

The regular Board meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held virtually on Thursday, June 25, 2020.

Call to Order

President Dixon Spivy called the meeting to order at 6:39 p.m. A roll call indicated the following Board of Education members were present: Matt Baron, Thomas F. Cofsky, Gina Harris (arrived at 8:30 p.m.), 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; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant Clerk of the Board.

Closed Session

At 6:40 p.m. on Thursday, June 25, 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); seconded by Dr. Moore. 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 Greg Johnson, Associate Superintendent; Michael Carioscio, Chief Operations Officer; Dr. LeVar Ammons, Executive Director of Racial Equity and Student Success; and Cyndi Sidor, Chief Financial Officer; Dr. Gwen Walker Qualls, Executive Director of Pupil Support Services; Karin Sullivan, Executive Director of Communications and Community Relations.

Visitors

OPRFHS staff Ron Anderson, Carolyn Gust; Alyssa Alfano Fred Preuss and Jeff Bergmann, Jackie McGoey, and Hugo Beltran; Josh Czerniak of FGM; Josh Warriner of Pepper Construction; and Fred Arkin, Monica Sheehan, Regina, Kathleen Osta, Joker Poker, M.P., and Gabriel Morelli, community members.

F.O.I.A. Requests

Ms. Kalmerton reported that 6 FOIA requests had been received and have been resolved.

Dr. Pruitt-Adams recognized Mr. Carioscio and Dr. Gwen Walker Qualls who were both retiring on June 30, 2020 and thanked them for their service. Ms. Dixon Spivy also extended the Board of Education thanks to both of them for their outstanding efforts on behalf of the community.

Ms. Dixon Spivy read the following.

“Each and every member of the Board of Education reaffirms our steadfast commitment to racial equity and declares, unequivocally: Black lives matter. In fact, Black lives more than matter--they are highly esteemed and valued.

“In the aftermath of George Floyd's murder, there has been extensive national dialogue about the role of police in any community, including in schools.

“Locally, we have received numerous emails urging the District 200 school board to discontinue our intergovernmental agreement (IGA) with the Village of Oak Park to have a School Resource Officer (SRO) at Oak Park and River Forest High School.

“ Before the COVID- 19 pandemic caused a disruption to many aspects of our board's deliberations, we were on the verge of discussing whether to continue that IGA with the village.

“The Board appreciates the input we have received from community members and plans to discuss the SRO contract at our meeting on Thursday, July 9, 2020.”

Public Comments

From Fred Arkin: “The morass continues to deepen. This week’s iteration of how the project turns continues to lack transparency and fails to align with the Imagine long-term facilities plan.

“On Nov 15, 2018 the administration came to the board with a Building Maintenance Strategy. This strategy called for a total of \$10M of spending for 2019 & 2020 and \$2M for each year 2021-2026 along with a \$2M contingency for unforeseen issues. This would have allowed for \$12M of Imagine funding over those 6 years. Under this plan, the ask at the time was for \$5.4M for 2020 capital improvements. Last week we were told that maintenance items for 2021-2024 a 4-year period have ballooned to \$20M.

“Let’s get one thing straight, the `10-yr maintenance plan` was developed after acceptance of the Imagine Plan and presented to the Board on Jan 24, 2019, not 10 years ago. It was supposed to have been created as a response to how annual capital projects and annual maintenance would dovetail with the Imagine projects to identify and eliminate any overlapping costs.

“In the hiring of FGM as the architect for the project, the Board was told, they provided a very concise description of project 1...demonstrated a thorough understanding of what OPRFHS wants done and...why’. Their work product does not support this view. Virtually each element of Project 1 has additional scope and cost associated with it.

“The Imagine Work Group was formed to study the district’s long-term facility’s needs, they embarked on a rigorous needs-based process that centered around student learning with an attention to equity. This process was to be ongoing. The Imagine Group presented a comprehensive plan that ceded some of the most urgent physical needs to later project phases for this student-centric focus. I urge

this board to forgo the opportunistic elements #'s 2, 9 & 10 which were not prioritized in the Imagine Project 1 and complete the elements approved as a part of Project 1, including the Main Entrance, Student Commons and Classroom Renovation. These elements directly address the Mission and Vision of District 200. I also urge the board to direct the administration to create an ongoing method for the continual updating of the Imagine Long-term Facilities Process that was originally contemplated.”

From Joker Poker, “I just want to say one thing and that is !@#!@#! guys for !@# making everything remote and I also want to note that you guys can find me in the webinar since I will be attending this !@# meeting @#\$.”

From Monica Sheehan, "Good evening. I appreciate this opportunity to address the D200 School Board.

“I want to thank Board President Spivy for her recent email responses to my questions raised in public comment at the May 28th General Board meeting.

“According to her email, the Board has shifted the \$20 million that it set aside in December 2018 for the ""urgent needs"" in Project 2, namely the pool and natatorium, to the construction budget to fund Project 1 with its academic and special education facility needs. That's positive news.

