

August 28, 2014

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

**Call to Order**

President Phelan called the meeting to order at 6:37 p.m. A roll call indicated the following Board of Education members were present: Thomas F. Cofsky, Dr. Steven Gevinson, Dr. Ralph H. Lee, Dr. Jackie Moore, Sharon Patchak Layman, John Phelan, and Jeff Weissglass. Also present were Dr. Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant Clerk of the Board.

**Closed Session**

At 6:39 p.m. on Thursday, August 28, 2014, Mr. Phelan moved to enter closed session for the purpose of discussing the appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of specific employees of the District or legal counsel for the District, including hearing testimony on a complaint lodged against an employee or against legal counsel for the District to determine its validity. 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(1), as amended by PA.93—57; Collective negotiating matters between the District and its employees or their representatives or deliberations concerning salary schedules for one or more classes of employees. 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(2); seconded by Mr. Weissglass. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

At 7:25 p.m., the Board of Education returned to open session and moved to the Little Theatre at 7:39 p.m.

**Visitors**

Joining the meeting were Michael Carioscio, Chief Information Officer; Amy Hill, Director of Assessment and Research; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Dr. Gwen Walker-Qualls, Interim Director of Pupil Personnel; Karin Sullivan, Director of Communications and Community Relations; Joey Cofsky, Student Council Liaison Representative; and Sheila Hardin, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair. Also visiting were: Karen Anderson; Doreen Berger, Nikita & Lilia Bondanvenko; Harry Carpenter; Rob Carpenter; K. Christmas; Karen Cofsky; Joe & Dana Connell, Community; Curtis Cruver, Community; Karen Fischer; Parnell Flynn; Tom and Sonja Hall; Todd Huseby; Gary & Krista Kaplan; Mary Rose Lambke; Kurt Mackey; Anthony Nowak; Arlene Pedraza; Mary Roberts; Peter Ryan, Steve Shorney; Ian Silber; Lisa Sorensen; Karen Steward-Nolan; Bill Sullivan; Deborah Weiss; Karin West; Mary Haley, League of Women Voters; Patrick Brosnan and Rob Wroble of Legat Architects; Alan Stettler of Henry Bros.; Rebecca Bibbs of the Oak Leaves; Robert Zummallen, Director of Buildings and Grounds; Nancy Heezen OPRFHS Staff; Marianne Birko of WSSRA; and Terry Dean of the Wednesday Journal.

**Public  
Comments**

Bill Sullivan, resident of 825 Home Avenue, Oak Park and president of OPYBS Board of Directors, representing 1500 families playing baseball and softball, thanked the Ad Hoc committee and the Board of Education for rescinding the recommendation to build the natatorium upon the baseball diamond as it was configured and represented August 19, 2014. Since the ad

hoc committee previously rejected putting courts on top of natatorium, he presumed that was still off the table. As such, tennis may be pushed off campus. At this time, regardless of the decisions or future proposals, he felt that the ad hoc committee needed to be expanded to have representations from the Park District, the hierarchy of PAC, Partner, affiliates of AYSOP, Huskie football, etc., so that all stakeholders could be considered. They were available for support during this process.

Karen Steward-Nolan, resident of 739 block of Hayes, Oak Park and community member for 10 years, thanked the Board of Education for the careful thought and planning that had gone into swimming community. She shared her thoughts about PE, swimming, TOPS, etc. OPRF is a swimming community, dedicated to health and fitness, and absent a quality pool. Aquatics supported the process, noting that replacement of the existing facilities was inefficient and it would not address the growing student population. She believed the best solution was to use the site of the parking garage. She did note that this was not about pitting one group against the other. It was about serving future generations.

Ian Silver, resident of 228 Wesley Avenue, Oak Park, thanked the Board of Education for exploring the question of field size, acknowledging the amount of time that was spent accumulating information to do its due diligence. Every year delay will add 5% to the cost of construction. He asked the Board of Education to be bold in using the information it already had. First, pick a spot, and then get more details about pricing, parking, etc. Determining the site will allow the architects/designers to do their jobs properly. Making a pool is the right thing for OPRFHS to do, as it will be used for the next 50 to 80 years.

