

A special meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on Tuesday, December 13, 2016, in the Board Room of the high school.

**Call to Order**

President Weissglass called the meeting to order at 6:38 p.m. A roll call indicated the following members were present: Fred Arkin, Jennifer Cassell, Thomas F. Cofsky, Dr. Steve Gevinson, Dr. Jackie Moore, Sara Dixon Spivy, and Jeff Weissglass. Also in attendance was Dr. Joylynn Pruitt, Interim Superintendent; Brenda Horton, Director of Human Resources; Philip Tod Altenburg, Chief School Business Official, and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

**Visitors**

Sheila Hardin, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair; Jeffrey Bergmann and Fred Preuss, OPRFHS staff; Peter Ryan, Hall, Monica Sheehan, and Julie Griffin of APPLAUSE!, community members; Declan Ryan and Kyra Woytek students; and Steve Scherer of the Oak Leaves.

**Winter Prisms**

Julie Griffin, representing APPLAUSE!, wanted to provide a glimpse of the Prisms of Winter Concert on December 15 at 7:30 p.m., a sold-out performance. She thanked the Board of Education for its hard and tireless work on behalf of the OPRFHS community and for performing arts and asked them to keep them in their minds as they move forward. Declan Ryan and Kyra Woytek performed.

**Public  
Comments**

Scott Hall, a newer family in River Forest, spoke on behalf of the younger, non-millennial generation who were ignorant of the facts about the facilities and the referendum. He had attended an informational session which he felt was balanced and informative; however, it did not convince him. The feedback he heard was that there was tons of interest in the facilities referendum, i.e., the need for a new pool, academic aspect, data around how the school is used in going to needs for art program, etc. Everyone believes in those facets, but there was too much done and the combination of facilities, financing relative to cash and a tax hike did not resonate with people effectively. He felt clarity was had on the need for a pool, but no other options were given other than the parking garage. The repudiation of the parking garage is a nonstarter, and he suggested that the Board of Education not use it, and go forward with expediency on fixing the pool situation with cash already in hand. Because there was no support for a tax hike, he felt the Board of Education should go forward in pieces and thus garner more community support.

Marty Bernstein had a short story about performing arts. A dozen years ago her son was in orchestra and part of a 4-persons Stairway to Heaven in cello. His reasons for the referendum not being passed were as follows:

1. Clarity: The process since the board's vote in 2015 to sell \$22.5 million in bonds through the election on November 8 has been difficult to follow because of the changing plans and costs. They have been moving targets in the community.
2. Cost: Cost drove this issue to a referendum. The Board's proposal for not spending out of the fund balance is out of balance.
3. Waste: Destroying a facility that has 25 years of life left is a glaring example of wasting money and resources. The Board of Education must provide easy access to information as to costs balanced with need and wants. If the Board of Education wants to retain aquatics, it should build a 25-yard pool in place. If not, close the pools. If it wants to be a great school board, convene with other taxing boards and work together on building all capital projects. The taxpayers in these communities cannot afford to have their taxes increased.

Monica Sheehan, read the first part of the letter submitted to the Wednesday Journal over a week ago. "The Expert's Pool Solution. With the defeat of the District 200 pool referendum, OPRF Pragmatic Pool Solutions encourages the Board to revisit and follow the logical recommendation of its own-expert commissioned report. In March 2013 after a year-long review, Stantec, the world renowned engineering and design firm, recommended that OPRF solve its pool problem by building one 8-lane, 25-yard standard high school competition pool in the East Pool site expanding into the South Gym.

"The Stantec Report, linked on the school's website, is the definitive assessment on the pool issue. It looked at usage, possible pool sizes, and prioritized locations on campus in making its recommendation. While the then-pool committee *preferred* a 40-meter stretch pool with 70% more water, Stantec stated that there was no place on campus to build it without impacting other sports teams or required parking. The last three years have borne out that fact. Stantec's rational East Pool/South Gym solution preserves all green space and the structurally sound garage with at least 25 more years of service life.