“The email also stated that the District has put on hold the funding plan for Project 2. Since the private fundraising effort began 18-months ago, how much money has been raised to date for the ""urgent needs"" in Project 2? Thank you,”

From Burcy Hines, “Dear Board of Education, Superintendent Dr. Pruitt-Adams, and Director of Equity and Student Success Dr. Levar Ammons. On behalf of equity allies across our community and the Committee for Equity and Excellence in Education, we express our sincere thanks to the leadership of Dr. Ammons and Dr. Pruitt-Adams who have guided the REPP committee in assembling the Racial Equity Policy procedures before you tonight. These procedures include key racial equity goals, specific measures of reporting, accountability, ongoing evaluation, and revision.

“With widespread community support this board and previous boards over the last 5 years have shown an unprecedented commitment to act on behalf of racial equity. The procedures presented tonight had better ensure that OPRFHS can realize its varied racial equity goals at a time when we all must be unequivocal, clear, and aggressive in putting an end to historic inequities and institutional racism in education at OPRFHS.

“With your support our administration and teachers have carried forth concrete efforts to advance racial equity, including using racial equity impacts protocols even before they had been finalized with the REPP Committee work of the past 9 months. They have advanced racial equity work with teams of trainers and

learners around restorative practices, curriculum equity and course restructuring, hiring, respecting, supporting and retaining teachers of color, and advancing institutional and individual understanding of race, identity, and the presence of personal and community bias.

“What in these procedures are historic and vital to our work to end disparities in how so many of our students of color experience education at OPRFHS?”

“Among the many strengths of the procedures, we would stress the following:

“1. Committing to “intentionally act to end racism in all aspects of school community life”

“2. Guaranteeing an active role of representatives from groups most impacted by racial inequities in the Racial Equity Assessment (REAT) process

“3. Providing a clear procedure for conducting a racial equity analysis using the REAT protocol; and, including regular reporting and public access to an archive with details and data on the application of equity analyses

“4. Asserting that the REAT is central to the curriculum evaluation and revision process

“5. Monitoring and improving the culture and environment of the school through bi-annual surveys of students and parents.

“6. Providing a process for hearing, responding to, and restoring victims and perpetrators of acts of racial harm through a set of specific Racial Incident procedures

“7. Providing for bi-annual meetings with community representatives from the Campaign to Hire More Teachers of Color and the annual reporting of both qualitative and quantitative evidence for reaching the goal of having a faculty and staff that reflects the student body

“8. Pledging to work with District 90, District 97, and other local governments to advance community understanding of racial equity, diversity, and inclusion.”

From John Duffy, “What needs to be done to ensure the direction D 200 has taken with racial equity continues and succeeds?”

“It is urgent that this board end any doubt about the District’ commitment to eliminate racial inequities in our school. To do this, we ask you to revise the language contained in the 2019 Racial Equity Policy. In the policy adopted on April 25, 2019, it states that if racial inequities are found after an equity review process, “the District will consider revision or elimination of the practice, procedure, or program.

“The history of racial inequities in education here and elsewhere are replete with moments when schools “considered” how to end racial disparities—the most famous being the Supreme Court decision in 1954 stating that segregation in schools was unconstitutional. “Considering” racial justice in America too often equates to delays, half-hearted measures, or solutions that require little from the dominant white culture.

“Considering” possible action now, more than ever, is woefully, and morally unacceptable. Instead, our policy must unequivocally commit to “*eliminating inequitable practices, procedures, and programs.*” Such an outright commitment can demonstrate that we really do value the lives of students of color.

“It is also time to apply the procedures the administration sets forth tonight for two pressing racial equity concerns of students, parents, and community members--the MENTA program and the presence of the School Resource Officer. Initiating a faithful use of the prescribed REAT process combined with other input is central to evaluating these programs. We look forward to joining the administration in that process.

“Finally, as key board members finish their tenure in the coming months, we offer you special thanks for all you have done to advance racial justice in our school community. Your dedication has been indispensable in putting racial equity work in motion. Unfortunately, there are those who seek to slow down this work, and even reverse long awaited racial equity restructuring of curriculum. In challenging this opposition, we beseech you to continue to help our community find candidates who mirror your dedication and who are ready to continue efforts at racial equity you have supported. Lastly, we ask you personally to remain a civic voice for racial justice in Oak Park and River Forest. Thank you. The Committee for Equity and Excellence in Education (CEEE).”

