

The regular Board meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held virtually on Thursday, May 28, 2020.

Call to Order

President Dixon Spivy called the meeting to order at 6:34 p.m. A roll call indicated the following Board of Education members were present: Matt Baron, Thomas F. Cofsky, Gina Harris, Craig Iseli, Ralph Martire, Dr. Jackie Moore, and Sara Dixon Spivy. Also, present were Dr. Joylynn Pruitt, Superintendent; Dr. Roxana Sanders, Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources; Dr. Gwen Walker Qualls, Executive Director of Pupil Support Services; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant Clerk of the Board.

Closed Session

At 6:40 p.m. on Thursday, May 28, 2020, Ms. Dixon Spivy 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) ; 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); Individual Student Placement 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(10); Discussion of lawfully closed meeting minutes, whether for purposes of approval by the body of the minutes or semi-annual review of the minutes as mandated by Section 2.06 5 ILCS 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(21); and Discussion of lawfully closed meeting minutes, whether for purposes of approval by the body of the minutes or semi-annual review of the minutes as mandated by Section 2.06 5 ILCS 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(21); seconded by Mr. Baron. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

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

Joining the meeting were Michael Caroscio, Chief Operations Officer; Dr. Levar Ammons, Executive Director of Racial Equity and Student Success; and Cyndi Sidor, Chief Financial Officer; Karin Sullivan, Executive Director of Communications and Community Relations.

Visitors

OPRFHS staff Ron Anderson, Carolyn Gust Fred Preuss and Jeff Bergmann, Dr. Dr. Laurie Fiorenza, Lynda Parker, Matt McMuray, Laurie Fiorenza, Kristin McKee, and Kennedy Dixon; KeJuan Carter, Instructional Technology Coordinator Earliana McLaurin, Instructional Technology Coordinator Matt McMurray, Instructional Technology Teacher Leader; Alexis Iliadhi, Josh Czerniak of FGM; Lance Tritsch of Pepper Construction;and Becky Thompson, Deana Herrmann, Mike Denz, Fred Arkin, John Phelan, Alyson Sternquist, Monica Sheehan, Kiko Achurra, community members.

F.O.I.A. Requests

Ms. Kalmerton reported that seven FOIA requests had been received and six have been resolved.

Commented [KG1]:

Dr. Pruitt-Adams noted that the District was waiting for guidance from ISBE as the District continues to plan for 2020-21 school.

Public Comments

Monica Sheehan provide the following public comments: “Good evening,

“I have three questions relating to tonight's agenda item VI (C), Project 1 Budget Update, and respectfully request an email response from the Board to these three questions.

“1) What specifically is the reason for the \$7.3 million increase in the project since the September 2019 conceptual estimate of \$37.2 million? This estimate released in September was already \$4.6 million higher than the original estimate of \$32.6 million.

“2) It's concerning that proposed cuts to Project 1 include 25% of the classrooms, the ADA elevator and the all-gender bathrooms. Where is the \$20 million that the superintendent asked the Board to set aside in December 2018 for "urgent needs" in Project 2, primarily for the pool and natatorium? Will this \$20 million be spent on the academic and special education facility needs in Project 1 instead?

“3) According to the minutes of the 12/20/18 D200 General meeting, Superintendent Pruitt-Adams is to propose a funding plan for urgent facility items in Project 2, including the pool and natatorium, no later than the May 2020 General Board meeting. Yet, the item is not listed in tonight's agenda. If the funding plan has already been proposed, where can it be accessed on the school's website? If the funding plan hasn't been proposed, when will it be? Thank you.

Deanna Herman provided the following public comments: “Hello board,

“In reviewing documents for tonight, I saw the potential reductions in scope in work in Project 1 which include a potential loss of an elevator in the North end of the building and reconsideration of work in the SPED Team. While we can understand the need to keep within a budget, I ask that you thoughtfully review what you are considering cutting. When budgets get tight, often the first thing to go are accessibility upgrades – and it shows in the current condition of OPRFHS.

“With regards to the original construction plan, it appears to only to have had a north elevator that was going to be the only ADA accessible elevator in the building. After much discussion, an additional elevator was added in the plans in the new construction space of the cafeteria/student common area. It appears you may be considering not installing that elevator in the north end. In a school of this size and with a considerable number of students, faculty & staff needing to use the elevators, this seems like a bad plan. The current elevator that serves the north side is small, slow and multiple students use it. Should there be a return to school with physical distancing measures in place due to COVID, having less options to travel to floors becomes a bigger barrier to accessing educational spaces.

“Also up for discussion is the work in the SPED Team room. It seems like the IMAGINE team identified this as an area early on that needed updating as it doesn't even have an accessible bathroom. Cutting upgrades in this space also seems problematic.

“OPRFHS is the only high school for 2 wealthy communities and the lack of access in the school is problematic. We don’t know the full extent because the accessibility study has not been released. Please put the full study up on the website - it’s been many, many months since it was done. I also encourage you to hire that ADA coordinator.

“Lest we think physical access is just a disability issue - taking away gender toilet rooms affects all the students - disabled and not. What is the plan for students who need these rooms?

“We have heard and encouraged the district’s aim of “Equity & Excellence through Access for All” in achieving the goals of the strategic plan. It’s time to make sure you live up to this vision you have been promoting to our community. If not, it becomes clear you are content with perpetuating inequities in our systems, continuing to fail some of these kids. Thank you for your consideration.”

From John Phelan, “Thank you for the opportunity to offer public comment. I comment tonight to urge the Board to postpone Imagine OPRF Project 1.

The present financial environment has been severely soured by the sudden, historic COVID-19 pandemic. As a result of this plague, tens of thousands of Americans have lost their lives, and tens of millions lost their livelihoods. Businesses both small and iconic are closing their doors forever. State and local governments across the country are braced for financial challenges we have not seen in our lifetimes, and our communities of Oak Park and River Forest face these same challenges.