"On 11/21/13, the Board eliminated Stantec's logical recommendation from the pool discussion based on false information in a Finance Committee memo. It incorrectly stated that the East Pool/South Gym site could not house an 8-lane, 25-yard pool and that it was the most expensive of the four sites under consideration. Several weeks prior on

9/26/13, one of the school's architects stated, in fact, that it was the "more cost-effective" pool and site. After eliminating the reasonable pool solution, the Board pivoted sharply and has spent the last three years trying to fit an oversized pool, a want not a need, on the too-small campus."

Jack Davidson continued reading the article. "The Stantec pool solution will right size our school's aquatic facilities and expenditures. Stantec clearly stated that OPRF's current 11 swim lanes are a luxury and "modern high school aquatics programs are supported by one 8-lane, 25-yard pool". The 1920s is a decade known for excess, and OPRF extravagantly overbuilt with two pools in 1928. No other peer school built two pools. As a consequence, for the last 88 years, we have overspent in operating and repairing the two pools and their excessive 11 swim lanes. As recently as 2010, we spent millions repairing the pools. Every dollar overspent on aquatics is a dollar not spent on academics, the school's core mission.

"OPRF's physical education and aquatic team needs will be met by the Stantec solution. The school has resisted updating its antiquated and unnecessary mandatory swim requirement. By instituting a water safety class for all freshmen, similar to Stevenson High School's, and allowing students to test out of swimming, the need for pool water declines sharply. OPRF's aquatic teams will share a pool just like their counterparts at other schools and just as our other sports teams share fields on our space-confined campus. The West Pool space will be repurposed for other uses."

Bridgett Baron read the following statement: "In reading the memo from Karin Sullivan and Dr. Pruitt about the factors that led to the referendum defeat, I see no mention of community opposition to *the size* of the pool as one of the factors leading to the NO decision. That certainly belongs on the list of factors.

"Second, regarding the recommendation to establish a "community engagement and outreach committee," based on recent history, I question if this board is serious about listening to members of the community.

"Three years ago, in November 2013, a memo from your CFO was issued to the Board that contained information that contradicted the findings of the Stantec report. Four of you were on the Board at that time, and not one of you questioned or challenged that memo. It was that memo that removed a single 25-yard, 8-lane competition-sized pool from consideration.

“And from that point forward, the 100s of hours and the 100s of 1000s of dollars spent has been focused on attempting to fit an over-sized pool on the school's campus...and camouflaging that as the real issue.

“Unofficially, the size of the pool was determined before the Pool Committee began meeting. And when your attempt to bypass the community with your Olympic-sized pool didn't work, you, rightly, pulled back to re-think your plan.

“However, you had your architect, Legat, which collected a whopping \$505,000 last school year, put forth three plans, all clouding the pool issue with items layered on top of them, and presented last Spring at “community input” meetings. What was lacking was a choice of a single 25-yard pool.

“And at those meetings, when Legat presented the three options, the presenter was neutral on two of the options and then lit up like a Christmas tree when presenting the option that the Board ended up choosing.

“To top it off, at those meetings, some of the note takers at the tables were far from neutral. They were clearly pro-big pool.

“The way those meetings were set up...the wording of the referendum question...the high school PowerPoint presentation on the so-called Facilities Plan...the two mailings that you sent out, neither one mentioning the size of the pool, and even de-emphasizing it...things posted in the high school newsletter—all had nothing to do with informing, and everything to do with selling.

“And you ignored the results of a \$14,000 phone survey that informed you that the community was not interested in this kind of expenditure.

“My concern is that this recommendation for a yet another committee will follow in the same vein as what's happened over the past three years---a pre-determined outcome, rather than getting genuine community input.

“The Board has not been honest about the choices that this community has. And the Board has shown a history of not listening to the community, and unwisely spending our taxpayer dollars.

“As elected officials, I hope that you are listening now, because we will hold you accountable.”

