

March 21, 2019

The regular Board meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on Thursday, March 21, 2019, in the Board Room of the OPRFHS.

Call to Order

President Moore called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m. In the Board Room. 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-Adams, Superintendent; Greg Johnson, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Roxana Sanders, Senior Director of Human Resources, and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant Clerk of the Board.

Closed Session

At 6:11 p.m. on Thursday, March 21, 2019, 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 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 meeting minutes. 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(11) seconded by Ms. Cassell. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

At 7:40 p.m., the Board of Education resumed the open session.

Joining the meeting were Cyndi Sidor, Interim Chief School Business Official; Dr. Gwen Walker-Qualls, Director of Pupil Personnel Services; Christopher Thieme, Director of Technology; Michael Carioscio, Chief Operations Officer; Krystal Jones, and Karin Sullivan, Senior Communications Director.

Visitors

Ken Florey of Robbins Schwartz, OPRFHS Staff Susan Johnson, Jonathan Silver, John Stelzer; Tony Martinez of the Oak Park and River Forest Community Foundation, and various community members.

FOIA Requests

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

Student Council

Student Council Eunseo Choo liaison reported on the following activities:

1. Student Council is focusing on a giving a gift to the school to spread the word about Student Council. It is recruiting students to volunteer, providing free T-shirts to increase student morale and mugs and thank you letters to every teacher.
2. Student Council determined that they would donate to The Thirst Project, and Housing Forward with the funds they raise through fundraising.

**Superintendent's
Announcement**

Dr. Pruitt-Adams made the following announcements:

Science students Elise Scheuring, Haley Gladden, Max Beach, and Leila Winn

have advanced to the National Junior Science and Humanities Symposium in Albuquerque, N.M.

Junior Sonia Zartman won the state-wide Shakespeare Monologue Competition and will compete against 50 state winners at Lincoln Center in New York.

Senior Maeve Doody qualified for the Speech and Debate Nationals after winning the Humorous Interpretation at the Illini District Tournament.

Visual Arts teachers Mark Collins and Tracey Van Duinen presented at the National Art Education Association annual conference in Boston. Only one-third of the 1,700 presentations submitted were chosen.

Public Comments

Kristen Charkow spoke about her son, a sophomore, who has Down Syndrome. A person with Down syndrome has an extra full or partial copy of chromosome 21, which causes the developmental changes and physical features. Ms. Charkow supported the addition of an inclusion facilitator position. While her son has good support from the students and teachers, the missing link is successfully including special education resources. Research demonstrates that students with cognitive delays can benefit from extra support in order to eventually live independently and be employed. He was in regular education classes in elementary and middle schools. Having an inclusion facilitator would provide an opportunity for him to learn to work with his general education classmates. However, he cannot be successful unless the course work is modified. Everyone is happy to have him in the class, but there is no person to handle the modification of the work. Ms. Charkow is an attorney and specializes in special education, and she understands the boards' perspectives. However, adding this position is not just about it being the right thing to do, it is also legally required.

Josephine Porter has an autistic child at Emerson and concurred with Ms. Charkow. Her child was mainstreamed all through elementary school, but the teachers were not happy about having him. At a subsequent IEP meetings, questions were asked about who had taught her son his ABC's, colors, etc. The answer was that he knew them by just being in a classroom in which he was engaged. He learned multiplication tables, how to read, and he exceeded in the general education classroom, but slowly. He is excited to attend OPRFHS and constantly asks about his schedule. A strong meeting was held with the faculty and he was put in a pre-algebra class. While it was a positive move, her child could not keep up with the work. Ms. Porter had no conduit to talk about lowering the expectation. In every class he is welcomed and the teachers are lovely. However, no one is telling her what she needs to do to tell him what to do. There is no formula for guidance. She concurred that an inclusion facilitator is needed bridge the gap between the general education classrooms and the parents.