Consent Item

The following items were removed from the consent agenda: D. Gifts and Donations; I. Insurance; K. MENTA, and N. Superintendent Compensation. Ms. Dixon Spivy moved to approve the following Consent items:

- A. Check Disbursements and Financial Resolutions dated June 25, 2020
- B. Monthly Treasurer’s Report
- C. Monthly Financial
- E. Contract for Occupational Therapy Services for the 2020-21 School Year
- F. Contract for Physical Therapy Services for the 2020-2021 School Year
- G. Contract for Social Work Services for the 2020-2021 School Year
- H. Contract for Psychological Services for the 2020-21 School Year
- J. Tri-District Consortium Addendum
- L. Revision of 2020-21 School Calendar
- M. Resolution for Driver Ed Increase
- O. Policies for Second Reading
 - 1. 4:50 Payment Procedures
 - 2. 3:60 Administrative Responsibility of the Principal
 - 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. 5220 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
 23. 340-E Checklist for the Superintendent Employment Contract Negotiation Process
 24. 7:130 Student Rights and Responsibilities
 25. 3:50, Administrative Personnel Other Than the Superintendent
- P. Open and Closed Minutes of May 28, June 16, and June 18, 2020 and a declaration that the closed session audiotapes of October 2018 shall be destroyed

A roll call resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Gifts

Ms. Dixon Spivy moved to approve the gift from the Class of 1997; seconded by Dr. Moore. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

Annual Renewal Liability, Casualty, And Workers’ Compensation Insurance

Ms. Dixon Spivy moved to renew the CLIC insurance renewal for a total of \$572,739 for the 2021 school year, as presented; seconded by Mr. Cofsky.

Discussion ensued. Mr. Cofsky expressed concern that the incumbent broker Gallagher, was the provider of the RFP, but that there was a bid that was \$70,000 lower and it was rejected. That is the reason he would not support the recommendation. Mr. Martire concurred.

Ms. Sidor stated that the District was at this point because of the bids. This is a result of where the District was earlier in the year. The RFP is written to be

able to make sure the District is comparing apples to apples. The District wants to make sure it receives the same coverage.

A roll call vote resulted in three ayes and three nays. Mr. Cofsky, Mr. Iseli, and Mr. Martire voted nay. Ms. Dixon Spivy, Mr. Baron and Dr. Moore voted ayes. Ms. Harris was absent for this vote. Motion failed.

It was explained if the Board of Education did not approve this renewal; it would mean that the District would have no insurance. Thus, the Board decided to revote.

Ms. Dixon Spivy moved to approve the renewal CLIC Insurance, as presented; seconded by Mr. Baron. A roll call vote resulted in five ayes and one nay. Mr. Cofsky voted nay. Motion carried.

MENTA

Ms. Dixon Spivy moved to approve the Contracts with MENTA for (Professional Services and Special Education Services) for an estimated total of \$205,107; seconded by Dr. Moore. Discussion ensued.

Dr. Moore had never voted yes for the MENTA Contract. With the information that continues to be provided, she will continue to feel this setting goes against the setting of goals of equity and education, which has been discussed. The evaluations received have been minimal. Thus, for all of those reasons and most importantly the feeling between OPRFHS and MENTA and the racial disparities, she would not support the recommendation. She was concerned about the quality of education and the continuing racial disparities. She would vote nay.

When asked if the contracts were not approved, what would happen to these students, the administration responded that they would not be sent to MENTA and the District would not have a place for students to go who receive suspensions. Thus, their future would be unsure. Not approving the contracts would also do away with seats for the special education students. The parents of students identified as special education have been very pleased with their children's enrollment at MENTA. These students are achieving success, and it would be a hardship for those families if the relationship were terminated. Only those students in regular education classes were represented in the report. Special Education students are categorized as "off-campus."

Mr. Iseli supported the fact that this issue has come up the last couple of years. While it would be unfair to take an action now to eliminate the program, he asked that the Board have a discussion on options.

Dr. Moore felt the data shows racial disparities. She lacked an understanding what education is challenging for both general and special education students. In addition, discussions have occurred about the desire to go with a new

behavior interventionist plan, and she was troubled that suspensions are still looming. She would like to have this viewed as her protest and she did not want to sway anyone's vote.

A roll call vote resulted in five ayes and one nay. Dr. Moore voted nay. Motion carried.

Approval of Settlement Agreement with Employee

No Action

Preliminary Budget Ms. Sidor stated that per the Board of Education's request, this budget shows an increase within CPI (1.8%). Other budget highlights to note were:

- The Administrative District for The Collaboration for Early Childhood Development (Oak Park School District 97) has notified us that they are skipping the next two scheduled contributions for July 1, 2020 and January 1, 2021 as they have determined that there is sufficient cash. The contribution amount the District will not pay next year will be \$447,310.92, which has been removed from the preliminary budget.
- The State budget will be flat, based on the State calculations. Due to COVID-19, it is estimated that school districts will spend \$1.5 million or more to address staff and student safety. The cost of COVID-19 is not included in the preliminary budget.