Joe Connell, 538 N. Elmwood, Oak Park, thanked the administration, the finance ad hoc committee, and the Board of Education. He noted that the pools at the high school intersect with youth at a most important time. Students numbering 77,200 learned how to survive instead of drown in the high school pools; it is a life-long activity learned under the direction of teachers and coaches. He felt that cost of a new pool would have its own payback, just as had the stadium, science labs, auditorium, dark rooms, etc., and it was worth it. The pool is used during all PE periods and after school until 7:00 p.m. or later by paying partners, i.e., TOPS, etc. A new pool will impact another 77,200 students in future years.

Steve Shorney, resident of 559 Park Avenue, River Forest, spoke of his personal swimming experience of having swam through college, noting that he continues to do so. Both his son and daughter are active in other sports. He believed that if the Board of Education decided not to determine a site now after all of the information had been received, it was being dysfunctional. He wanted the Board of Education to stay committed to the current timeline.

Curtis Cruver, resident of 159 Linden, Oak Park, noted that building a regular pool was an important step for the two villages, although because he lives across the street, it was not his favorite site. Linden Avenue is an already busy street and he was disenfranchised when the curve out was installed. He was

concerned about traffic and parking. The school should pursue vacating North Scoville Avenue to expand field or however it can be used best.

Deborah Weiss, resident of 208 S. East Avenue, Oak Park, supported a new pool as she wanted outstanding facilities. She opposed the vacating of Scoville Avenue south of Lake Street because of its access to Pilgrim Church, its daycare, the Farmers' Market, etc. Already there is much traffic from Fenwick and OPRFHS on East Avenue. If this site is chosen, residents will fight this at the village level.

Lisa Sorenson, resident of 138 S. East Avenue, Oak Park, a 22-year resident with 3 years on East Avenue, concurred with her neighbor and urged the Board of Education not to close South Scoville Avenue between Lake and South Blvd. She suggested the Board of Education members spend some mornings and afternoons watching how viable and busy that small stretch of street is. While she lives on East, she avoids it because she knows it is too busy. Traffic is backed up with 7 or 8 cars deep, bike riders, pedestrians, skateboarders, etc. It is a well-used thoroughfare to high school, Pilgrim, the Farmers market, and softball fields. She hoped that traffic studies were being conducted. Her preference would be for the parking garage as it does not look like it is being overly used and it could be used in other ways.

Kurt Mackey, 518 S. Kenilworth, Oak Park, was disturbed when he found out about the consideration of a new pool. While he is a sports addict and supported students developing on athletic fields, he had questions as a taxpayer. The school was supposed to be a partner with the park district and the village and yet brand new facilities now exist across the street. While arguments are that there is not enough space, the high school is landlocked, he never sees it. The Park District loses a \$1 million per year. Is this the best use of the money? He felt by partnering with other agencies it would reduce the costs to the taxpayers.

Tom Hall, resident of 304 N. Grove, Oak Park, was born and raised here and his grandchildren currently attend OPRFHS. He has been involved with the community for 40 years. Among other contributions to the community, he started the GALA Fourth of July Fireworks. He stated that a 50-meter facility with seating for large events is needed and offered his help.

Mary Roberts, 818 N. Grove, Oak Park, noted that this has been an evolutionary process and she had spoken for the students who swim in the pools. Although she did not go to OPRFHS, the vision at her high school was that every student would have a swimming component through PE. As a result of vision, she is an adult swimmer today. It is a life-long exercise. She encouraged the Board of Education to come to a decision on this process and she recommended a regulation long-course pool. She asked the Board of Education to continue with the momentum to make a swift and informed decision. She thanked the Board of Education for its time and she asked it to think of the good of the entire community—for the next 77,200 children who will graduate from OPRFHS.