Dana Connell read the following statement, “It is unfortunate that THIS and the last Board of Education have had the task of righting the many wrongs of past boards who hoarded tax dollars while failing to provide, construct, control, and maintain facilities. Instead, this board acted ethically by returning over 30 million dollars to taxpayers hoping it would restore trust between the board and community. As is so often the case, no good deed goes unpunished.

“Sadly, it is our students who are being punished by voters who don’t trust a board of education, aren’t willing to pay for schools where they don’t have children, and worst of all they ARE willing to pay for parking to prevent others from parking in front of their homes.

“According to the OPRF website, The OPRF Motto is stated as: “Those Things That Are Best.” They mean that each person should strive for the best things and high ideals. It is hoped that the motto will have this meaning for each teacher and student.

“The community motto seems to be more likely “Those things that are good enough.” So now what? 21<sup>st</sup>-century curriculum drives facility decisions – the board makes facility decisions. The choir room is a classroom. The band room is a classroom. The field house is a classroom. Driver Ed cars are a classroom. The pool is a classroom. Classrooms should be aligned with pedagogy, a number of students, optimal use, and flexibility for current and future use.

“Here is the fork in the road – build a 40-meter pool as planned with the funds on hand with a plan to implement other spaces over a five-year period. Or, “Put out an RFP to think creatively and address the failing pools and a larger scope multi-phased plan to replace the south campus facility, a so-called big idea.

“I beg you to resist any “good enough” plan which would result in yet another band aid in our historic community and not meet our pedagogical needs for students in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

“Keep in mind that a mere 29 voters have led us here – fewer than are in this room. 29 who were misinformed, misled, misunderstood or simply didn’t know.

“Do not let others take the board or the facilities hostage with no regard to student life, achievement, engagement, and success.”

Emily Schick, a special education teacher who was recommended for termination on December 8, reported that she was not given a reason for her termination, pursuant to her contract which stated that probationary

employees can be terminated without cause. She believed she should be allowed to retain her position, stating that the positive feedback from those who have worked with her, including teachers, students and parents was a testament to her excellence performance. Since starting in October, she had been assigned to work with a senior with autism who had responded very well to her guidance and mentorship. Through conversations with the student's caseworker, she learned that his parents, too, have been thrilled with the growth their son has shown since her assignment to him. Various faculty and staff had also noted a positive change in his demeanor and confidence. Ms. Schick had worked in education for over 1 years and she has learned how important it is to connect with students on common ground, to be present, consistent and show care. She had thoroughly documented this student's behavior, homework, and overall progress through emails every day. One of his teachers said she was the best aide who had worked in his classroom. Prior to being recommended for termination, she had received no disciplinary actions. Subsequently being recommended for termination without cause was shocking to her and has added financial, emotional and mental stress to her life. The student for whom she had worked has had his entire routine changed ten days before finals. As is typical of autistic students, he does not respond well to sudden routine changes. It seems that his needs were not considered. At the end of her probationary period, she was told that her probation would be extended because she did not have a bus driving license, though I was not notified until after being hired that such a license was a requirement of the job. She was offered the position on August 10 by telephone and invited to Institute Day training on August 18 and 19. Nowhere in her conversation was she asked to come in for an official interview in which she would have been offered a job description. If the bus license was a requirement of the job, she was unclear why she was eligible for the position in the first place. Her position as a 1:1 aide for a designated student would seem to make a bus license superfluous, as she is unlikely to be called upon to drive the student anywhere. Again, she did not know whether the license issues was tied to her termination. She asked that she reinstated, at least until the end of the academic school year, when the student she works with will graduate and she will have to time find another position. She has worked to show competence, commitment and passion for special education in the short time that she has been at OPRFHS. She truly felt a sense of community at the school. She had letters of support from the student's teachers and caseworkers testifying to her capabilities and parental feedback.