Tom Snyder did not believe that the draft racial equity policy dated March 12 would improve the situation for students of color because it was a manifestation based on victimhood. Racism cannot be ended with more racism. The policy features racial quotas and is subject to strict legal scrutiny. The racial makeup of OPRFHS faculty is consistent with the body of potential teachers from which it hires, regardless of

race. He felt this was playing the race card. All students need to learn but not at the expense of others. He has heard about the curriculum issue for years and he thought it was nonsense. He has seen classes reading the narrative of Frederick Douglass.

Lauren Arends, an OPRFHS Special Education teacher, supported the hiring of an inclusion facilitator. The role of this person would include working collaboratively with all members of the IEP team. This person would provide intensive concentration, be knowledgeable of all the best practices, be able to demonstrate the practices to others, and create and modify materials. The current program is lacking. Approximately 50 students could benefit from this position.

Cathy Morgan stated that her son, Eddie, had Down's syndrome and she support the inclusion facilitator position. Teachers do not know how to modify the academic work, but they welcome him into the classroom. The District must provide the expertise on how to include her son by looking at the IEP goals and matching those to what is possible. The general education classes allow him to enter, but not to grow and learn. A bridge is necessary. District 97 is making a huge push through co-ed classes. More and more people who are experienced in co-ed and general education classes. She asked for this to start.

Ninth grader Eddie Morgan has Down syndrome and that affects how he learns. He felt that it was important to learn about the world, how to read, and understand human beings so that he can get a job when he is older. He spoke about his experiences at middle school and being in general education classes. He liked being with different types of people because it helped him learn more. While this is hard, he felt he could do when people help me by modifying more work. He asked that the school hire the inclusion facilitator so that he can attend classes with students who do not have disabilities.

Naomi Hildner read the following statement, “With the restructuring of the administration, I would like to strongly suggest that our job descriptions begin with: ‘In conjunction with faculty, staff, and students, this position will include _____ duties and oversee _____ operations.’ I believe that with technology and the unfortunate rush to common assessments, there exists an easy trap of top-down decision-making. Our faculty is strong, we are experts in our fields, so our input must be embraced rather than ignored; we must be sought out rather than dictated to.

“This would require trust and respect. I bring this up at this juncture because I have witnessed a lack of respect for our division heads. Teachers have autonomy because we are sensitive about how best to reach our students and what curriculum would most resonate with our students. But we also have in this building, thankfully, an existential concern for equity. If our curriculum is not addressing those concerns, that is a teacher/Division-head discussion. I feel they have been sidelined and this is an opportunity to bring them back into the fold.

“Again, this would require trust and respect. We are on the brink of releasing an equity policy, but it seems that the Board and community remains ignorant of the equity work we have been engaged in for the past seven years. As our Board, you have also sidelined Devon Alexander who is an expert in this field and is a leader who is thorough, has collaborated with others around the country, and has brought his expertise to us. When members of the community come to our school, ready to

even run for the Board with, the erroneous assumption that we do not have an equity program, in part due to *America to Me*, I would like to hear our administration and Board members correct this assumption and to be fully aware of the work that Devon Alexander and Sheila Hardin have been doing concerning our equity policy. I feel that Devon has been also side-lined, untrusted, and disrespected.

“And lastly, when students want to develop curriculum, the very first place they must turn to is the teachers of that discipline. If you allow curriculum to be developed without any contribution or guidance from teachers, I want you to understand the clear, draconian statement that you are making – that post high school education is irrelevant. Those four to eight years’ teachers spend in college mean nothing. To allow a student–only conceived and developed curriculum to move forward without consulting teachers not only disregards the very concept of education, but it deprives our school of the invaluable opportunity for teacher/student collaboration. To empower the students in this way is not the celebratory pinnacle of success; it is simply an unfortunate opportunity missed.”

Paula Klutz read the following statement: “Dear Oak Park-River Forest High School Board Members. “I am a parent of a 9th grader at OPRF, a former K-12 educator inclusion facilitator, and former professor of inclusive education. I, therefore, have a lot of personal and professional interest in the proposal to create a position for an inclusion facilitator in D200.

