meeting was recorded and uploaded to the website.

Dr. Pruitt-Adams added that the feeling was that this process was more transparent and truly community driven. Mr. Cofsky was excited as this process seemed more need driven rather than solutions driven and asked how people got down to the foundation and the needs. Mr. Poirier noted the challenge it had been and the discipline that had been existed. He graded the work as being A-. Once people understood the current state, they realized the magnitude. They are still grasping on what happens in the building. Themes are emerging, not solutions.

Mr. Poirier asked if the IMAGINE OPRF group should broaden its scope in consideration of the memorandum of agreement regarding a community recreation center. The high school is the most important institution in these communities. One theme that has been emerging is the degree to which spaces are used before and after school and during lunch periods and how that is tracked by certain programs, as this is in part how students find a home in the institution. The question is how to document this? Dr. Moore suggested that conversations occur with Faculty Senate, club sponsors, Motivational Mentorship Coordinator, security staff, etc., to know how students are using the building.

Mr. Baron noted the importance of thinking big as 65% of now grade school students will be working in jobs that will expire. He would rather spend more to make sure the building is purposeful and adaptable. He encouraged not spending money on this that would be counter to the bigger picture.

Ms. Cassell asked that IMAGINE look to student groups for student management and to be mindful of the students who do not have a space.

Ms. Sullivan was appreciative of both the co-chairs and the committee members for their work on behalf of students. Dr. Pruitt-Adams said that the co-chairs give a sense of energy and optimism. Ms. Kamenitsa felt the same energy from the 41 volunteers and she had been impressed with the intelligence and drive and the

number of hours they have spent talking with teachers about equity, diverse backgrounds, etc. She appreciated the administration for letting them do this great work.

Report Card

Ms. Hill's report noted that on October 31, ISBE released the 2017 Illinois School Report Card data for public school districts. The Report Card includes demographic, academic, operational, school climate, and finance data across a number of categories. It is the most comprehensive, publically available data set for our school. As District administrators and the Board of Education continue our work to develop consensus about key outcome metrics and measures of school efficacy, we anticipate overlap with the Report Card indicators. A challenge administrators are working to address is that the Report Card contains some items that are inaccurate or that lack important context for understanding. This report summarizes those issues.

It continued that as the administration has looked into the analyzation of the report card, there have been revelations as it relates to processes and procedures and the administration has an understanding of how the state utilizes the data they receive. In 2017, the data listed in the report card centers around demographics, operations, school climate, and finance. It is a public document and something that is done annually and the administration has been able to identify processes and procedures. Note: In September, statisticians got preliminary access as to how ISBE calculated the scores and said clearly what ISBE was doing was problematic. They were going to share information from the College Board. SAT has become the dominant test.

With regard to the SAT, percent proficient represents the percent of students who achieved a combined SAT score of 1080 on last April's state SAT. Sixty-one percent of OPRFHS juniors achieved or exceeded that cut score, compared to a state rate of 39%. The state arrived at 1080 by adding its designated cut scores in Evidence-Based Reading and Writing (EBRW) and Math. Those state-designated cut scores—540 in each subject—are higher than the college and career readiness benchmark scores established by College Board, whose research shows that an EBRW score of 480 and a Math score of 530 indicate college and career readiness.¹ The upshot is that the state's formula for proficiency understates the extent to which OPRFHS students are meeting external standards for readiness. Figure 1 shows how OPRF success percentages differ using each of the two sets of cut scores. Figure 1 in the report was a Comparison of College Board Readiness Benchmarks and ISBE Cut Scores for "Meets Standards" (Sources: College Board and Illinois Report Card) ¹ A student who scores at or above a College Board benchmark has a 75% chance of earning a C or better in a related first-semester credit-bearing college course (e.g., algebra, statistics, history, literature).