David Pope, 306 S. Humphrey, thanked the Board of Education members for their service. He offered his opinion about the referendum. He interpreted the 3 questions posed on the ballot to be: 1) should the Board of Education invest in the new pools? 2) Should the Board of Education invest in the recommended pool proposal? 3) Should the Board of Education pay for it in the way it was articulated with fund balance and

bonds? The results were that 49.9% of the voters favored all 3 of the questions. He was 100% confident that a majority of the community supported the first two questions. He had voted no because he felt it should be paid for out of the fund balance, as he was concerned about the tax impact and the issues the community faces in terms of the economic diversity of the community. He encouraged the Board of Education to consider whether Question No. 2 was the right configuration? The voters elected Board of Education members to make a decision. He understood the need and desire to have a community conversation; however, he recommended not taking the referendum results as a sign that a majority supported something else in terms of an alternate configuration. He had served on FAC that made the recommendation to take major project out of fund balance. The major concern is adding bond debt that will impact everyone in the community. He thanked the Board of Education for its service and leadership.

Sherri Johnson, president of P4SS, applauded the efforts of the Board of Education and staff to have a non-tracked civics course. P4SS is always concerned with the success of all students and she encouraged the Board of Education to make this pilot by providing communication, high-quality support to all students so they can be successful, and support and training for teachers.

## **Facilities Plan**

Dr. Pruitt reported that on November 8, 2016, Oak Park and River Forest residents voted down a bond issue of up to \$25 million by Oak Park and River Forest High School District 200. The bonds were intended to help fund a five-year, \$44.5 million facilities plan. According to the results from the Cook County Board of Elections, out of 35,676 ballots cast, those opposed to the bond issue prevailed by a margin of 28 votes or 0.08%. Conversations had occurred before the vote as to what would happen if the referendum failed and what that would mean. She asked the Board of Education to approve the following resolution.

“BE IT RESOLVED THAT, pursuant to Policy 4:150 - Facility Management and Building Programs for the academic year 2017-2018, the Oak Park and River Forest High School D200 Board of Education charges the Administration with establishing a community engagement and outreach committee to review previous processes, make recommendations, and strengthen community partnerships pursuant to District goals related to equity, academic programming needs, facilities to support those needs, and finances, in order to ensure that the District meets the educational needs of the next generation of learners.”

Mr. Prale noted that the pools are used as classrooms and for athletics. PE Division Head Clay Reagan and Athletic Director John Stelzer had

provided valuable insight and have given more perspectives. PE uses the pools 5 out of eight periods per day. If the pools are not available, teachers have to stagger into other spaces, share spaces, and do seat-based lessons and adding a core value that goes along with believing in lifelong activity. Classrooms are in use 15 out of the 18 weeks of a semester. Staggered swimming into seat-based activity is completed after PE classes are scheduled. And while the teachers will develop worthwhile lessons, swimming then is a less activity-based program.

Because the pools were closed in 2010 and 2011, OPRFHS athletics has developed a partnership with Ridgeland High School and Riverside-Brookfield currently for diving practices only because its pools are used for swimming. Mr. Stelzer is exploring possible partnerships with community colleges and other governmental agencies. However, that will incur costs for transportation, staff, and security.

Why not pay for the pool out of the District's fund balance? Mr. Altenburg stated that it would result in a lower the fund balance and it would cause the District to go for an operating referendum possibly as early as 2019.

Dr. Pruitt stated that the administration is proposing to step back to look at academic programming, equity, and facilities that would support the next generation of learners, i.e. new science standards, etc. Having the facilities to support the next generation of learners, who are more consumer-outcomes and more engaged in more personalized learning. The last time a major facilities renovation occurred was in the 1960's. The District needs to look at how it supports 21<sup>st</sup> Century learners, i.e., furniture, computers, etc. What will the classroom look like? Learning is no longer locked into a classroom. Learners are able to access university libraries. Learners are not bogged down by time. They are only bound by progress against goals and moving to mastery. One does not have to be in just one proximity. When conversing about looking at the next phase, it includes not only the facilities but what the community wants for the future, i.e., partnerships with taxing bodies, etc.