A Summary of Preliminary Budget – Revenues included Tax Increment Financing (TIF) Surplus is gone, a Decrease in Corporate Personal Property Replacement Tax (CPPRT), Flat Evidence-Based Funding (EBF), Lower Interest rates, Flat Federal & State Grants, and Lower Real Estate Tax Collections

The overall expenditures increase within CPI – 1.8%. Salaries/Benefits increased by 2.5%. The salaries are mandated by current collective bargaining agreements. The non-affiliated staff is the only group that the Board annually controls and approves salary increases. Purchased Services/Supplies increased by 1.7%. Capital/Non-capital Equipment decreased by 37%. The construction paid from fund balance for Project 1 was \$10 million. Life Safety equals \$500,000. The 10-year Maintenance equals \$4.13 million.

The reclassification of capital spending is for supplies. Between \$5,000 and \$500,000 has been moved. Purchased services was kept low because unnecessary furniture will not be purchased. Anyone who has a furniture request will be denied unless it is a replacement for something that is broken.

COVID-19 will impact the District's revenue will be Lower Real Estate Tax Collections (97.5%), a decrease in Corporate Personal Property Replacement

Tax, Flat Evidence-Based Funding, lower interest rates, flat Federal & state grants. The Expenditure Impact is NOT in budget. The District is estimating at least a \$2 million increase for PPE/Cleaning/Additional FTE. There may be potential cost savings to consider. The District will continue to monitor impact on finances (field trips, travel budgets, etc.)

Ms. Sidor reported on the timing of when tax payments from Cook County are received. The first payment is an estimate and the final payment is a true-up. There will be a slight fluctuation in revenue. That is the reason for the difference. Evidence-based funding is not classified as Property Tax Grant Fund.

The 2020 unaudited actual will be around \$78 million. As of May, real estate taxes were aligned with the budget. After a bit of time, real estate taxes will start falling. In 2022, they will be lower than \$76 million and that downward trend may continue. The year 2020 was an outlier. A pie chart of the budgeted revenues by source was provided.

The Preliminary Budgeted expenditures are the actual numbers. Supplies and materials is now \$1.9 million versus the \$1.4 million before, which is the non-capital equipment line. COVID-19 may cause redesigning of classrooms.

Ms. Sidor stated that the administration was working with the insurance broker on rates for 2021, and looking for lower rates. OPRFHS is on a fiscal year but insurance is on the calendar year. So the cost of insurance is split between the 2020 and 2021 school year.

The 5-year projections presented are fluid and at this time COVID 19 was not included in the budget. No other major changes were made in the assumptions since last winter, but they will be revised because of COVID 19. COVID services and supplies are being identified in a separate account and will be added to the 5-year projection, including what has been received and paid out. At the end of Project 1, the Fund Balance will be 62%. In 2021, the Fund Balance will be 85%, in 2022-25, 75% of the fund balance.

Mr. Iseli appreciated the work. He stated that it was critical to keep people safe and determine what does not need to be continued. This is very difficult situation. Ms. Sidor stated that savings would be incurred in salaries relative to substitute teachers. A complete report of the savings is not available at this time to see if any of the savings will pay for safety next year. Dr. Pruitt-Adams noted that the administration hopes to put some of the costs of COVID into both the CARES and FEMA grants.

Mr. Cofsky also appreciated the work. Would there be any savings this year because of COVID-19 that are not reflected yet. Ms. Sidor responded that while the TIF Surplus was removed from this budget, but the administration will be taking additional EAV in the future.

Racial Equity Procedures

Dr. Ammons thanked the Board of Education for its leadership and making racial equity an important part of the District. He also thanked Dr. Pruitt-Adams for her support, as well as that of the Executive Cabinet, teachers, students, Faculty Senate, community members, including CEEE representatives, and content experts.

COVID-19 has impacted all, but it highlighted racial disparities regarding health care, education, access to resources, etc. The murder of George Floyd set the country on fire and reminds all that racism is prevalent in all lives. The timing of the procedures are more important than ever.

The Racial Equity Procedure Development Team met monthly. They kept in mind the building principles.

- Crucial examination of current practices with equity lens
- Reflection On approaches to equitable education
- Education

Dr. Ammons reviewed the different sections of the Racial Equity Policy.

The Accountability and Monitoring procedure will ensure the implementation of all the components of the racial equity policy, using the racial equity analysis, and then using an annual accountability report to the Board of Education in June on racial equity.

The Racial Equity Analysis Tool is the engine to propel the racial equity policy. The purpose is to provide a set of guiding questions relative to what decision needs to be made, who are the stakeholders, etc. Then the team would complete the Racial Equity Analysis Tool (online or in paper) and then determine what did and did not work or go well.

Using the EQT will allow discovery of the over/under representation of racial groups. Then the District will serve these identified students via grants, multi-tiered systems of support, professional development (PD), curriculum and instruction, and educational technology.

The charge is to have a Racial Incident Reporting Protocol for both students and employees to report a racial incident report/misconduct. A flowchart of the protocol was provided. A fact-finding process will occur. By collaborating with the deans, a decision will be made as to whether it was a racial unconscious.