During difficult times it is important to look on our communities as towns with neighbors rather than cities with residents. By this I mean that our local government entities need to look outside of their silos and work with their sister governing bodies to see how they can join forces to help residents and businesses. The State of Illinois is near operational insolvency. The Villages of Oak Park and River Forest are looking at hard times. Revenue shortfalls await that will lead inevitably to tax increases. Such increases at a time when unemployment has surged to record levels can be the tipping point for many residents who are struggling to survive.

Last month this Board voted to move ahead with Project 1, despite the warning of its financial advisors. On tonight’s agenda, you are presented with a 9% increase in the cost of Project 1, adding another \$4.5 million of taxpayer money to the more than \$32 million cost of the project. Last month you decided to pay for Project 1 from your fund balance, money that was taken from taxpayers opportunistically two decades ago and which the District has been seeking to spend in a responsible way since that time. As you debated at last month’s meeting, the excessive fund balance has been an albatross around the neck of the District for many years, and part of the motivation for moving forward with Project 1 articulated by several Board members last month was to be rid of this burden.

However, the times we face right now are dire. People are hurting and frightened. If many are not desperate now, they soon will be, regardless of whether the State gets additional federal funds. This is also true of small business owners, landlords, and the vendors that rely upon them to succeed. Hold the money for now and see what comes next. Perhaps the District can offer tax relief coordinated with our Villages' tax increases that will save many businesses, residents, and building owners from ruin. Perhaps the District will need the money to preserve its own excellent educational opportunities if the predictions of your advisors come true and the state cuts educational funding and burdens local districts with underfunded pension obligations. Perhaps America will weather these times, and the day will come when Project 1 can move forward responsibly. Today, however, is not that day.

I urge you to vote to delay Project 1, particularly in light of these budget adjustments.

From Ross Lissuzzo: "Dear Board of Education. Thank you for your time in advance and for your work on behalf of all the students at OPRF HS as we prepare for a post covid-19 educational environment.

This comment is in regards to a decision that was made to sacrifice an on campus asset for two years that is used for an activity where all grades, including both boys and girls, participate in a no-cut sport. As you know, no cut sports in high school are rare these days.

"This physical school asset also serves as a valuable community asset where families and friends can play and exercise. This asset also is used as a popular PE choice among many students and introduces them to a physical activity they can play for life. Taking such an asset off line for two years does not seem inclusive, equitable or rationale based upon the philosophy OPRF HS claims to espouse. The selective use of taglines and beliefs only when convenient erodes the confidence and trust a school has with their community. Our own board has recently acknowledged that the school and community trust has been compromised in the past and unfortunately the recent exchanges that I have had on this topic only magnify those concerns.

"For me, these discussions are no longer about the tennis courts. Don't get me wrong, I hope to see our students congregating, enjoying on campus after school time, practicing and hosting conference meets on campus in the fall, but these past few months go way beyond tennis.

"I understand from recent documents that the board expressed a renewed "passion" for the tennis team and a willingness to "collaborate" to find a solution that reduces further the negative impact to our student body during the Imagine construction process. While our community would like to take these statements at face value, the facts are that as we all sit in our homes tonight, and as the clerk reads this statement, the tennis courts currently have fencing holes drilled into them, fences are actually up, four courts have been made unusable and a few trucks have been parked on them from time to time over the last week. This newly expressed "passion" for the tennis team and willingness to "collaborate" seems at best insincere and empty – I don't know how else to describe it. If you

are looking for another example of how the school shows its “passion” for the tennis team I encourage you to view the public imagine town hall meeting recording and determine for yourself.

“For those listening tonight, the tennis community has been asking for collaboration for months.....yes, months. The goal was a desire to have a conversation with the school and the construction company to better understand the process and come up with staging alternatives – these conversations were denied at least for me. Where did this newly found Board “passion” for tennis and “willingness to collaborate” come from ? By May, the tennis community felt frustrated with the lack of a detailed response and some reached out to attorneys to understand options to at least get information and to understand the decision process. Only then did this “passion” and willingness to “collaborate” emerge from the school. Recall that this “passion” coincided with fences literally (not figuratively) being erected on the tennis courts. The response from the board did not offer answers but rather implied that school can do what it wishes and fencing was now up on the courts anyways. This situation has further eroded trust and hardly suggests a genuine desire to listen to the community or a passion for tennis.

“I ask the following in hopes of learning more and to ultimately find ways to reduce further the negative impact of the imagine construction:

- Will the school share details of the past alternative staging and trailer hosting design options on the west field ? There is a schematic of the tennis court staging which is helpful to see. Can you simply share a similar schematic of the proposed west field staging for comparison. If we understand them both, we can see if there just might be a misunderstanding and if we can develop a more equitable option.
- Additionally, will the school share the existing student specific impact study results of the tennis court option which has led to the conclusion that this option indeed is the least impactful solution for our students ?

“If only one west field option was presented that somehow impacted baseball, football, marching band and softball all at the same time, that seems short sighted. I am hopeful the construction planners had an alternative space plan available on the west field or a completely different location on campus which takes into consideration the seasons and positioning of the fields. With all that is going on in the world today, one may think that tennis courts at OPRF HS is a small problem and you would be correct. However, for a few hundred tennis Huskies that tried to raise this issue pre covid-19 and who will come through the program over the next two years, it is important.

“In this instance, do you think the student voice was heard? In this instance, has this group of students been treated equitably over the last few years and will they be treated equitably over the next two? In this instance, do you think the school really wanted to collaborate in February to help find a better solution ? It’s not about tennis, it’s about how ALL students are treated ALL of the time.

From Christine Nelson, "I'm a resident of Oak Park and have a child who will attend OPRFHS in the fall. His name is Paul Nelson and he is a cancer patient and student with a disability. It's important that you know who these considered cuts will affect.

"In reviewing documents for tonight, I saw the potential reductions in scope in work in Project 1. While I can understand the need to stay in scope, I ask that you thoughtfully review what you are considering cutting. When budgets get tight, often the first thing to go are accessibility upgrades.