Gary Kaplan, resident of 1026 Woodbine, Oak Park, thanked the Board of Education and the committee for doing something courageous and stepping back and reconsidering its decision. That is not easy to do. He quoted, "Wisdom often does not come at all, so it should not be rejected because it comes late." He believed the consensus of the Oak Parkers was to put the new pool on the site of the current parking garage and that is where he believed the Board of Education and committee should focus their attention.

Tony Nowak, resident of 825 N. Cuyler, Oak Park and of the Oak Park Boys Softball, thanked the Board of Education for not only reconsidering this decision but for the transparent process it used. What was alarming was to have the information as to the change in dimensions at the last minute. He agreed with the recommendation to put the pool on the parking garage site and save the fields.

Mr. Phelan stated that this process has been longer than most people know. He appreciated the 3 Board of Education members and the others who have picked it up as they go on. He explained process for edification. The pools were built 80 years ago with a life expectancy of 50 years. Recently, as a result of regulatory changes under the ADA, the IDPH and the Virginia Graeme Baker Act, maintenance costs have been increasing and the diving program was forced to move off campus. Students have complained not only about the worst aquatics facilities of their peer schools, but of respiratory and discomfort issues because the pools are too old. In the winter of 2011/12, discussion started about replacement of the current pools. A committee led by Stantec, a consultant chosen because of its familiarity with then-recent park district studies, was convened. Ms. Patchak-Layman and Amy McCormack served as Board representatives on that committee, along with several administrators, Legat Architect representatives and Henry Brothers Construction representations. The committee was led by former Chief Financial Officer, Cheryl Witham. Later in 2012, due to increasing enrollment projections, a Long-Term Facilities Committee was convened. Ms. Patchak-Layman and Dr. Lee were appointed to serve on that committee along with many of the Stantec committee representatives, with the exception of Stantec. Ms. Witham also led that committee.

March 29, Stantec issued a written report. At the end of April 2013, the Board of Education turned over and Mr. Phelan was elected as president. In June 2013, the Long-Term Facilities Committee (LTFC) held its last meeting and had been asked to consider questions concerning the pools. In September 2013, Rob Wroble of Legat Architects presented the recommendation of the Stantec Committee as modified by the LTFC as well as the basic report of the LTFC, which noted that enrollment was projected to increase and the progress of the LTF proposals was awaiting a decision on the pool. The pool recommendations presented by Mr. Wroble included the options awaiting a decision on the pool. Mr. Wroble presented the pool recommendation options of 3 sites: 1) the baseball field, 2) the parking garage and 3) the tennis courts. When discussions first started, the question of whether the proposed pool building would be more expensive if the square footage was kept the same, but the building was made narrower by moving some of the facilities to the ends of the building was raised. Mr. Wroble agreed to look into that option. He did

and Mr. Phelan thought it was great news. It appeared that the pool could be built on the baseball field and with the more narrow design, the tennis courts and softball fields could be left alone. Only the baseball field would need to be moved. Baseball would get a new field, everything would fit and a structure could be created with minor inconvenience. This option was presented on August 19 with the unanimous recommendation of the summer group. Many of those who heard that recommendation for the first time and know baseball better than he stated that the drawings were off—that it would not fit. Upon revising the drawings to add the details of fencing, dugouts, etc., it was discovered that they were correct. The summer group met again on Tuesday morning and determined that the expected and recommended solution would not work and therefore withdrew its recommendation. At that meeting and since, a great deal of discussion concerning the pool had occurred. Many are proposing creative solutions, others are revisiting solutions that been taken off the table. Many are advocating one or another of the alternatives that were left on the table by the LFTC.

Timing is important and the school has 3, possibly 4, options on the table for which feasibility studies have been performed. Drawings need to begin or this will be delayed by a year. If other options are added, it is likely that the project will be delayed and will incur the costs associated with doing so. Delay in a decision about the pool will also likely cause a delay on the broader LFT plans. Yet, a delay would provide time to take a more deliberate approach to the remaining questions. He asked the Board of Education members to respond to the following questions.

- 1) Pool or no pool?
- 2) Olympic or other?
- 3) On what site?
- 4) How should it be paid for?