Dr. Sanders put together a Talent Management Plan with four areas of focus: recruitment and selection, onboarding, compensation and benefits, and retention to maintain a racial diverse demographic of teachers.

OPRFHS has an affinity group that provides black teachers and staff a space to connect with like-minded people. Unofficial affinity spaces will also happen.

Culturally responsive and relevant teaching and learning will be reviewed annually by the administration. The starting point of the process was to have a curriculum development team regarding evaluation, design, selection of materials, etc.

While there is an established process in place about action research, opportunities for widespread development (PD) exist on the historical roots of racism, culturally responsive mindsets, implicit bias training, and anti-racism. Skills will eliminate bias in student achievement and the hiring processes.

Creating a welcoming school environment will include hanging relevant artwork.

PD on implicit bias and restorative justice will be provided to Campus Safety personnel. Data will be collected on how people are being welcomed into the community and will be shared with both of the students and the community. PD will also be provided on trauma-informed practices.

Discipline disparities is the piece that will make sure the District is in alignment with the educational plan. Annually, data disaggregated by race will be reviewed. From the BEP Social Emotional Learning standpoint, the team will maintain its focus on school climate and PD (geared around social emotional learning), and it will establish common goals for the classroom. Restorative Justice Practice cohorts of circle keepers will provide PD specific to TCT leaders during their TCT time, so the principles and practices can be implemented. The desire is for a universal mind shift.

The In-school Reflection Center will have restorative measures put into place with the intent of changing student behaviors. This will occur in addition to the students doing their work received from their classroom teachers. The intention is for this resource to be less punitive.

Additional funds for resources will be sought. The process will include development, learning, and research to see if something would be attainable for OPRFHS. Exploration of human capital and special education resource allocation will occur to improve upon operations.

The infrastructure of Equity Leadership has five areas that currently do not exist in the building. In the fall, PD will be provided on the equity analysis tool, equitable practices, programs, procedures, and the racial incident reporting protocol. In the spring, PD will be provided on accountability, monitoring, and equity leadership and instruction.

Mr. Cofsky appreciated the presentation. He asked the following questions.

- 1) Has the racial equity analysis tool been tested? If so, what has been learned? While it has not been tested yet completely, Dr. Ammons is working with ET on digital citizenship and is running that through the racial analysis tool.

2) Does this mean an increase in PD? There is an overlap with the PD currently scheduled. With limited time, creativity will be used to interweave this PD with the other. Some teachers are taking trauma-informed practices this summer.

3) How does the student-based funding model compare to the state's evidence-based funding model? Student-based funding will position the District to be intentional about placing funds specifically toward students who are in need of those funds. This is an exploration at this time.

4) The procedures say what and how with the intent of assuring consistently that tough racial disparity issues are addressed. How will that occur? The response was that more detail is provided in the procedures themselves.

Mr. Martire asked if there were an ongoing PD plans for incorporating UDI, which is evidence-based and designed to reach all of the families so that the District can have more assurance of the implementation of the procedures to eliminate the designated gaps. Dr. Ammons noted PD time has to be restructured, as it is so limited. Mr. Martire said the Board should provide the resources for a long-term cross-disciplinary program that reinforces its goal of eliminating the gap. Dr. Pruitt-Adams stated that the PD plan that is part of the curriculum work being done, it has equity imbedded in it, and Dr. Ammons meets with that team. The plan is to bring that plan forward in August. Racial equity pieces will be tied to the initial PD days in August. Mr. Martire recommended that the Board should support this PD with a long-term plan, resources, and then monitor the effectiveness of it. Faculty collaboration is one of the international best practices for improving student performance. Is that built into this somewhere? Mr. Johnson said that conversations have been about implementation of what has been learned through PD. UDL is a package that is not clean and so it would have to be designed for OPRFHS, as it has to be specific to the local setting. Mr. Martire was interested in resource allocation and identification of how the resources were being allocated via the EBF model and then through the subcategories to improve outcomes from an equity lens going forward. Dr. Ammons noted that process is in its infancy. The District may take a student-based funding model and research to understand how resources are allocated now. Mr. Martire added that the student-based funding model failed terribly at CPS. It is looking more at a needs-based funding model that is student centric.

Dr. Moore thanked Dr. Ammons for this work. She wanted to understand who the committee members were and what that process was like. The timeline says in the spring of 2021, PD will be provided on accountability and monitoring and equity leadership and infrastructure. What does that mean? She thought both of those things would be instrumental to the implementation of procedures. Dr. Ammons clarified that it is the reports that will be presented in the spring.