Ms. Sullivan stated that the District has had two long-term facilities plan committees, one in 2012 and one in 2015, three different pool committees and even more discussion. All of those efforts have not brought the community to consensus. A broader, community-based committee is what is believed to be needed. The administration envisioned a process that involves internal stakeholders and community members and includes people in the community, and others as well, and people on both sides of the issue to reach some consensus. The Committee will review the facilities process plans, equity, programming, community partnership, and using the funds in a way that supports

retooling a building to support academic goals and future learners. As part of the process, a facilitator will make sure everyone's concerns are heard and a consensus is reached with no foregone conclusion.

Dr. Pruitt continued that the administration wants to impact the District as a whole, Special Education, Performing Arts, the core content, extracurriculars, sports, community partnerships, personalized, flexible interacted, engaging, organized, centered around moving forward to accomplish Strategic Plan goals of Holistic, TTL, Equity, Facilities and Finance. The administration wants to work to lead back to these goals and to be collaborative, agile, and achievable to open the doors for future students. The timeline will include establishing an application process to identify people on the committee from the government, community, etc. and then look at an RFP. The community members want to talk about transparency and trust. The current perception is that the administration led the direction. In this case, the administration would be providers of outside information and start immediately. The community would determine if it would go for a referendum. The charge of the committee was included in the resolution below.

Dr. Pruitt stated that the facilitator would be provided with assessment data, feasibility information, the role of forming a committee, chairs, and a subset of administration and chair, based on the Strategic Plan, would identify the key areas of priority in order to prepare for the next generation of leaders, i.e., status on technology, academic achievement of students (report card data, etc.), look at the utilization study, get feedback to the teachers will frame the direction of the committee. This would be a bigger project than just the pool, but a timeline would be developed and the work would be phased in. A concern had been raised about not adequately vetting the long-term facilities plan. Dr. Gevinson reiterated the need for a pool. Dr. Pruitt stated that the LTFP should also focus on equity, the achievement gap, how to move forward, and cost containment. The District also needs to strengthen partnerships with other taxing bodies. At the end of the day, recommendations need to come from the committee.

Mr. Weissglass thought of this as a multi-stakeholder, planning process, facilities planning process, and a bridge building/conflict resolution process so that competing interest in the community are no longer at loggerheads about this. Which does the Board of Education think it is doing? What kind of facilitator can lead an appropriate process? In bridge building work, it is a chicken and egg game about who hires the facilitator. Choosing the committee is an important piece of determining who needs to be involved in making that decision? Dr. Pruitt stated that a committee would first identify the criteria for an RFP, interview, and then bring forward the finalist to the Board of Education. The facilitator

can help form the broader committee in terms of skills set and help plan for each session using the administration as a resource. Mr. Weissglass felt the integrity of this process depended upon who was making the decisions on each step. Who is on that steering committee is important and the community needs to feel represented, because of the many different processes, the level of distrust, and the need for transparency. An outside facilitator needs to guide the process because the Board of Education does want the citizens to have a voice.

Mr. Cofsky reflected on the process and noted that there was much to learn and some efforts were more effective than others. He questioned whether another committee was the best way to go because one does not want to travel down the same road again. He echoed Mr. Weissglass' comments about who would lead the committee and he felt there was a tremendous value to having community members involved in the critical decisions. However, the Board of Education has to provide clear guidance on things at the beginning. Taxes are a concern and, thus, entering into open-ended projects would be suicidal. Dr. Pruitt concurred and questions would be asked about how to fund this without increasing taxes. What is the capability of the District at this point? Mr. Weissglass said he would not chair this committee.