“When I moved to Oak Park nearly 15 years ago, I came because I had heard that the community was progressive and inclusive and I assumed that the schools would be progressive and inclusive. When my kids started school, I quickly learned that I should have not made so many assumptions. I know that some students were successfully included in those schools, but for the population I most often support (students with intellectual disabilities) inclusion too often meant occasional "visits" to a general education classroom and not true membership. Through the years, I met parents who had to fight for placements and I met many wonderful--often exceptional--teachers who were making inclusion work without the support they needed.

“I soon learned that Oak Park was not alone and that Illinois is one of the least inclusive states in the country. For students with intellectual disabilities in fact, no state ranks lower.

“This realization was devastating to me as a mom. My children don't have disabilities, but I desperately wanted them to attend inclusive schools, because I have seen the many benefits of this model for all learners. I was, therefore, elated when I saw things start to change in our area. A few years ago, D97 began co-teaching and focusing on inclusion-related goals, parents in that district started inclusion-related advocacy groups, and with this proposal of an inclusion facilitator, there may be more inclusion support coming to our high school.

“I am thrilled to see this new energy because there are so many benefits to inclusive education. I want to outline a few of these to illustrate why investing in this support is worthwhile.

“1) Social Justice: In inclusive schools, students learn about equity, belonging, and human rights from observation and experience. They develop relationships with kids who may have different ways of communicating, relating, learning, moving, or engaging in the world. They see that the community is a place for all. When schools are not inclusive, students also learn powerful lessons. They learn that some people with disabilities belong elsewhere. They may also learn that they have little-if nothing-in common with "those students." They also fail to learn quite a bit and they lose a chance to become educated about differences through observation, interaction, and personal connection day after day, year after year.

“Students with disabilities have all of that to lose and then some when they are excluded. This is not just a learning issue-- although it's that too. This is an issue of rights. It has been since 1975 when PL 94-142 gave students with disabilities access to a public education regardless of disability or need. Even the UN has jumped into the conversation declaring only weeks ago that, "Inclusive education empowers children with disabilities because it equips them with the competences, knowledge, and skills they need to fully enjoy their human rights and participate in society."

“2) Academics: Students who are included do better academically than those educated elsewhere. Four decades of research consistently show that students are more successful when they are educated alongside their peers without disabilities.

“In a brand new study out of Indiana University, students who spent 80 percent of their learning time in general education settings made significantly more progress than their peers who did not. This finding replicates what we have seen in other studies through the years across ages & types of disabilities. Conversely, not a single study shows that students with intellectual disabilities are more academically successful elsewhere (in special classrooms or schools). There are also several studies that show academic and social gains for students without disabilities in inclusive schools-- a win-win.

“These gains are not easy to come by, of course. It takes dedication to inclusive values and support for general education teachers so they can learn new strategies and can collaborate on curriculum design.

“3) Equity: In both D97 and D200, equity issues have rightfully moved to the center of our conversations. Districts that are serious about creating welcoming spaces and providing an appropriately challenging education for all students must understand the relationship between inclusive education and equity. There are many issues to consider related to these intersections, but perhaps no issue is more compelling than considering the advantages that parents with resources may have over those who do not. When a child's placement is deemed inappropriate to the family, parents often need time, services (e.g. legal support), and support to challenge that placement. Therefore, students who have families with all or some of these resources may end up getting access to inclusive classrooms, but it is far less likely to happen for students who have parents with few financial resources, inflexible work schedules, little access to outside professional help, etc.

“There are also racial disparities in placements. For instance, on a national level, students of color with disabilities are placed in the regular classroom--on average--

less than 40 percent of the school day. By comparison, 11 percent of white children are similarly placed.

“Clearly, parents should not need to fight for inclusive placements. All learners should get what they need to be successful in general education classrooms and schools should have the necessary supports to make that happen.

“As the district moves ahead with planning, I am hopeful that we will move toward a model with at least one--if not more--inclusion facilitators. It's somewhat shocking that we don't already have educators in these roles, so adding one or more will be more than a step in the right direction.

“This work is so important and, clearly, teachers must have the resources to serve students, learn new methods, and collaborate effectively. The good news is that what we do for some, does profit all. In the long run, supporting staff in this way has the potential not only to help our teachers create universally designed lessons and welcoming spaces, but it may also go a long way to help us commit to the progress and inclusion associated with our community.”