Dr. Moore asked how the administration would insure that accountability is done with fidelity. She felt that the use of resources would be a great Board-goal discussion as to how it would want to demonstrate just how racial equity occurs within the District. What do the boards of the vendors and consultants look like? Do those institutions reflect the racial demographics and philosophy that OPRFHS has? Dr. Pruitt-Adams noted that the administration was shooting for a percentage. As it continues to move forward, it will ask the Board to provide percentages for minority-owned businesses.

Ms. Harris also offered her thanks for the report. Similar to what Dr. Moore asked regarding the annual review of information, what would be interim benchmarks and how would they be reported to the Board? Dr. Ammons will provide that information as it is developed. Regarding implicit bias training, 93% of the staff has attended the PEG group training. He is having conversations with the racial equity coaches and affiliates to see just who has had this training and who needs added support.

Ms. Harris asked what was the role of the Culture, Climate and Behavior Committee in collaborating with these interests. How do they intersect? How does the flowchart intersect with the Student Code of Conduct?

Mr. Harris noted that the IEA and the NEA offer numerous trainings. Considering this is a NEA building, the District would incur no cost for trainings in such things as SEL, RJP, trauma-informed practices, etc. given by various experts. She appreciated the intentional pieces around recruitment of black affinity spaces. She asked if the talent management piece had demonstrated success as it relates to racial demographics. The response was that the Board approved the Talent Management Plan last September and demographics are given with each personnel report. At the conclusion of each hiring season, the Board receives a report on demographics.

Mr. Baron appreciated the email that Dr. Ammons sent to the community. It is young people like him who have historically brought the transformative work and he supported Dr. Ammons in this fight. It is important to raise future leaders. It was a good reminder to him. What kind of response was received from his statement? The more he steps in the better.

Mr. Iseli thanked him for the overview. He looked forward to having the procedures and seeing them implemented. He asked what the baseline is and what metrics will the District use to improve with the equity analysis tool. Dr. Ammons noted that the procedures were linked to the document and they included metrics tied to the Strategic Plan, i.e. hiring, curriculum. The new ones would be the baseline, equity analysis tool, racial equity analysis, etc. Mr. Iseli reiterated the importance of data/numbers to see if there were improvements in outcome performance. It was noted that the superintendent's proposed goals aligned to the metrics and had been sent to the Board.

Ms. Dixon Spivy wanted to be mindful of including the student voice in terms of the procedures and to make sure the District was “walking the walk.”

Recess

The Board of Education recessed at 10:00 resumed at 10:05 p.m.

**Construction
Budget
Project 1**

Mr. Carioscio presented the Construction Budget for Project I. On September 17, 2019, the Board of Education was presented with the initial budget estimates for the for the facilities master plan. In the March Board meeting, discussion ensued about funding issues associated with the 10-year maintenance plan. In the May Board meeting, the funding gap associated with the Project 1 capital improvement project. In the June Committee of the Whole meeting, additional information was provided on both the 10-year maintenance plan and Project 1. Due to timing considerations, this presentation focuses solely on the Project 1 scope and the associated 10-year maintenance items impacted by that scope. The District is recommendation is to move forward even with a budget gap.

The initial construction of the South Cafeteria and Student Resource Center has already begun, and the administration needs guidance on deferral of the scope. The administration will continue to look for ways to reduce costs through value engineering. The 10-year maintenance work for 2020 has already been approved and this will be discussed more in-depth later. Mr. Carioscio stated that it would be prohibitively expensive to undo what has already begun and it would extend the construction schedule. This District is locked into the scope, cost and schedule.

Confirmation was received from the structural engineer that the bad fill under the foundation under the servery would not have a significant impact on the structure. However, if it were to be done, now would be the time to do it. Thus, the servery now becomes an opportunity.

The prioritization of the projects listed on the Analysis of Project 1 scope not initially estimated that is driving funding gap ** South Café / SRC alone ** chart was explained. The green items are needed to complete Project 1 but were not budgeted in the master planning budget. The yellow items were opportunities, i.e. the servery, solar panels on the South Cafeteria, etc., and would be paid for with capital improvement funds. Both of these categories added up to a subtotal of \$5,775,888. Noted was the fact that the green items included the mechanicals which were not fully vetted.

The base bid included:

- SRC/South Café
- Library infill – classrooms and labs
- 63 renovated or new classrooms
- Remodel Special Education Spaces
- All gender toilet rooms
- Servery

Possible alternatives were:

COMPONENTS:

Budget Estimates

Main Entrance	\$ 1,000,000
Student Commons	\$ 4,200,000
33 Classrooms	\$ 3,300,000
Total	\$ 8,500,000

The Project 1 funding gap is \$8.4 million. Taking all proposed alternates provides the potential to align the budget to original master plan budget.

Discussion ensued. Mr. Martire felt this report was easier data to digest. The basement is an opportunity cost to be paid with capital improvement funds. If that were removed and those same funds of \$3.5 million would cover the needs that were proposed, and then categorize them as maintenance costs and that would reduce the exposure to under \$5 million or \$4.8 million.