"My hope is that you don't make this decision to cut the ADA elevator and that you can find other creative ways to meet both your scope and all of the needs of your students. Paul needs that elevator. He is not to be sequestered on the first floor in the TEAM wing. He is small and has some physical needs that require an elevator for him to successfully manage getting to his classes. He will be one of the casualties of any decision to not make the school ADA compliant.

"We have heard and encouraged the district's aim of "Equity & Excellence through Access for All" in achieving the goals of the strategic plan. It's time to make sure you live up to this vision you have been promoting to our community. If not, it becomes clear you are content with perpetuating inequities in our systems, failing some of these kids. Including Paul."

Consent Items:

Ms. Dixon Spivy moved to approve the following Consent items:

- A. [Check Disbursements and Financial Resolutions dated May 28, 2020](#)
- B. [Monthly Treasurer's Report](#)
- C. [Monthly Financial](#)
- D. [Instructional Materials](#)
- F. [Homecoming Contract for DJ Services](#)
- G. [Securatex Contract](#)
- H. [Administrator Contracts](#)
- J. [Natural Gas Pricing Contract](#)
- K. [Policies for First Reading](#)
 - 1. [4:50 Payment Procedures](#)
 - 3. [7:170 Vandalism](#)
 - 4. [7:325 Student Fundraising Activities](#)
 - 5. [5:200 – Terms and Conditions of Employment](#)
 - 6. [6:300 Graduation Requirements](#)
 - 7. [2:125 Board Member Compensation, Expenses](#)
 - 8. [2:160 Board Attorney](#)
 - 9. [2:70 – Vacancies on the Board of Education](#)
 - 10. [2:200 Types of Board Meetings](#)
 - 11. [3:40E Checklist for Superintendent Employment Contract Negotiation Process](#)
 - 12. [5:100 Staff Development Program](#)
 - 13. [5:150, Personnel Records](#)
 - 14. [5:220 Substitute Teachers](#)
 - 15. [5:250 Leaves of Absence](#)
 - 16. [5:280 Duties and Qualifications](#)
 - 17. [5:60 Expenses](#)

18. [5:70 Religious Holidays](#)
 19. [6:135 – Accelerated Placement Program](#)
 20. [8:110 Public Suggestions and Concerns](#)
 21. [2:220-E1 – - Board Treatment of Closed Meeting Verbatim Recordings and Minutes](#)
 22. [2:220-E7 – Access to Closed Meeting Minutes and Verbatim Recordings](#)
 24. [7:130 Student Rights and Responsibilities](#)
 25. [3:50, Administrative Personnel Other Than the Superintendent](#)
- L. Open and Closed Minutes of [April 23](#), [May 13](#) and [May 19](#), 2020 and a declaration that the closed session audiotapes of September 2018 shall be destroyed and a declaration that the closed session minutes from January 1, 1989 through May 19, 2020 shall remain closed.

Personnel Dr. Moore moved to amend the personnel recommendation to included including New Hires, Rehires, and Summer School; seconded by Ms. Harris. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Policy 3:60 Ms. Dixon Spivy moved to approve Policy 360, for first reading; seconded by Ms. Harris. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Natural Gas Pricing Ms. Dixon Spivy moved to approve the Contract for Natural Gas Pricing

As presented; seconded by Mr. Martire. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Dr. Pruitt-Adams introduced two new team members Mr. Ronald C. Anderson, as the new Executive Director for Operations; and Mr. Coleman, as the new Fine and Applied Arts Division Head

Makerspace Program Educational Technology Update Mr. Thieme introduced his team mates and they provided their backgrounds and what they do:

Matt McMurray, instructional technology teacher leader.
Earlene McLaren, instructional technology coordinator.
KeJuan Carter, IT Coordinator.

Mr. Thieme was thankful for the staff and the administration’s and community support during COVID 19. He spoke about how it had affected the department.

The presentation was reviewed.

Mr. Cofsky thanked Mr. Thieme and his team and noted his appreciation for the work they were doing. The work they had done prior to this day made the District well prepared for today’s situation.

When asked about the voluntary participation and the feedback, it was noted that half of the teachers had joined the Google Classroom page and 25% in Step 1 for best practices. In Part 2, 15% participated in tech tools. Part 3, 10% participated in lesson planning.

Mr. Thieme reported that CDW is the District's vendor for Chromebooks and the supply chain now has bottlenecks. Just that day they had received enough for summer school. A significant portion of work in readying them is being done by OPRFHS own techs to be sure they are ready for distribution next week. CDW is working on receiving the rest of the Chromebook.

Mr. Martire too thanked Mr. Thieme and the team for the presentation. He asked about the use of Universal Design for Learning (UDL), in particular is a design being taken on taken approach to the cross disciplinary collaboration and utilization of the facility. All research shows that UDL project based learning all UDL practices closes achievement gaps based on race. Ms. McLaren's response was that ISBE t recommended that teachers brush up on UDL to make sure everything is accessible, e.g. screen readers, written text, etc.. The digital leader teachers are trying to retooling this curriculum, with UDL in mind as it pertains to a remote learning environment. Mr. McMurray said they strive for that. It was distributed to World Language immersion classes, as it was a priority. In terms of remote learning, the District implemented access to "Read and Write" for all students. As they push into health in the fall, that will be part of the discussion. Mr. Martire asked if PD regarding UDL was being used to encourage faculty to represent content and give students multiple options to express themselves.