Ms. Spivy's concern was about having too many committees and passing the buck on solving this problem. Dr. Pruitt responded that the District had community engagement around the pool, a Strategic Plan, two facilities plans, and other plans that talk about community projects. She felt this was the first time that everything would be pulled together and decisions would be made that were centered on the students. The Board had moved aggressively on the pool, but people have said that the District did not listen to everything. The District needs to show that everything is related to the strategic plan; it is a different process. At the end of the process, the goal will be to have a delineation of items to be addressed over time as well as how it has impacted student outcomes. The Board of Education will need to identify 2 representatives to routinely report to the Board. The committee will make a recommendation. This is not just about the pool, it is about how to move forward in the future—structure, and facility-wise. Mr. Weissglass reflected that the last two years had been dramatic about the pool and that the Board had not said it was going back to zero, as it had learned much about the pools, i.e., location-wise, financing, etc. Some of the public comments were about not going for a referendum and others were about going for a referendum. The Board of Education could make a unilateral decision but it could cause a divisiveness for a long time. It is fair to say that the majority of the voted for the pool plan. He liked the concept of stepping back and doing more study. What would building the one 8-lane, 25-yard pool mean in terms of the PE curriculum and

athletic use? The implications are dramatic and that has not been studied. In addition, more study can be given to an underground pool or raising Lake Street for underground parking.

Dr. Moore appreciated Dr. Pruitt's fresh eyes and experience in going for a referendum. She supported this because this community likes having a voice and is very savvy, and yet it always feels as if there is some group that does not feel represented or it is all for naught. At first, she was completely opposed a pool and a LTFP. But by year three of her Board tenure, she concurred to building a pool. She believed the narrative had to change. The pools are in bad shape and discussion needs to occur about what will be done to keep the students safe and done in a fiscally responsible way. It is a broader question and she appreciated bringing this back to what is in the best interest of students. She did not support a committee of 70 people as it gets very hard to know how to follow the recommendations. Dr. Pruitt suggested thinking about this as more community engagement. In her previous district when she became superintendent of schools, she was faced with a lack of community trust, a feeling of the lack of transparency, poor student achievement, aging buildings, not having highly qualified staff, and no fund balance, etc., so she embarked on major community engagement process. A steering committee of citizens with various levels of experience and who had been in the community for a long time was formed. Discussions occurred about the concerns of the community and they helped to create a plan. It was decided that an outside person was needed to help chart out community engagement over time. A 15-member committee was formed. They came with various aspects of what the community wanted, needed, demographics, etc., and they asked critical questions. This committee helped to form the questions and the presentations. Two meetings per month were held and at the conclusion, they stated priorities they had heard and outlined how to prioritize the next steps. A small subset of the committee held the District accountable. This is what OPRFHS needs: academic achievement, parent and community engagement at every level of decision-making on communication, refurbishing of facilities and financing. It will not be the committee making the decisions but instead listening to the voices of the entire community as to what is wanted from the District.

Mr. Arkin appreciated this recommendation. He too suggested going forward with a crisis management plan in case something happens to the pools. He acknowledged that the referendum showed that there was community support and that the community has to engage and give the Board of Education direction. While he acknowledged that the Board of Education members were elected to make the decisions on what is best for the community, they must listen to it. He felt this recommendation might be the most feasible solution.

Dr. Pruitt responded to questions about when discussions would occur about different options, i.e., paying for an underground pool, a Lake Street alternative, etc., by saying that some pieces have to be at the forefront, i.e., pools, and partnering with local taxing bodies has to be a part of the process, funding, and yet under that comes the academic and education pieces.

Ms. Cassell observed that expediency was important because of the state of the pools and the facilities issues. The timeline laid out in the report suggests going for a referendum in 2018. That may conflict with District 97's referendum. Parameters need to be set by the Board of Education.

Dr. Gevinson favored the concept of a committee looking at all aspects of the educational program. However, he was concerned about the urgency of the pool problem. Much information is already known about it. He wanted to table this discussion and have the Board of Education discuss it first. Running a referendum in a general election is asking it to fail and for it to have almost passed was remarkable. He believed that if the referendum had run in a non-general election, it would have passed easily. There was strong support for building a pool and doing it fast. Dr. Pruitt concurred that the pool is a priority and the Board of Education can direct the administration to come back with a pool first or to have a specific conversation about the pool.