The Board was informed that the design and demolition contracts were signed. To scale this back now would affect the schedule, as everything would have to be redesigned and rebid because changes were so drastic. Mr. Carioscio noted that enabling work that has been going on for weeks now. If the basement were eliminated, the load-bearing walls in the South Cafeteria would need to be changed, the utilities that run through the South Cafe would have to be changed, and the HVAC system was able to reside in its existing site but the ductwork would need to be redesigned. So not only would there be significant change to the redesign, the recommendation would be to go out for another RFP on the entire project as that would be less costly than giving change orders to the contractors. This would also equate to many months of delay.

Dr. Moore became more confused in thinking about the conversation that occurred last week whereby a decision was to be made about whether the basement was an opportunity versus an essential element to the plan. However, it is already underway. What decisions could the Board of Education have made when the work was continuing as the Board met? What is not already underway? Last week there was no basement and now it is another RFP as it is being constructed. She asked what had happened between this meeting and the last. Mr. Carioscio apologized. He said it was in the scheme in the way of the various items. The basement did not have to be included. It was classified as opportunity. If the Board of Education felt strongly enough that the money is not well spent, the District could incur the additional costs and extend the construction schedule. If that were the will of the Board, it could be done. He apologized for not saying this was underway and could not be undone previously.

Ms. Harris asked if he was asking the Board to stay on track with what had been started? Mr. Carioscio responded yes and that he had struggled with bringing this back as he did not feel he had a clear signal. The team looked at what could be done to stay within budget. While this was a significant shift in scope, but it would get through the original IMAGINE master plan process. The Board of Education had given a list of non-negotiables in May.

Mr. Iseli said it felt like the Board was between the maintenance plan and that this is about \$12 million above where it thought it was going to be. The opportunity on the table is not to figure out how to reduce scope or value the engineer, but to defer scope. That decision seems to already have been made. He noted that the administration has done nothing but added to the design.

Mr. Czerniak noted that the designs are at the end of design development for the remainder of Project 1, but there were opportunities to make a change to the components. It could bring a reduction in cost. The architects have engaged the contractors to come up with budget alignment items. Public bidding requirements say that the architects cannot negotiate a contract before approval. Conductive change orders would be issued to the contractors. The architects are actively doing that. However, it is impossible to get back to a \$32.6M budget. He did not feel that anything had been added to the Project 1 components. However, space for programs needs to be developed with the faculty and administration for the entire scope, i.e. how many rooms, cafeteria, etc.

Mr. Iseli felt the budget was spent and what is left is the overage. He was frustrated. He was very concerned that if \$40 million is spent on a \$32 million project, the ability to get capital for the second project will evaporate. He did not know what the choice was the Board was being asked to make.

With regard to the decisions made and the options, Mr. Cofsky stated just because one can explain it, does not mean it is acceptable. When he looked at it from a choice standpoint, he stated that when asked for guidance, certain needs were expressed but the Board of Education was being asked to defer those needs. Much money was spent on the basement. The only issue they can decide on is the servery and that was not a recommendation of the IMAGINE project. Does the Board just continue to overspend or should it cut back on the real deliverables that were requested. He did not feel like there were any choices because the decisions have already been made. Mr. Carioscio stated that the servery could come out of those things to be included.

Ms. Dixon Spivy asked how this affected the student experience. Is it a modernization and convenience for staff? Mr. Carioscio stated that the turf was on the list and there had been complaints about how the field house looked, and it is not just aesthetics. There is bad soil and it has caused some cracking.

Mr. Baron expressed similar concerns and frustrations. The Student Commons was an important part of Project 1 from the IMAGINE team. While the work in the basement is moving forward, to stop it would not be fiscally wise. He wanted the Student Commons to be part of the plan, but not necessarily the welcome center. He had heard discussion about deferring about 33 classrooms. Project 1 had a scope and this is beyond the scope. He was inclined to spend more now and not defer until later.

Ms. Harris noted that the Student Commons was important. She understood about the server. She was challenged by that fact that the Board was presented with an estimated budget of \$32.8 million for Project 1. However, in actuality, it came in over what was expected. The Board of Education voted to move forward. How does the Board move forward now? She felt that decisions were made based on what the Board knew. A conversation about potential debt occurred and it came in a form of hodgepodge that made her feel like the decision-making process is not there. She wanted more fore- thought or information prior to a project moving forward with potential for funding things. The administration keeps coming back with things and the Board has no choice. She felt boxed in by what has happened.

Mr. Carioscio agreed and owned that along the way, decisions and the District went along with the decisions. When the Board decided that ground had to be broken in June, the administration noted that the timing was challenging. The money was then spent by that time and the administration did not realize the District did not have the money to spend. The team is trying and said there were issues and it was trying to find ways to avoid the present situation. The master planning process included creating a budget, but that process was not designed to come up with an exact budget. He was sorry he was not clearer about this previously.