The District is trying to embed with English, perhaps with health, and to the World Studies immersion class. Students and teachers have a remote learning website, which makes online documents more accessible. More discussion will occur in the fall. Is more PD being done around UDL to encourage faculty to represent content and giving students multiple options for expressing themselves? Some of the teachers were doing free choice assignments for students to use the materials in the way they felt best to get their information across. Teachers are experimenting with this. At this time, they don't have access to the number of classes outside of Makerspace but in the future instructional PD will be scheduled UDL will be on the items that will be focused on for remote and brick and mortar learning. Mr. Martire was excited to hear that UDL was being incorporated and felt that the Board should support UDL. Ms. Harris stated that UDL was not new and she felt educators were doing that lots and she did not want to assume that they do not know this about a practice. Mr. Johnson responded that when he was first presenting the curriculum and design process, UDL was talked about as a framer. When the District moves forward with PD, UDL will be reflected. Mr. Martire asked if the District was deeply invested in UDL in the past? Understanding what UDL is, as a package framework for PD has not been a focus. Mr. Johnson stated that UDL is embedded in different layers of pedagogy, and it will be able to be seen in differentiation and teachers are always doing that and fits smoothly into UDL. Ms. Harris stated that UDL has been around a long time under mentioned under different names.

Mr. Martire noted that it was important to focus on PD in systemic way to focus on professional ways to coordinate across grades and curriculums and use to UDL as basis that allow students the flexibility of content to how they convey mastery of content, etc., This would be a significant step forward to OPRFHS and one to pursue in the system on the professional development lane to make that

change. There are still disparities in achievement. UDL has proven to eliminate achievement disparities. It is important to move forward. Ms. Harris stated that components are being done and she appreciated it as a piece and she wanted to appreciate it as a piece. Mr. Martire said that an individual doing x,y, and z that is not supported by PD is going to change the system. The research shows that this is a leverage that changes the achievement gap. This is a key level and this lever changes the achievement gaps. Mr. Martire highlighted the emphasis on PD and systemically implement UDL and classes to taking evidence approach as eliminating the achievement gap.

Dr. Moore too was appreciative of the presentation and the thinking and moving ahead of the technology and staff. Regarding digital literacy from student with summer, so if for incoming freshman if applying freshman equity lens what percentage of freshman are avail themselves because summer school has been head start. What is the options are available for summer school? What is the capacity for teacher expertise in digital. While Mr. Thieme did not have those statistics, the data is tracked and he can obtain it. Dr. Moore stated that as the District adheres to the desire in terms of the racial equity lens to reduce racial disparities with achievement that information is included as a matter of course and always have the demographic breakdowns.

When asked what the PD optional opportunities were in the summer and what was the current capacity for teachers in terms of digital literacy, Ms. McLaren noted that she was working with Dr. Fiorenza and others in the administration to facilitate a teacher technology. Part of the needs assessment will include more specific data on technology digital skills. The hope was that would come soon and it would be a source of information going forward for the fall. When asked if all of the teachers could do an online lesson plan, Mr. Johnson responded that it was unknown at this time, but it was part of the transition meetings for the fall. PD is one of the most important topics. Synchronous learning experiences in remote learning are essential and the District will support the quality of that. The District is now in the early stages of these plans.

Dr. Moore reflected that the school began 1:1 learning in the 2016-2017 school year. She wondered why the capacity has not been evaluated in that time and why PD continues to be optional. Ms. McLaren noted that PD has been offered based on teacher data. A technology needs assessment was done two years ago in terms of technology integration and PD. It all depends on how it is facilitated and who is in charge. Mr. Thieme added that he was seeing levels of partnership within the District grow in the last couple of years. It is still a source of insight and BrightBytes. Ms. McLaren stated that PD is provided through Lunch and Learns, monthly newsletters, and any avenue possible to get technology PD and education to the teachers through the methods that ET can control. Dr. Moore appreciated everything they were doing, but she was trying to tie digital literacy of going 1:1. Dr. Fiorenza stated that April 9 was an optional PD day. It was a sudden removal from the school in the plight of a pandemic, the administration felt the staff was not in a place to sit and engage in a day of PD when they were scrambling to hold together lessons they could do virtually or different platforms. The staff was allowed, based on their comfort level, to opt in or out. PD planning for next year is being discussed. In addition, the administration is

offering/changing and creating a literacy resource center, which incorporate digital literacy as well.

Mr. Baron felt there would be a permanent shift in learning because of the opportunities that arise from this, e.g. students are sleeping more in the last 2.5 months. He appreciated the work felt that everyone were self-proclaimed experts. OPRFHS has leaders and the administration needs to inform the world of what it is great intent and thoughtfulness. He appreciated all they were doing in trying to juggle including getting back into the building as well.

Mr. Thieme thanked Mr. Carioscio who is retiring this year. His leadership and mentorship has led the District who where it is today and has enabled the team to do the work it is doing. Ms. Dixon Spivy thanked Mike for pioneering 1:1 with the school. She asked if any families struggle with internet access. Mr. Thieme stated that the number was in the single digits and they were supplied with equipment. A question is asked during the registration process about internet access. If they do not have it, they are supplied with a hotspot. If a counselor or teacher says a student is need, they get a hotspot. There is enough supply for next year.

The Board of Education recessed the meeting at 9:29 and returned at 9:35 p.m.

Academic Supports for Students

Mr. Johnson spoke about providing a more structure support in a short amount of time. He introduced Dr. Laurie Fiorenza, Kristine McKee and Alexis O

Dr. Fiorenza Laurie noted that they were restructuring the supports being added in a multi-tiered system. Data will be used to provide support to students based on their needs.

The tiers of support are framed in the way people learn, i.e., background knowledge, prior learning and experiences to learn to new skill. In Tier 1, 80% are getting what they need. It is only utilized when students are struggling to make sense of something in a healthy way - asking a question to get clarification. It is for a student who has background knowledge, experiences, engaged in opportunities in classroom, but cannot ask a clarifying question. Tier 2 students may need tutoring. Tier 3 students do not have the background knowledge to get to the place of having experiences. They grapple to make meaning. As the district began to do some good reflection, Ms. McKee used a tool to evaluate the tiers of support. Some of the tools were lacking. She visited other schools, and then looked at how the District could restructure and provide more access of support to the students.

First support is academic enrichment. The tutoring center is a Tier 2 and 3 support. Students needing Tier 2 and 3 support have executive functioning issues, organizational issues, etc. Ms. McKee has coordinating support and working with instructional coaches. What works for one person, may not work for another. It is a matter of looking at student deficits and then develop ongoing plans as they exit them.