Natalie Andrus’ daughter will begin to OPRFHS next year. She has been educated in River Forest in primarily general education classes 80% of the time since kindergarten with supports and services. She has made progress on all of her goals. Research shows that the benefits for being included in general education courses are:

- 1) better performance on math and reading assessments
- 2) better discipline,
- 3) better attendance;
- 4) more diversity in the classrooms
- 5) best preparation for adult life.

Eve Kelly, Ms. Andrus’ daughter, likes being included in general classes because she enjoys showing teachers and others what she can do. She likes reading the same books as the other students, and doing the same experiments in science. By being in the same classes as typical students, she has made new friends and has lots of good experiences. She was appreciative of being allowed to talk.

**Strategic Plan/
Culture Climate and
Behavior Committee**

Dr. Pruitt-Adams provided an update on the Strategic Plan including the work of the Culture, Climate and Behavior Committee. She shared the goals and strategy areas. On June 22, 2017, the Board of Education approved the [*Oak Park and River Forest High School Strategic Plan 2017-2022*](#). The plan encompasses six broad goals: Holistic Community Education, Equity, Supportive Learning Environment, Transformational Teaching and Learning, Transformational Leadership, and Facilities and Finance. Last year was the initial year of implementation of the plan and its focus. Dr. Pruitt-Adams reviewed each goal, the strategy, noting that there were links to the meeting notes, agendas, who was the owner, the beginning and end dates, and the barriers.

Discussion ensued. With regard to the merging of the CCB and the Strategic Plan, Dr. Pruitt-Adams noted that CCB is talking about the data dashboard, equity lens, and data

feedback. The Strategic Plan Accountability Committee would still exist. The administration was trying to embed the CCB recommendations into the Strategic Plan. The CCB Committee had suggested that it be part of the Accountability Committee. At the last Accountability Committee meeting it was discovered that having a large group worked better than breakout groups. The administration has not considered in depth the inclusion of parent groups as part of the Accountability Committee.

At a future meeting, the Board of Education will be asked to consider recording all of the Board of Education meetings.

Next year the administration will have metrics in terms of where the District is in transitioning students into honors and AP courses.

PSS Intervention Report

The Board of Education received the PSS Team Intervention Report Discussion ensued. Suggestions/questions:

- 1) Include in the report the number of home visits and observations and tie that into behavior support.
- 2) How has UMOJA informed the practices that are in place? The administration responded that the RJ training has been ongoing and much of the work done over the years has been restorative, but the divide has been about the issuing consequences. A mind shift has occurred over the last few years and the District is doing more to lessen the severity of the consequences yet finds itself struggling. RJ practice is both healing and punitive. The administration struggles with determining if it should do “a” and not “b” or doing both. The Code of Conduct still has those consequences in it. The District is in the midst of RJ practices training, building its knowledge base, and crafting the plan. Part of the metrics of how it will be developed is what is being tracked. A suggestion was made about direction and linkage to the present Code of Conduct that there may be a parallel process. If the District wants Restorative Practices, those practices need to be defined and then have expectations at the policy level. More conversation is needed. One member wished to know more about whether or not RJ practices were appropriate for some and not for others and then determine how to be agile in how to address these issues to get the expected outcomes. This is a culture shift. One member admitted the mistake of saying “training” as having one or two people trained does not mean RJ is ready to be implemented.
- 3) Include a qualitative story in the report, i.e. vignettes, stories that illustrate the work that we are doing. We are eager to share experiences on a daily basis.
- 4) How can IEP students be better supported? They are given suspensions and detentions of up to 10 days before coming to the Board of Education. Legally, a student with a math disability who punches another student will get an infraction. SPED Law does allow some days of suspension.
- 5) Racial Equity has to be the standard lens when looking at all of these reports.