Mr. Phelan asked if there were consensus on anything at this point, noting that he thought there was a Board of Education's consensus on an Olympic pool, but it had not been put to a vote. William Blair have given financing options for the pool and the LTF plan previously. In December, the Board of Education approved a site feasibility study, soil borings, analyzation of the locations, and obtaining more specific costs. Costs are estimates because the materials are yet to be selected. On April 15, Legat and Henry Bros. provided a range of proposals and costs for the sites. Mr. Phelan thought there was consensus at that meeting, but he wanted consensus this evening. At the May meeting, he had suggested exploring the property south of Lake Street on Scoville. None of the options were obvious. Tennis courts on the roof were prohibited. Building the pool on top of the parking garage would have limited use. The tennis court location was far from the building and would require replacing an existing athletic program. Following that meeting, he asked Mr. Cofsky to join him, the architect, construction manager, athletic director, PE division head, Chief School Business Official, and the Superintendent to evaluate Lake Street, leaving the tennis court location off of the options. He apologized if other Board of Education members felt that was an option. The building was made narrower so as not to take more field space. The architects said they could make the building narrower, and the baseball and softball fields would not be impacted. When the recommendation was made August 19, it

was a unanimous. After public comment, they looked at the details around the fields and realized it would not fit as determined. While it could be made to fit, no one wanted to put it on the baseball field. At that point, the committee decided to withdraw its recommendation and keep the baseball field as an option and move this to a discussion as to what to do next.

Mr. Phelan looked at the issue as being similar to the Strategic Plan, having a narrow objective, not pitting one sport against the other and looking at the lifestyle health of the community. That was the reason for forming the FAC. Costs like this are borne by high schools across the country on a regular basis. That is how the Little Theatre, the auditorium, and the baseball and softball fields got built; the costs were spread over a period of time. He favored having a pool. The size of the water would not drive the cost of the facility; it was the right choice or the consensus of the Board of Education. Where the pool should be located is a decision to be made, perhaps next month. He felt the way high schools financed these types of expenses was to spread them over a long a period of time and to ask the residents for vote on a referendum. He hoped for consensus on having a pool, its size, and to eliminate one or two of the sites where there is no interest. Between now and next month, if the range is narrowed, information would be gathered i.e., parking, traffic, cost of the parking garage, etc. and Board of Education questions gathered. A decision is needed to determine a path.

Mr. Altenburg stated that the cost of the garage would be \$3.1 million, which is \$2.6 million in principal and \$400,000 in interest.

Mr. Cofsky needed no additional information but choose to share his thoughts after having been involved in the process. This is a complex issue and it does not have an easy solution. He appreciated both the written and public comments. While progress has been made, it is still early in the process. Whether a pool is needed or wanted, what site location, and how should it be paid for are questions that are difficult to unbundle. Yes, from a process standpoint, the District has to go one step at a time. A pool is needed and the Board of Education must choose a site, so that the cost can be determined, and then decisions made about financing, including public involvement. He was not ready to make a decision on the size of the pool. The work that had been done was on an Olympic pool. He understood that the incremental cost that was looked at is not unusually significant and yet it would add much value in terms of programs, so he was leaned toward the recommendation of Olympic pool.

While Dr. Lee believed a new pool was needed, he did not believe all of the practical sites had been considered. He expected to present additional sites in the next couple of days. The parking garage choice would only be painless if the people who have not had the wherewithal to put together an organized effort to press their agendas are ignored. Tearing down the garage would not be painless and a waste of money to tear down an expensive structure. That garage has the asset of keeping a certain number of cars off the street. While he has heard the proposition that Oak Park is becoming a village where more and more people are walking or riding their bikes, the people who park their cars in the garage will not switch to riding their bikes or walking. He wanted

to be on record that the parking garage option is not that simple. The effect of cars on the street, looking for parking by teachers, staff, and administrators in the building is not being considered. The value of that garage has been underrated, at least publically, to this point. Dr. Lee would rather an Olympic pool, but he could not express his preference without taking into consideration of the location. Bigger is better only under some circumstances.