Ms. Dixon Spivy echoed the frustrations of her colleagues. She asked what direction could the Board give. Dr. Pruitt-Adams asked which components would stay. What does the Board want? Alternatively, does it want more information? If the Board does not want to make a decision, OK. The administration had come forward with funding alternatives.

Dr. Moore stated that for her, the whole idea of what stays in and comes out appears that the options are those components listed here. It would be foolish and belabor the process if the project had to be redrawn. Even if the Board wants the main entrance and not the student commons, the architects stated that the renderings had to be redone. If items are added or parceled out, does that mean going back to the drawing board? Mr. Czerniak noted that the District would not incur any additional costs in terms of the drawings because the construction document phase has not started. A great opportunity exists for the remaining components of Project 1, not just all gender bathrooms, the elevators, and special education space. Dr. Moore noted that the cost of the main entrance was less than originally budgeted. She reviewed the recommendations of CCB, which was front and center for the last three years about prioritizing resources for the racial equity procedures. One had to do with providing resources in order for students to be successful. She never liked basements and objected to that fact that opportunity was taken. She is thinking about lost opportunities. The student commons and main entrance were such viable options and stakeholders, and not having them is not an option.

Mr. Cofsky asked if the Board proceeded with the classrooms, what would happen over what timeframe. With the COVID situation, there is some reason to think things may change. Mr. Czerniak stated that half of the classrooms are slated to be renovated in the summer of 2021 and the other half in 2022. The documents going out to bid will be done in October and go out in November. Mr. Carioscio stated that classroom could be done in alternates of 10.

Mr. Martire acknowledged that the original budget was wrong as it allocated on 50% for the construction of the south cafeteria when it should have been allocated as new construction. The original budget should have been \$36.5 million, which would reduce the overage. Mr. Czerniak stated that the original master plan did not include some additional green items as well, e.g. replacing 1” with 2” trees. He would add items like that into item 5. Mr. Martire continued that they could have gotten right Numbers 5 and 6, but did not. If so, it would have reduced the budget by \$4.2 million, which translates to a 12% overage. He agreed with Dr. Moore and Ms. Harris that the Student Commons should be completed as it is about equity. He would devote the funding to completing project 1 if classrooms could be done over a couple of years, utilize the reserve to cover Project 1. Then there will be the overage project impasse as decisions are made on what to do with Project II.

Mr. Iseli saw three options:

1. Spend all of the money and try to value engineer it, but he asked Mr. Carioscio and Mr. Czerniak if the District could continue to value engineer, as there are no guarantees that they would not spend it all. What is the motivation to do the value engineering? FGM has a responsibility to the district and the community, even if there were no budget issue. Mr. Iseli stated that every time they look harder, the costs go up.
- 2) Defer all of the classrooms due to the questions about the future, get rid of the servery and do the rest of the pieces for equity reasons.
- 3) Stop the project and wait until February. In 30 years, that time delay would be meaningless.

Ms. Dixon Spivy was not excited about the servery and the Student Commons cannot be cut. The main entrance is not top priority, and it could be mitigated through the Student Commons. Classrooms are integral, but she could be swayed into doing them piecemeal.

Mr. Martire supported not doing the survey and solar #2 and #9. He agreed that the Welcome Center should be done now. He would also defer classroom work because of COVID 19, etc.

Mr. Cofsky suggested anything that can be done to shave that basement cost be done rather than abandoning it. It is an Achilles heel and the Board wants to

spend money on other things. Others agreed. Dr. Pruitt-Adams noted that if enough cannot be shaved from the basement, does the project go forward.

Mr. Baron felt that #9 would be important for the future, and asked if it could be delayed. Mr. Czerniak stated that this would not preclude delaying it, but it would make a difference in how that fits on the roof. It is weighted down, balanced, and sits on the roof's membrane. It could affect the warranty of the roof. Thus, Mr. Baron supported doing it now on multiple levels as a model for the community. The deferment of the classrooms relative to COVID-19 makes sense. He said the main entrance and Student Commons were essentials.

It was acknowledged that the green roof was no longer an option.

It was the consensus of the majority of the Board of Education was to categorize the following.

Servery - No	Student Commons - Yes
Main entrance - Yes	Deferring classrooms – Yes

Closed Session At 11:25 p.m., the Board of Education returned to closed session and resumed its open session at 11:55 p.m.

Superintendent Compensation for School Year 2020-21 Ms. Dixon Spivy moved to approve a salary increase for the Superintendent of 2.5% for the 2020-21 school year; seconded Mr. Martire. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Future Agenda Items None.

Adjournment At 11:59 p.m. on Thursday, June 25, 2020, Ms. Dixon Spivy moved to adjourn the regular Board of Education meeting; seconded by Mr. Iseli. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

Sara Dixon Spivy
President

Thomas Cofsky
Secretary