Preliminary Savings At the March 12, 2019 Committee of the Whole meeting, the Board was presented the

staffing recommendations for the 2019- 2020 school year. At that time, the Board requested information on the potential budgetary offsets to cover those costs. The stipend recommendations, salary increases for administrators and non-affiliates for the 2019-20 school year were as follows:

New FTE	\$270,000
Additional Stipends	\$14,505
Non-affiliated salary increases	<u>\$139,446</u>
Total	\$423,951

A preliminary analysis of the budget has been compiled. A list of the savings most likely to be realized is as follows:

Furniture	\$250,000 (only replacement and repairs)
Imagine consulting	\$ 62,000 (updating the plan)
Technology	\$150,000
Grant offsets	<u>\$ 15,000</u>
Total	\$477,000

Additional areas of savings include food, conferences and field trips (limit who can attend and how many field trips are offered), overtime, transportation, and substitutes, etc. Manager budgets are also another opportunity for savings.

Paper reduction of \$100,000
Career Technical Education Grant will be received

FTE grew by 1%, one FTE in Instruction and one in Special Education.

It has been put in different budgets and now we can see where the other cuts, 15% in services and 12% supplies. That is additional that we are saving just here. Sped a lot of money on food and field trips and overtime. 2 positions we are coming with is going from begin an hourly employee to salary.

The administration is developing process/procedures for scrutiny and approval of budget requests relative to conferences, substitutes, food, transportation costs, etc.

One member said that timing was everything. Each issue that the Board receives is compelling and, in a vacuum, everything could be used. However, the Board of Education must have an understanding of the whole when making decisions, including additional staffing for one year. If \$100 is cut from this year's budget but next year a recurring \$100 is spent, it changes the trajectory. The process question should be about good versus passionate decisions being made. Every request is compelling, but this member was trying to be fiscally responsible and wanted a plan. A balanced budget is needed.

The administration is in the midst of determining process and procedures. In terms of timing, having a dedicated process and procedures have shown the evidence, rationale exists that these are the right ones to make.

One member was very optimistic about this conversation.

Management Realignment

The Board of Education was presented with an organizational chart that aligned the administration to the Strategic Plan for the 2019-20 school. This reorganization was given much consideration and its primary purpose was to give voice, enhancement and to streamline the Strategic Plan.

The major goals of the Strategic Plan will be as follows:

1. Transformative Education (Supportive Learning Environment/Dr. Gwen Walker Qualls)
2. Transformative Education (Greg Johnson) will incorporate Transformative Education (Transformative Teaching and Learning Previously) and Transformative Education (Holistic Community Education)
3. Racial Equity will circle the entire plan and headed by the Executive Director of Racial Equity and Student Learning.
4. Transformational Leadership headed by Roxana Sanders, Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources relative to the talent management plan.
5. Operations, Facilities and Finance headed by Michael Carioscio, Chief Operations Officer; Chief Financial Officer, Cyndi Sidor, and Executive Director of Communications and Community Relations headed by Karin Sullivan.

Dr. Pruitt-Adams was not recommending a principal position for next year and spoke about the distribution of those responsibilities to the Associate Superintendent, Director of Student Services, Director of Student Learning and SEL and put them under Chief Operations Office, Safety & Support Services, and Crisis Management. This reorganization is not about working in silos.

As the details are finalized, open community conversation will be scheduled. This reorganization can maximize the potential to address student performance and equity. Faculty Senate is gathering questions, the administration met with the Division Heads, and meetings with the deans are scheduled. Additional meetings with individuals will also be scheduled. The Division Heads are also gathering questions from their divisions.

Discussion ensued.

- 1) What is the difference between associate and assistant superintendent? An associate superintendent is a higher level of authority and that person will have more leverage. It will give that individual more of an opportunity to do curriculum and instruction work as well as the work of the high school.
- 2) Will the reporting order change? Some will and some will not. There is some anxiety about who will be the face of the building.