Dr. Moore agreed that a new pool was necessary. If anything less than an Olympic pool is built, people will eventually ask when something bigger will be built because of increasing enrollment. The middle schools were rebuilt because they were too small and some children had to have lunch at 9:30 a.m. Rehab and construction is inconvenient, messy, and loud, and there is no easy solution. In thinking about the residents of north Linden, she too hears the band practicing in the evening and the sounds of life at the high school at her home. Many times her driveway is blocked because people are at events at the high school. She believes, however, that the parking garage site makes the most sense for the community and it would connect it to the other athletics facilities to the high school. Paying for this with a referendum is the only way that this will feel like a true, community product/project. She wondered about an IGA with the Village and the Park District, having to pay for the parking garage. She felt that number should be negotiated, knowing that this product was not only used by the high school. Parking is a nightmare here. The current parking structure's spaces are too narrow and the layout is not good. She felt a parking study was needed. The Board of Education has to be mindful that staff and students do that park there. If the community is not early for an event, they have to look for other options because it gets full. She was confused about the order of decisions and she had questions about the renovation of the current site and reservations about the cost and why the costs for building the pool and renovating the existing space were separate.

Dr. Gevinson attended a meeting several months ago where administrators and board members sat with administrators from the Elmwood Park High School. He asked what Elmwood Park was doing about swimming. The response was that they put a floor over it. That is not the OPRFHS philosophy; a pool is needed. An Olympic size is preferable, but a place is needed to build it. He too had options and wanted to know the process to use if other options were going to be presented so not to delay the building of the pool. He did not believe the parking garage was underutilized. The 300 spaces are utilized during the daytime, beyond school hours, every day of the week. It is utilized whether it is hard to pull out of the spaces or not and it is used by many River Forest residents in the evening. He could not think of another high school where the faculty and staff do not have a place to park. This is a highly professional faculty and he could not think of a building a facility to solve a problem and then knocking it down. He believed the principle under which the Board of Education should operate is that it wants to do the greatest good for the greatest number of people, understanding that this will not solve the problem permanently for everyone and somebody will be upset. He believed by the temperance of the comments that evening that people understand that this is a difficult tradeoff. Also when he was an administrator and a teacher, he walked from South Oak Park to the school nearly every day and he took the Scoville Avenue route to and from school. His experience was that there was

not much traffic along that route. He too felt a traffic study should be conducted. Scoville dead ends at Washington St, so one cannot have traffic coming down an artery. He felt over the long-term, it would be better to have an athletic expanse that went from East Avenue to Ridgeland. He supported a referendum.

Mr. Weissglass thanked everyone for their comments. He appreciated all of the work of the committee this summer, all of the work that went into the last 2 ½ years and thanked Mr. Phelan for the history. He was grateful for community input, as it was particularly helpful in this instance. He felt the 2 critical questions were: 1) what is the best option for a new pool, assuming it would be a 50-meter pool; and 2) what is the best alternative to an onsite 50-meter pool. He preferred an on-site, 50-meter pool for all of the reasons stated and as a former high school and college athlete. Although he did not swim, his soccer coach was a swim coach. All 3 sites have negatives to them. He was concerned about students walking across the street in the winter and because of the traffic. He preferred the parking garage, but only if the parking issue can be addressed, as it impacts the employees of the high school. No parking study has been completed. Some walkthroughs of the garage during the day showed a high capacity of 250 to 300 cars. The parking garage is used. If it is torn down and staff and teachers are pushed out, students may be pushed to park even further away. None of his direct neighbors are at this meeting and they would be very unhappy to hear him say tear down the parking garage, but at the same time they were activists who felt parking could be solved. IHSA requires parking in order to hold some of the state events. He wanted a parking study conducted.

Mr. Weissglass continued that the best alternative needed to be considered. Perhaps the goals cannot be accomplished on any site. The Board of Education needs to consider:

1) The consensus of the majority of the Board of Education members was for a 50-meter pool. In April, the Board of Education learned that the pool would cost \$35 million or more, not \$18 million. More discussion needs to occur on this matter and he was uncomfortable with those numbers. On the matrix last week, for the first time, it indicated the estimated capital costs to reconstruct the existing pools would be \$18 million. Prior to that, it was stated that the cost would be prohibitive or could not be done. He needed to understand whether the existing pool could be renovated.