Post-Secondary Enrollment: ISBE data has consistently underreported the percent of OPRFHS graduates enrolling in 2 or 4-year colleges within 12-16 months of graduation. For any given year on the graphs in Figure 3 below, data reflect post-secondary enrollments for the class that graduated two years earlier. For example, data for 2014 reflect college enrollments for the OPRFHS graduating class of 2012, and data for 2017 reflect college enrollments for the class of 2015. A comparison of ISBE data in Figure 3 and National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) data in Fig. 4 shows the extent to which ISBE underreports the source data. The reason for the discrepancy is unclear, given that the Report Card cites NSC as its source. It was

further explained that 48% of graduates need postsecondary remediation, but only 46% of students who attend 2-year colleges need remediation and the fine print on the report card explains this.

Several Board members noted their concerns about students needing to take remediation courses. These are the most vulnerable students and they are not taking college classes and still doing remediation and how can they be expected to be persistent if only in the remedial stage. We should be able to address with Triton. One member remarked that if the District is saying “x” number of African-Americans are going to 2-year institutions, how can the District alter its goals. The administration remarked that Triton is aware of this problem. Other indicators needed, rather than a one-time test. Dr. Moore asked how the District was going to look at post-secondary success. If the goal is to have a 4-year degree in 5 or 6 years, is that being accomplished?

Teacher Attendance: Internal records indicate that the teacher attendance figure shown on the report card is not accurate. The overall number of teachers in 2017 shown on the report card (219) is lower than the actual number of classroom teachers (225), and absences for non-classroom faculty—counselors, social workers, and librarians—appear to have been erroneously included in the calculations. Administrators are working to reconcile these discrepancies and to determine the correct percentage aligned to the state’s measure for teacher attendance.

Early College Coursework/Dual Credit: The Report Card shows that no OPRFHS students took dual credit courses in 2016-17. We have identified an error in how we are reporting this data to the state but were not able to correct it prior to the deadline. The number of students who took dual credit course was 95. The reporting will be corrected next year. Questions: What is driving the disparity between African-American and White students? What will be done with that information? Mr. Johnson stated that Triton is aware that every department was working separately and it was difficult to navigate the students but that the process was being revised. He is working with Triton on removing the barriers regarding the AccuPlacer Test (College Board), including rolling testing dates.

Comments and questions:

- 1) How many African-American students go to Triton as their 2-year school and are not represented in these numbers?
- 2) Parents need an explanation as to the benefits of dual credit classes, as the savviness of parents may be driving it more than the work being done internally. Note: Mr. Johnson and Ms. Hoffman are working on this endeavor and the hope is to have students register for Triton at OPRFHS.
- 3) The best ambassadors of dual credit courses are the students who have participated in them. Dual credit classes save time and money.
- 4) The state-wide trend is that math scores are lower than English scores. One member noted that Fox Valley had created summer math programs and it was suggested holding a similar program at the Oak Park Library.
- 5) One member was sorry that tax dollars were being used to create a document that was misrepresenting data and was misleading.
- 6) One member was bothered that the most vulnerable students were taking remedial post-secondary classes and that should be addressed with Triton.
- 7) Addressing this properly with the community is critical.

Dr. Moore looked forward to seeing the recommendations on data that address instructional and school climate issues.

**Future Agenda
Items**

Mr. Baron asked to have a discussion about connecting with more with Triton. Dr. Pruitt-Adams is a member of Triton’s Board of Control and School Alliance Partnership, which is systemic across all districts, and they are working on putting in a bridge program in place to help students transition.

Ms. Cassell asked to have a discussion on how the high school can support mental health needs in the community via Goal 1, Strategy 3.

Mr. Iseli wanted to have a discussion on the element of students’ voice as he did not believe the Board of Education had the full picture and he wanted to hear from a broader set of students at the beginning of the meetings in order to give them balance. Dr. Moore noted that discussions have occurred about having other student leadership groups report beyond just that of Student Council about what they are doing. Dr. Moore also encouraged Board members to attend student meetings, as the students are appreciative of Board members hearing their concerns/ recommendations.

Closed Session

At 10:00 p.m., the Board recessed open to enter the closed session and resumed the open session at 10:21 p.m.

Adjournment

At 10:21 p.m. on November 16, 2017, Ms. Cassell moved to adjourn the regular Board of Education meeting; seconded by Dr. Moore. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

Dr. Jackie Moore
President

Jennifer Cassell
Secretary