- 3) Are there any concerns that there will be an increase of one layer between the teacher and the superintendent. The Superintendent meets with teachers and students daily and has an open door policy.
- 4) What teeth will the Executive Director of Racial Equity and Student Success have? This position will report to the superintendent but would be part of the team. One person cannot do everything. In looking at different reports and RJ that have to do with a specific focus and RJ practices, that person would report to Mr. Johnson. Feedback will be critical.
- 6) Has this been discussed with students? It will be on the second Tuesday in April.
- 7) Have any organizations aligned themselves with the Strategic Plan? The administration was unsure. Dr. Pruitt-Adams believed that the percentage of teachers working aggressively on the Strategic Plan, the audit review process, and the Division Head ownership was expanding. This is good work and the District is fine-tuning its focus. As this is communicated, she believed more buy-in would be had. The hope that the differences of administration, faculty and staff will just be OPRFHS working towards a common focus.
8. What is the difference between this and the previous structure of superintendent/principal? The Division Heads also had that question and they said that they could help with the do's and don'ts so that the mistakes that took place during that time would not be made again.
9. The responsibilities of the Director of Student Services seems overwhelming. The administration is balancing out the workloads as they have not been balanced previously. That continues to be a discussion.
10. The intent is to roll this out to the community by July 1, 2019.

The Board of Education was asked to send any feedback to Ms. Kalmerton. Faculty should send their feedback to the Faculty Senate Chair. Division members will send their feedback to the Division Heads. The administration will meet with student leaders also.

[Approval of Capital Campaign Fund Contract](#)

Dr. Moore moved to approve the contract with the Oak Park and River Forest Community Foundation to establish an IMAGINE Fund; seconded by Mr. Arkin. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

The background was that on Dec. 20, 2018, the Board approved issuing a request for qualifications (RFQ) for design services for Imagine OPRF Facilities Project 1, at a total estimated project cost of \$32.6 million. At that time, the Board also directed administrators to propose a funding plan for a second, future facilities project no later than at the May 2020 regular Board meeting. The Board of Education's direction included the administration's funding plan should specify that the district's objective is to align spending with revenue and that at least 50% of the estimated total project cost of \$65.4 million will be covered by private donations of at least \$10 million, annual levy increases equal to CPI (Consumer Price Index), and \$20 million from capital funds.

In order to begin fundraising from private donors, the District needs to establish a fund to house the donations. At last month's meeting, the Board had a discussion with Tony Martinez, president and CEO of the Oak Park-River Forest Community Foundation, about how to establish a fund at the Community Foundation. The contract includes details on the fund's structure as well as the makeup of an advisory board to oversee the fund.

Members of the Capital Foundation Committee, Fred Arkin, Karin Sullivan, Steve Schuler, Cindy Sidor, and Gail Kalmerton, and members of the Community Foundation met on how to establish the fund. Legal counsel reviewed the contract and fees and terms are in the packet.

Mr. Martinez was appreciative of the opportunity to be a partner in this endeavor. The Community Foundation will be the recipients of the dollars used towards the Imagine Campaign. Should the District establish a separate 501(c)3 IMAGINE Foundation, the funds can be transferred that foundation. The funds collected can be invested in an investment money market account, CD, etc., depending on the funds' goals. It is also an extra set of eyes to see that the donors' wishes are met. Adjustments were made to the fees since the last meeting. It has an investment policy statement that has guidelines. Depending on when the funds are wanted and the duration of the investment, the investments could include laddered CD so or longer responsibilities. The focus is on the long term. It is entrusted with people's funds.

Discussion ensued are regarding fees. Whether IMAGINE has an active manager or money market account, the fees are the same. Further discussions can occur about implementing a separate pool that could be money market or a ladder set of fees. The Foundation has \$35 million in assets under management and is a trustee for another \$35 million. The fees pay the Foundation staff and cover overall operations, i.e., grant making, generally the operations and management of the fund. The Foundation adheres to the donor's intent and will do the recordkeeping and insure that the amounts are correct. Some type of agreement that the IMAGINE Foundation understands that the monies are to be for a targeted is not needed at this time.

The District could still use the Foundation as a fiscal agent, and that could be beneficial. The idea of the IMAGINE fund is long term, not 12 to 18 months. The Foundation can serve the District's needs for as long as it would like as this is its business.