The PSS Teams identify students to make sure they are pairing the right students with the right interventions. Monitoring is constant. This is not about students being in a holding pattern, but rather ongoing intervention.

Tier 3 student supports are more intensive, more like case management. It is a smaller group of students and it is more intensive because of more needs that are intensive. By using this MTS system and moving proactively and getting away from academic enrichment as a place but instead it is based on the need to move students out of support and into regular classrooms fully ready to tackle academics. These students may have been involved with other interventions. The Early Warning System data is used to look at what students are presenting with the most need. It will be closely monitored. Students start doing well because of intervention. If they are not strategically reduced, the skills might not be where they need to be when this stops.

The Math Enrichment Center is a Tier 2 intervention. Currently students enrolled in pre-Algebra and block classes need continued support. The intervention will target something specific, rather than a full class. The District will restructure current staff and will be available 5 periods per day as a pilot. While these can participate in grade level classes, they might have gaps, which cause them to spiral downward. Data will be used to identify those students who are in that range. If it is just a gap, then they can go back to the class.

The Literacy Resource Center is a pilot Tier 1 intervention for all students. Eventually, the hope is to do this for all grade levels. Looking at 9th grade health courses. It is direct instruction on literacy skill. What is keeping students from getting to literacy skill and literacy teachers are benefiting from coaching from the LRC so multi things are accomplished in one resource spot. They are looking at a specific writing skills. These were ideas on how to move along with each grade, e.g. working with all sophomore classes who have to write a speech in sophomore year, etc. In addition, digital literacy may be incorporated. Bringing literacy into a large scope and it is being a literacy person, books, texts, etc. Onboarding of new teachers can be difficult but a rich resource center can provide continuous onboarding and skill development. This is about building capacity.

West 40 support previous provided one interventionist and sets the caseload at 32 students. The most at risk students for dropping out of school are typically black and brown students. OPRFHS asked if West 40 would provide a second interventionist and it was granted that request. So now two interventionists will work with 64 students who are at risk. The interventionists reach out to families. West 40 has an intensive structure for the ALOP grant. This support can be layered on other supports as well for everyone across the school. It is critical for students with attendance issues. It is about outreach and working with the families. They meet with the students two times per week, monitor the students' academics and meet with the families.

The next intervention or support through is to work with the P4SS parent group. The concerns are about black and brown athletes, who due to grade requirements, are not allowed in sports. Conversations have begun with the Athletic Director and the Assistant Athletic Director about their programs. They are looking for a

way to assist and meet some of the needs of another population. IHSA requires that if a student has a “d” or “f” in a class they must be assigned so many hours of athletic study table. It is not intensive oversight. That works for some students but for the group that has multiple D and F and requirements are more intensive. A targeted resource center for athletes has been started. First goals are set and activities regarding organizing occur. This started in January but because in school instruction ended in March, it was in effect for only 2.5 months. In that time, 13 students came for targeted resource. The sports teams during January and February is small, but of the 13 students, they all had success. Six continued to come even when they did not have to do so. One student had 4 F’s and he was able to get all of his grades up to passing. One student had 3 F’s and his parents were prepared to pay for private tutoring. The plan is to continue to pilot this and collect data to see how successful it is. The fact that half of the students that did not need to come came anyway was an indication of their desire to do well.

Ms. Harris was highly appreciative of MTSS. Many students in Tier 2 have SEL issues and have different traumas as well. Is that built into part of the plan, etc.? Ms. McKee facilitated the PSS Team process for the last 8 years and when they look at interventions, they look at the child holistically. Social work services are provided if needed. Many times the social worker will help with the phase out and continue to do regular check ins.

Dr. Moore said that the energy around the presentation was infectious and it was hard to believe that his year was Dr. Fiorenza’s first year. She thanked her and Ms. McKee for taking over this area with the same intentionality, doing evidence based practices and relationship building. This was one of her most inspiring presentations. It was insightful and hopeful in the work being done with students.

Ms. Dixon Spivy knew that P4SS had played a big role in this, as she was the Board liaison to this parent group. She was so impressed with the dedications and moms focused in getting operations up and running. Thank you.

Project 1 Budget Update On September 17, 2019 the administration presented its initial budget estimates to the Board of Education for the facilities master plan. Several other budget updates were presented since then but this is the point at which the construction project needs clear guidance whether to: 1) eliminate scope from the project or 2) increase the initial budget of \$32.6M to address the actual costs of the project. For the sake of clarity, the conversation was focused on the Project 1 scope and its costs. Costs associated with Capital Improvements and Health Life Safety were omitted.

Mr. Carioscio thanked Fred Preuss, Jeff Bergmann, Cyndi Sidor, Chris Thieme, Josh Cerniak, and Josh Warner

At the original presentation at the September Committee of the Whole meeting, the initial estimates were provided by Perkins and Will and the IMAGINE team. The subtotal was \$32.6 million for the budget. At that time, the administration projected a shortfall of 8.93%. They had hoped to get into the detail design and bidding to find a way to gain some benefit and not have the shortfall. That did

not happen. Some things were not anticipated, i.e., soil problem in the South cafeteria, a crack in the floor.

The Student Resource Center and bid package 4 is \$13.7 million and it was broken into two bid packages. All of the others have been accepted and approved. That is a \$5.3M of variance right now. The SRC and the South Cafeteria have a deficit of \$5.3 million. It has already designed and either accepted or the bids are on the street. The other key components and scope are not solid. The project is now \$8.3 M over budget. Initially \$8.9 overage was not accurate because that number included capital improvement and life safety dollars. Note: that Project 1 was about 14% over budget in October.

The team has done multiple reiteration on what items can be reduced, modified or taken out of scope since September. We considered them as alternates. If bids were favorable, some might be able to do. The items considered originally were the second floor balcony bridge, skylights, choices on finishes (less expensive), and the servery was pulled. However, the foundation under the servery is bad. The soil can't be fixed unless the servery is demolished and built new. If renovating the classrooms were reduced by 25%, three-quarters of the \$8 million would be gained back, but that is not enough. A decision is necessary on the servery because the building is about to be taken down.