Dr. Gevinson moved to table this motion until the Board of Education had an opportunity to talk about the referendum results; seconded by Dr. Spivy. A roll call vote resulted in 5 nays and 2 yeas. Dr. Gevinson and Ms. Spivy voted yea. Motion failed.

Discussion ensued about the philosophy of whether the best results in going out for a referendum were at a general election or not. Bond counsel had said that during smaller elections, passing a referendum is harder than in a larger election.

Ms. Cassell supported the plan that Dr. Pruitt and her team had brought forward and she appreciated her prior experience in this type of engagement and going for a referendum. Mr. Cofsky supported the resolution with the understanding that the Board of Education will provide clear guidance in terms of priority.

The large number of votes that were cast indicates the community's high level of interest in this issue, while the near-tie reveals a community that is evenly split in its views. The administration believes a number of factors contributed to residents voting "no," including the overall cost of the project, a desire to fund the project only with cash reserves, the cost

to taxpayers, the demolition of the current parking garage, and concern about whether long-term facilities needs were fully vetted.

In the past five years, the District has had two long-term facilities planning committees, multiple pool committees, and the strategic planning process. Yet an impasse exists when it comes to addressing facilities issues. It seems clear that what is needed is a different process, one that goes beyond pools, locker rooms, performing arts classrooms, etc., and ask the question: What are the instructional needs of the next generation of learners and how should the high school's facilities be altered to meet those needs? Internal stakeholders clearly need to be involved in the next steps. Additionally, the administration believes a process that also more broadly and deeply involves community residents and community partners is essential to resolving these questions.

The Board of Education recessed at 8:20 p.m. and resumed at 8:36 p.m.

**Public  
Comments**

John Duffy distributed a written statement to the Board of Education and summarized it in his oral comments: He expressed gratitude and hopefulness with the recent efforts the Board of Education and administration had taken in fostering racial equity. CEEE knows it has been heard. The adoption of the non-tracked Civics Class is bold effort. The visit to Evanston Township High School was admirable, and he looked forward to hearing the report at the December 22 meeting. He looks for more from the Board of Education regarding other things that will affect racial impact, which could be the guiding force. It is important to have community involvement, as these efforts will contribute to greater learning and the success for all of our students. In the meantime, what must be remembered is that students can't wait too long. Indeed, they have been waiting for generations. Involving community and other representatives more fully is important. Research shows that students must have safe places, the rosters must reflect the perfect diversity of the school, and teachers must reflect and identify the talents of students. Qualitative research is necessary. He suggested reaching out to pro bono consultants. He thanked the Board of Education for exercising moral leadership and asked them to continue to act responsibility so that all stakeholders can more forward as have other districts.

**Personnel  
Recommendations**

Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the Personnel Recommendations, as presented; seconded by Ms. Cassell. A roll call vote resulted in six ayes and one nay. Motion carried.

**Closed Session**

At 8:41 p.m., Mr. Weissglass moved to enter closed session for the purpose of discussing the appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of specific employees of the District or legal counsel for the District, including hearing testimony on a complaint lodged

against an employee or against legal counsel for the District to determine its validity. 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(1), as amended by PA. 99-646; seconded by Ms. Cassell. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

At 10:12 p.m., the Board of Education recessed its Special Board meeting until after the Committee of the Whole Meeting.

The Board of Education resumed its closed session at 11:31 p.m. At 12:10 a.m., the Board of Education resumed the open session.

**Adjournment**

At 12:11 a.m., on Wednesday, December 13, 2016, Dr. Moore moved to adjourn the Special Board Meeting; seconded by Mr. Arkin. A voice vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Jeff Weissglass  
President

Sara Dixon Spivy  
Secretary