There is some interest in becoming a separate entity so that the monies garnered would be guaranteed to go into the IMAGINE recommendations. The District is gathering information and developing an RFP to help begin the framework. There is a group of citizens that want to establish an IMAGINE Fund to make sure there are monies involved in the recommendations. This could eliminate the fees. A small fund has high fees in general and creating a parallel small fund may not generate small fees. The Foundation noted that its fees were to pay staff and offer additional resources nonprofits to benefit

OPRFHS. The annual fee is based on a quarterly basis and the Foundation would need 90 days to terminate the account.

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

Approval of Stipends
Committee
Recommendations

Dr. Moore moved to approve the Stipends as presented; seconded by Mr. Baron.
A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

No reductions were recommended in either stipends or clubs for next year. Consideration may be given to making some small reductions next year depending upon the activity. The recommended increase would be \$14,505, including stipend changes and clubs that need to be increased, and additional new clubs and activity. The overall budget for stipends is \$1.6 million.

A demographic report is provided in August each year. However, the rough numbers show an overall increase in activities and athletics.

**New Positions for
the 2019-2020 School
Year**

Dr. Moore moved to approve the positions of Secondary Pathway Coordinator, Inclusion Facilitator, Testing Coordinator, Security Supervisor and Food Service Supervisor; seconded by Mr. Arkin. Discussion ensued.

Dr. Pruitt-Adams noted that the positions presented were an illustration of the commitment to work with a balanced budget. These positions were evaluated as to whether they were needs or wants. The administration is reducing its spending and there will be no carryover from one year to the next. Decisions were made not on past practice, but where the team strives to be. The team is committed to balancing the budget and looking at how spending can be monitored. Initially eight positions were requested and they were reduced to five.

Mr. Cofsky reflected that this was the crossroads with culture and process. He was torn because this district has been very generous in its resources and a significant amount of money is spent on each student, i.e., \$100,000 from freshman to senior year. Ultimately, he looks to the administration to hold to its directive to how to maximize what is best for the students, but there are many trust issues every year. This should not be a question of more resources but how to maximize those resources. He understands and sees everyone's needs as critical on an individual basis and with passion. But the Board of Education needs to hold true to the balance the fiduciary responsibility.

Mr. Iseli concurred. He applauded the effort of administration to look at the expenses and that is great progress and needs to be done. From his own experience, leveraging those opportunities with purchased services and moving things from furniture to capital might get a start for a time, but the District cannot continue to adding FTE and cut out other processes. That process will not change. This is a short-term fix in cutting things for FTE.

Ms. Cassell struggling with this and yet recognized the need for all positions, i.e. Campus Safety and the work of the Inclusion Facilitator. All students need to feel they can be included in general education classes by getting the support they need. She sided with the administration and she put faith in the fact that the process will be followed in the future with a balanced budget committed to now and a critical look to where other savings could be made, making sure that every position is mission critical to helping the students.

Mr. Arkin had the same concerns and applauded the administration's work on the expense side. The Board of Education has committed to a balanced budget but, as the District moves forward, the needs will change. Three positions represent the bulk of the additional costs, 1) the post-secondary pathway coordinator which will directly kids in the future; 2) the inclusion facilitator--Mr. Arkin has worked with kids who have come through the wrestling program and it has been a wonderful opportunity; and 3) the testing center coordinator. He has seen the lines of kids waiting in line to get into the testing center. The needs will grow and he did not think that 100% of the savings is long term, but he was substantially putting his faith in the administration and would vote to approve. Ms. Dixon Spivy and Mr. Baron concurred.

Dr. Moore too concurred with Mr. Cofsky and Mr. Iseli and the amount of change next year. How can a brand new position have impact? There has not been time to see what zero-based budgeting will do. The new positions are compelling and she saw the need for them, but the questions are about how to bring pilot recommendations forward as well as substantiated data. She felt the test center seemed a place to put energy of the help center and would not support this position. She felt a step back should be taken when it is aspirational introducing a new position, changing structure, balanced budget and adding FTE when talking about cost per pupil and the need for tutoring center. What happens next year? What needs assessment is put forward in how positions are brought forward. She felt the need for certification in the testing center was reactive.

A roll call vote resulted in four ayes and three nays. Mr. Iseli, Mr. Cofsky and Dr. Moore voted nay. Motion carried.