The plan was to take the freight elevator and convert it to another ADA elevator. Discussion ensued about bundling in the building and they tried to pull out the costs. Another million dollars is needed to replace the plumbing risers for the all-gender bathrooms. This all leaves a short fall of \$2.8 million.

The bulk of cost is with the new SRC and Cafeteria. It is clear that there is not enough in the budget to do what was conceived of in the IMAGINE master. The capital improvement dollars were considered as being a possible contribution to the short fall. The Board was asked for help with respect to what were considered necessities.

Next month a modified version of the capital improvement plan will be presented.

Ms. Harris was disappointed. She did not believe that not having all of the work done was O.K. She knew there was a finite amount of money, there should be some places to make those cuts, and finding those places is hard. She noted that Mr. Martire had mentioned that it was important to have check-ins on capital improvement projects more often. She felt that the servery was not previously considered and now there is a problem with it underneath. She did not understand why that was not part of the original conversation. She was frustrated.

Dr. Pruitt-Adams responded that when the original budget was presented, the administration was hesitant to give a price because of anticipated price changes. The other aspect is that a different architect and a community group did the work. With an old building, often other things are uncovered. The Imagine plan did not have a servery. As the administration looked at the design, it questioned how it would not have a new servery in a new cafeteria. Over the course of this year, a

utilization study uncovered some unknowns. When the Board of Education said to stay within the proposed budget, it had to look at cuts. Mr. Carioscio had brought regular updates to the Board of Education and an option to bundle everything, e.g. capital improvements, life safety and Project 1. The administration has been looking at what could be shaved. Now the administration needs the Board of Education's guidance to clear up misconceptions that may have happened prior to some of the members being on the Board. Ms. Harris did remember some conversations, but the pieces are missing. Dr. Pruitt-Adams continued that the previous company did not look at some things, e.g. the severy or the ground underneath it. The removal of an oil tank is part of the 10-year plan. This is the reason that Ms. Sidor and Mr. Carioscio looked at debt certificates to pay for some of this expense.

Mr. Carioscio stated that the team initially wanted to do the entire design of the project all at once and then determine how to bid it out in order for prioritizing. Because the Board of Education directed the administration to break ground in June, the design needed to be broken down into pieces. While that is satisfactory, when one commits to one project, it affects projects down the line. The lion share of the building is not in line with the parameters. That is part of the reasoning. Some things were not considered in the original master plan. Because funding is tight, the administration wanted to stay within the means for this project.

Dr. Moore too was feeling frustration. The discussion about going out for debt was not contextualized around needs being brought forth now. It is a cognizant dissonance. Why were many of these items anticipated and costs built in due to the fact that this is an old building. How were all-gender bathrooms not considered? She did not understand a 24 percent variance. Why were not the structural issues, soil, plumbing, etc. anticipated? How did the team make the recommendations based on those things. How did the administration get here?

Mr. Carioscio stated that it was the understanding that IMAGINE went through a master design process which was meant to prioritize/conceptualize needs, in terms of implementation but not necessarily create a budget. That team was asked to do high-level estimating. An elevator was placed outside of the cafeteria, but that space had mechanicals and was not an appropriate space. As more details were uncovered, many things were discovered. FGM and Pepper Construction were not part of the team did that did the master plan or the budget based on all of the things the master plan looked at. Perkins and Will and ICI did what they were tasked to do--develop a master plan. As such, the unknowns would never have been discovered during the master plan process. In addition, while the master plan had a contingency, it was not nearly enough to address the unknowns.

Dr. Moore noted that this had been taken over from the visioning team for a year. It was very unsettling to know this now as the process has moved forward. She directed this comment to the administration. The Board of Education proceeded with the groundbreaking without this discussion being part of the discussion. The hesitation of the administration was COVID and she struggled to understand the pieces. She was very confused.

Dr. Pruitt-Adams noted that conversations had occurred about what the status would be. In the fall, Mr. Carioscio talked about what was allocated for different items and the Board saw a variance report similar to the one presented. Discussion ensued about door spacing and not putting that into the context of the work that had to be done. The servery was discussed. At the COW meeting, Mr. Carioscio had wanted to have this conversation before the conversation on debt so that the Board could see the context. The discussion about cost is not new. This is about what it could be and the Board had said, "If it was going to cost more, how much." It was not the intent to make the Board feel the administration is pulling this out now. Over the course of the year, several items have been discussed, e.g. reducing classrooms. Now a decision needs to be made on the elevator, the servery, and the classrooms.

Mr. Carioscio said when everything was bundled, the capital improvement dollars were included. That helps with Project 1 but it hurt with capital improvements. While they tried to make it work, too many cuts were being made to the vision of Project 1 and thus the administration felt they had to bring this to the Board. This is the first time when all of the pieces were presented.

Ms. Harris wanted to know when the Board of Education would be able to look at the full plan, as there seemed to be lots of fluctuation. Mr. Carioscio said he needed to know the priorities. If certain priorities are non-negotiables, other things have to be considered. If the Board stays within \$32.6 million, but x, y, and z have to be done, a determination will be made to see if it can be. The answer could be no. If yes, that means other things have to come off the list. It is the assumption that the South Cafe and the SRC will go forward. The administration needs guidance.