2) A backup plan needs to be put forth should an agreed upon referendum fail. More discussion should occur on the 25-yard pool and possibility the renovation of the existing pool or offsite collaboration. However, Mr. Weissglass acknowledged that the high school uses the pool all of the time and it would be difficult to share it with others.

If a new pool were built, he supported going for a referendum, but if the garage site were used and parking addressed, he might support doing so without a referendum.

Ms. Patchak-Layman sat on the planning committees when this was first talked about by the school. Initial conversations were about a recommendation from a



community member to cover the pool at Ridgeland Commons. Even before looking at Stantec, research began on how pools were used for other communities, what could be achieved for \$2 or \$3 million, and partnering with the Park District. It was determined that the high school could not do that at the time and that its own pools needed work. The conversation with Stantec was 1) should the pools be fixed, 2) should new pools be built, or 3) should a pool be built off campus. For her it started with the combination of what the pool would look like and what happens to the students during this time. If the pools were fixed just because of the state requirements, they would be smaller and students would not have use of the pools as they were being constructed. For many years, there has been limited ability for students to swim. Because of state rules, knowing that they would be reduced in size because of the size of the apron, where could they bump up here or there, always some part of the program that would be affected. The option of the Fieldhouse, if moved east or west, and moved up, would be too costly. That was the turning point for the committee that the pools needed to be outside of where they were. The first reiteration had 10 places of open space as possibilities, i.e., the mall, Lake Street, fields, inside of the parking garage, etc. Many of those sites were eliminated. Students having to go back and forth and the need for additional security, eliminated the mall and Lake Street sites. When this came to the Board of Education, the study covered working with a stretch pool or smaller and eliminating the large pool. The other consideration was not just what happened to students during the day, but to outside groups such as TOPS, West Suburban Recreation, etc. The athletic department was able to provide charts as to who was using the pool, when, free time, etc. It was a good visual for the community and Board of Education. What is in place will help all visualize all of the possibilities. They looked at the most important activities, i.e., can the PE Program and the after-school program relocate for a year, or two years? The LTFP looked at whether the west pool could be pushed and a stretch pool could be put in by moving into the mall area. She hoped only to spend \$20 million. They toyed with the idea of having it offsite, but an onsite pool was needed and that added dollars. They settled for an onsite location and it became the field to the west, and, for her, not across Lake Street. She favored the parking garage, because she had seen student parking permits go from 200 to 125. The high school would have to get more specific as to who is parking on what lot. She felt it could be a more orderly process and spaces could be assigned. Another consideration would be the Oak Park and Lake Street parking garage for students; they could walk from there, as many students walk from even longer distances. The advantages of having a pool connected to the high school and part of the athletic facilities far outweighs the planning to be done for parking. She moved to wanting an Olympic size because she wanted the public to have access to the pool, and not just when the high school is not using it, much like the tennis courts and Lake Street fields, designating open times. The public needs to know that is an option because of the cost. This should be paid for with the fund balance and anything above that should come from a referendum for repurposing the present pools. She believed the community would support having a larger facility. She had no interest in the west field. She wanted to avoid the density of buildings, the east field because of the increase in activity and because it would be a separate entity. She liked it on Lake Street, being part of the mainstream. If the pool were shared and

used by not only adults but other feeder schools, it would serve more than just the 77200 student swimmers.

With regard to timeline, Mr. Altenburg reported that a decision would have to be made by October 1, if the process were to start next July to minimize the disruption of the school. Legat has to work through the systemic development, i.e., going out for bids, getting board approval, awarding subcontracts, getting materials, which would take 10 months. If Henry Bros. and Legat were authorized to move forward with design and bid it out, it could be fast tracked and done in 9 months. If the referendum passed in April, they would be ready with contracts, and could start in July. While construction could start later in the summer, the benefits to starting construction earlier is that a super structure can be built so that trades could work indoor under cover. Either way it will take two winter seasons to complete. A 5% average escalation of costs is anticipated or \$1.5 million. Mr. Phelan noted that if other options were taken into consideration, a decision could not be made by October 1. The design bid award timeline is 10 months and the questions regarding a referendum and permanent financing must be answered. The site also has to be chosen.