**Administrative
and Non-Affiliated
Salaries for the
2019-2020 School
Year**

Dr. Moore moved to approve the administrative and Non-Affiliated Salaries for the 2019-2020 School Year; seconded by Ms. Dixon Spivy.

Discussion ensued. The justification for giving an overall increase of 3% was that the majority of individuals being recommended are not part of a bargaining unit and not placed accurately in the salary grade. This recommendation represents an adjustment to be fair and accurate. It was noted that the overall amount was an increase of \$140,000, a small percentage of the overall budget. The new positions approved reflected a .08% increase overall. So the estimated total cost is \$180,000.

Questions arose about balancing the budget and that was systematically increasing it. Disappointed was expressed that the plan to move toward a compensation related to performance was yet delayed another year. That needs to be implemented otherwise the Korn-Ferry tool is not being used the way it was designed to be used. Ms. Sanders concurred that the system in place was missing important pieces of the performance evaluation. The current state penalizes those who are dedicated to the district and much of their time working in the district. They are closer to the top of the range and they are not recognized for performance. Discussion had occurred about this being a gap year and tying increases to CPI. This group does not bargain for their salaries increases and they are much lower than the bargaining units.

A roll call vote resulted in four ayes and three nays. Motion carried. Dr. Moore, Mr. Cofsky and Mr. Iseli voted nay.

**Resolution
Authorizing Dismissal
and Non-
re-employment
of First-Year and
Second-Year
Probationary Teachers**

Dr. Moore moved to approve the Resolution Authorizing Dismissal and Non-re-employment of First Year and Second Year Probationary Teachers; seconded by A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

**Project 1 Design
Architect**

Dr. Moore moved to approve FGM as the design architect for IMAGINE Project 1 pending review of final contract; seconded by Ms. Cassell.

At the March 12, 2019 Committee of the Whole Board of Education meeting, the administration's recommendation to move forward with FGM as the design architect for Imagine Project 1.

FGM's key references have been checked and they gave extremely positive reports of FGM as a firm who delivers projects on time and under/on budget. In several cases the FGM relationship has been for many years, with FGM continuing to retain the business due to their performance. FGM was chosen as the Architect of Record in August, 2019.

There are economies in using FGM as the architect of record and the coordination of this project 1.

**Approval of Racial
Equity Policy for
First Read**

Dr. Moore moved to approve the first reading of the Racial Equity Policy; seconded by Mr. Baron. Discussion ensued.

It was noted that legal was reviewing this draft policy and subject matter experts were also weighing in on the content. While the larger committee had reviewed the document, a subcommittee of two or 3 district staff and others made additional changes.

Mr. Iseli was concerned that because it contained so many specifics, the policy was being weakened.

Student Discipline No action was taken.

Consent Agenda Item I, Notice to Remedy, was removed from the consent agenda.

Dr. Moore moved to approve the following consent items; seconded by Ms. Dixon Spivy.

- A. Check Disbursements and Financial Resolutions dated March 21, 2019
- B. Monthly Treasurer's Report
- C. Monthly Financials
- D. Personnel Recommendations
- E. Approval of Administrator Contracts
- F. IHSA Membership
- G. Gala Fireworks
- H. Triton Transitional Math Partnership MOU
- J. Open and Closed Minutes of Revision December 20, 2018, February 28 and March 12, 2019 and a declaration that the closed session audio tapes of June 2017 shall be destroyed

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

Notice to Remedy of Tenured Teacher Dr. Moore moved to approve the Notice to Remedy of Tenured Teacher Anthony Vincent Clark, as presented; seconded by Ms. Cassell. A roll call vote resulted in six ayes and Dr. Moore abstained. Motion carried.

Special Education Report The Special Education Department report presented at the Committee of the Whole meeting was presented as an informational item only.

Future Agenda Items The marrying of the Code of Conduct to Restorative Justice Practices. Audio and video recording of the Committee of the Whole Meetings

Adjournment At 12:39 a.m. on March 22, 2019, Dr. Moore moved to adjourn the regular Board of Education meeting; seconded by Mr. Baron. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

Dr. Jackie Moore
President

Jennifer Cassell
Secretary