Mr. Iseli stated that the fundamental problem is that the SRC is taking up \$22.5 million and \$5 million of that would have been invested in SPED and the all gender bathrooms because they are \$5 million over budget. Is the point where the SRC, the South Cafeteria design is all set and ready to tear down, and is the District committed to \$22 million? Mr. Carioscio said that a lot of enabling work has been done for the June 1 breaking ground. Mr. Iseli continued that the district has \$10 million to do \$20 million worth of projects. He missed approving \$22.5 million to build with a \$17.5 million estimate. That is the fundamental issue and he did not know how to unwind it. Is there any option to change the design of SRC to get the \$5 million back? Mr. Czerniak stated that the costs had to do with breaking ground in June, so it would be hard to go back. Mr. Warner stated that row six showed that what was left to be bid out of the \$22.5million is \$13.5 million. What is left to bid is the finishes. Finishes are probably the only place to scale back on the SRC prior to bid. Money might be saved with low bidders. Mr. Iseli stated that \$20M is fundamentally the design of the SRC and that project cannot be stopped or changed. The choice is either do it or decide what can and cannot be done. That makes up half of the \$32.6 million. This is difficult situation because the only way is to cut are the elevator, the all-gender bathrooms, etc. Mr. Carioscio stated that the other lever is the capital improvement dollars. The replacement of the roof could be changed. Mr. Iseli stated that this was taking from capital improvement to make the other budget bigger. Mr. Carioscio stated that things need to be bundled, as it is all the

same work. The administration needs to be held accountable to the budget and thus capital improvements would be pushed out further.

Mr. Iseli felt that spending additional fund balance or debt was immaterial to this discussion. How can the Board decide what scope is done now and what scope is not done?

When asked if there was a contingency that could absorb this, the administration noted that it went from 12 percent to 15 percent which added a million dollars and that comes out of classrooms in the total dollars. Mr. Cofsky asked for a clear assessment of what can be done to maintain the building. He felt the administration should be making an assessment, not the Board of Education. He did not want to have that discussion. The administration needs to say what needs to be done in the building and what is not realistic. He did not want to make decisions on capital repairs. Mr. Carioscio said that had been left out of this conversation, but the administration will come back with what is necessary to maintain the building.

Mr. Cofsky thought when the IMAGINE plans were put together; a dialogue was had on the priorities that shaped Project 1 when the Imagine work was done. The Board of Education was asked what it wanted and the answer was taking care of Special Education facilities and classrooms as top a priority. He supported Ms. Harris introductory comments and now the administration is asking the Board of Education if it wants to undue this. His concern is that after the last update in September, the numbers were 14% off and now they are 26% off. What is the next data point? 40%. Mr. Carioscio stated that the administration was given the direction to break ground in June on the Student Resource Center and by default it was prioritized over everything else. All of the other things were prioritized in the first phase but by direction, this is the place that now exists. The architect reported that it just did a budget update on remaining projects outside of the Student Resource Center and the South Cafeteria and those numbers are close to the projected numbers. They felt good about the numbers. He understood that the Board did not want to see a trend with more problems. The architect reiterated for Mr. Cofsky that it had already done a relook at the remaining part of Project 1 and it was not anticipate that those costs would be over budget by 30%.

Mr. Martire asked when the Board of Education had known this was running a 30% overage on the SRC. Mr. Carioscio stated that it was not 30%, it was more directional. He would have to go back and do more research if the Board of Education wanted an analysis. Mr. Martire continued that direction from the Board of Education was to proceed with the understanding that the overages were in the variance presented and that they did not exceed the known variances. He believed this was the first time the Board of Education was getting the variance on the portion of the project. It seems when the administration made its presentation on debt certificates that this information was known yet was not included in the presentation. While the building needs the capital work, confidence is needed in the numbers. When the administration makes a recommendation to finance to the Board of Education, the Board of Education needs to understand and be privy to the information.

Dr. Pruitt-Adams stated that the administration came forward with the debt certificate conversation at the request of the Board of Education. At that time, Mr. Carioscio was crunching those numbers and he even referenced that in that conversation. Hearing from ISBE and West 40 and the Village about the potential impact on school district finances initiated the conversation about not going forward with Project 1.

Mr. Czerniak stated that the overage on the Student Resource Center and the South Cafeteria is 21%. In September of 2019, the overage was 19%. So from then until now, it is 2% more. The basement was never part of the original SRC and South Cafeteria and, hence, it is broken out. The contingency for the SRC and the South Cafeteria was 10%. The remaining items still carry a 15 percent contingency. Mr. Martire observed that because the basement is now part of Project 1, the overage is 30 percent--\$5 million--that was never communicated clearly to the Board of Education until now.

Appreciating the Board of Education's sentiments, Mr. Baron stated that from the start through the imaginary process there were remarks made about the unknown. He shared the frustration of not having this information nine days ago. The fundamental point is, does the Board of Education want to do this project even with the increased cost. When the Imagine team was formed in 2017, they were told to dream big. This is the first and least expensive project. Project 2 is projected to cost \$70 million. If Project 1 is over budget by 30%, what will Project 2 be? He felt there were elements that could be scaled back, but overall at the present time, he was looking to support going forward.

Ms. Dixon Spivy was not surprised at the overruns. The building was under invested for years. Whether the information was available or not, it is not surprising at the structural issues. However, she was not OK with not doing the elevator or the all gender-bathrooms as that is the real core of what the school is trying to do. That it is the impetus behind Project 1. While this disheartening and she was not placing blame on anyone, she did not know how to go forward and she did not want to spend \$22.5 million on the SRC and the South Cafeteria.

Mr. Iseli did not think the Board of Education could back away from toilets and ADA improvements. Special Education is hard to judge in terms of a holistic nature and the opportunity to cut. To get some of that he was willing to expand the budget for the project but only to a certain extent. He wanted the administration to say if classrooms, SPED opportunities, and finishes could be cut to reduce the SRC cost, including the server. If that number were still \$4 to \$5 million over budget, then he would stop the entire project.

Mr. Cofsky felt similarly. He agreed that the District could not compromise on ones, as those were the first items for Project 1. He agreed that the Student Resource Center is the lead weight. Discussion on finishes told him the District is off base.

Dr. Moore stated that classrooms, ADA accessibility, the elevator and the Special Education facilities were the priorities. The Board had discussed this from the standpoint of the SRC and she remembered the comment being made during a heated discussion that the Board of Education had said to break ground on the

SRC, but she thought it had to be done based on the domino of projects. The Board is not proceeding because it wanted a new SRC. She was concerned about reducing classrooms, as the discussion is about the need for more space for classrooms. If the cost gets to be 20% to 30% over the budget, this is talking about Project 1.5 and that was disconcerting. The recommendation had no information about the concerns being delayed having anything to do with cost overruns. That should not be part of communication. The vote from the Board of Education was different from the recommendation, but the recommendation did not include this information. That needs to be on the record.

Mr. Carioscio stated that it was not a reduction, just fewer renovations.

Mr. Martire agreed with his fellow Board members and he was not willing to compromise because that would fall on the students. He agreed about redoing Special Education and the finishes. However, this is so far down the road and the building needs those upgrades, even after paring overruns, he agreed with Mr. Baron. He would take the reserve to cover the cost overruns, and then have serious discussions about Project 2. The building is old and the facilities are not amendable to many students for a number of reasons. The significant overrun is unfortunate, but it is less important to the students, but crucial for the other things. He would look for savings from other areas, continue with using the reserves, and then look at what can be cut from Project 2.

Ms. Harris stated that toilets, Special Education, and classrooms were not negotiable to her. Anything that affects the students' ability to have what they need to be who they are she could not agree to. The SRC pieces have a big equity component, allowing students to have additional time in the building who need it. Aspects of it are credible to the equity issues that were discussed.

Mr. Carioscio noted that the Project 1 had already started. Breaking ground on June 1 was symbolic. Everything was done to shift construction into high gear. The enabling work has already been done because no students or staff are in the building. The servery decision is needed. The soil underneath needs to be decided. Mr. Carioscio will distill this into a consensus with the team and sort out the possibilities. He will return with better numbers, look at the capital improvement portion, and bring them together.

The Board of Education reiterated their desires.

Ms. Dixon Spivy would not compromise on elevators, bathrooms, classrooms, and SPED.

Ms. Harris wants student common spaces. She wanted to trim as much as possible from the Student Resource Center. She did not know if that were even possible if the basement must be done. She did not know what could be done about this.

Mr. Baron would not support anything over \$37.5 million.

Dr. Moore reflected that what seems to be urgent in demolition has to do with servery. If there is a difference of replacing the servery now versus major repairs

later, she would favor being part of the package. Mr. Carioscio responded to a question about Huskie Pups noting that it was scheduled for Phase 4 and was not included in these numbers. The only disruption would be moving the infant room so the Special Education area could be renovated.

Mr. Czerniak stated that the soil condition is like that of the South Cafeteria. It is more complicated as half is slab on grade and half is over a basement. Where they meet there is an issue in the floor - a tripping hazard at that intersection. Things could be done to be a temporary fix, however.

Third Quarter Variance Report Ms. Sidor submitted the Third Quarter Variance Report which is a comparison of revenues and expenditures YTD. It is used to look at last year to see if it is in alignment and if not, why.

Rollover of Vacation Days Ms. Dixon Spivy moved to approve the roll-over of up to 15 unused vacation days to be used by June 30, 2021: seconded by Mr. Baron.

Discussion ensued. Due to COVID-19, most 12-month employees were not able to use vacation days allocated for the 2019-2020 school year. To ensure continuity of the District's operations, the administration recommends extending the time frame by which 12-month employees must take vacation time. Specifically, the administration recommends approval of the rollover of up to 15 unused vacation days to be used by June 30, 2021.

Mr. Cofsky stated that the purpose of vacation is that people need to unplug, get away from work, and do something else. That may look different today but the purpose of a vacation is to encourage that. He felt people needed to take their vacation and he would not support this action.

Dr. Pruitt-Adams stated that many of the people in this room and B&G staff fall into that category and were thrust into this COVID at a time when vacations could not be taken. COVID began at spring break. Many of the people who are in the decision making process, it has been hard to take considering what is occurring.

Mr. Iseli did not support these because rolling over days will encourage a shortage of staff next year.

Mr. Baron was unfamiliar with the intensity occurring and he was concerned about the back end issues on how to address this. Was there a compromise? What will it look like if people take the time off next year? What are the unintended consequences? He leaned toward supporting the recommendation.

The administration has discussed allowing the supervisors to spread out the rollover vacation days. Many things need to be accomplished to get ready for next year, e.g. sanitizing, obtaining PPE equipment, getting the rooms ready for students, professional development, etc. If people were not allowed to take their vacation, many people may not be in the building to do this work. The District already has a procedure, which is in the collective bargaining agreement that people have until November 1 to take all of their vacation. They are waiting to

see if the building is safe and then use their vacation days in the fall. In Phase 4 and 5 and it is safe to travel, they can take vacation before November 1.

Mr. Baron supported. Ms. Harris supported it as well and trusted that 12-month employees would know not to take the same days off and not be disruptive.

Mr. Martire literally pushes to take vacation time as it is for the good of people's mental health. He agreed philosophically and he would vote with the administration. He also agreed with Ms. Harris' about not taking the same days off and being disruptive.

A roll call vote resulted in five ayes and two nays. Mr. Iseli and Mr. Cofsky voted nay. Motion carried.

Textbook Bids Ms. Dixon Spivy moved to approve the adoption of the included texts for SY 2020-2021 for a total of \$19,726.06; seconded by Ms. Harris. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Approval of Settlement Agreement for Specialized Instruction Ms. Dixon Spivy moved to approve the Settlement Agreement for Specialized Instruction Facility; seconded by Mr. Iseli. A roll call vote resulted in six ayes and one nay. Mr. Martire voted nay. Motion carried.

Discussion of Issuance of Debt Certificates to Pay for Capital Projects This report was provided at the May COW meeting and is for informational purposes only.

Future Agenda Items None.

Adjournment At 12:17 a.m., on Friday, May 29, 2020, Ms. Harris moved to adjourn the regular Board of Education meeting; seconded by Mr. Baron. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

Sara Dixon Spivy
President

Thomas Cofsky
Secretary