Mr. Altenburg stated that to renovate the present pools so that they complied with the Illinois Department of Public Health, it would cost \$18.8 million. The west pool would be shifted north and east to accommodate wider lanes and bleachers on north. The east pool would be shifted north and east. The balcony would shift to the weight room and the locker rooms would be affected.

The deadline for putting a referendum on the ballot is in January. This fall there is no election date. The next election date would be April 2016.

If the design and bid did not start before the referendum, it would take another 10 months to get to the point of building a super structure. The school needs to release the team to do the design and bid process. Once the referendum passed, they would get the grading, excavation and steel and were confident it could be done in 9 months.

Dr. Lee did not understand why the costs of tearing down the two existing pools in order to make other use of that space was not part of the building the new swimming pools.

Mr. Phelan recapped the responses to his original questions:

- 6.5 Board of Education members wanted a new pool
- 6 wanted an Olympic sized pool and 2 were unsure
- 6.5 supported a referendum

With regard to locations, he asked if other proposals should be considered. Did the Board of Education want to start next year?

Dr. Moore noted the lengthy process that had already occurred and she could not imagine a site that was not yet considered. She asked for a list to know that every location was exempted for one reason or another.

Dr. Gevinson and Dr. Lee felt two sites had not yet been mentioned. Dr. Gevinson suggested overlapping the baseball diamond with the football field and putting home plate at the south west corner of the stadium and having a temporary backstop. Only 75 more feet is needed to get the baseball diamond there. Going as far as the bleachers on Linden left much room for things besides softball. During baseball many things are occurring and while scheduling would be difficult, he was not sure how difficult. The pool building would then be north of the baseball diamonds. North of the baseball field or on north end of tennis courts and shift everything down. That was a better option for him and people could sit on the first baseline. If one could capture Scoville Avenue and move the tennis courts to Scoville, then the swimming pool could be at the tennis court site. Scoville is not wide enough for the tennis courts so one would have to capture some of the athletic field. He believed that 8 courts could be built if the parking spaces were captured. Even if that was not done, Scoville has tennis courts for matches. This option would not do anything to the fields, capture space, make a shorter track, and a field hockey field could be lost.

Dr. Lee wanted a couple of days to get more information in order to assess his option. Mr. Phelan directed Dr. Lee to work with the administration. A vote will be taken at the September meeting or if not, the decision will be put off for another year. Mr. Wroble stated that the companies who would be providing the parking and traffic were confident they could gather the information and give a read out by the September meeting, but might not have a finished product at that time. Both consultants would do a survey of existing conditions, get an understanding of current situation, and identify what need to be changed, including the additional increased enrollment of students and staff.

The reason for doing these studies is that some of the members were not in consensus that more sites should be added to the ones presented. That is the reason for the discussion and vote at the next meeting. Dr. Gevinson noted that Ms. Patchak-Layman had asked if the baseball idea was considered and it was not. Originally, it was on that site.

It was the consensus of the majority of the Board of Education members not take to any of current sites off the table.

Discussion ensued about the cost of the traffic and parking studies. Ms. Patchak-Layman believed that the village had traffic and parking studies and Dr. Moore felt that if that information was available, it should be used. The many issues beyond what has been discussed with regard to traffic was concerning. The ramifications would be important to know. Dr. Isoye noted that no response has been received from the village on the availability of these studies. If none are available, then the administration will work with the other companies. Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that this is not just about today as this is the benchmarks but the possibilities of what can occur on the street. The 2-hour parking restriction would have to be changed in order to put parking on the street. How many on parking on the street, how do they make that distinction when making a parking study? It was noted that the consultants could not predict what the village would do with regard to parking restrictions. They could tell how many are legal spaces exist and how many could be made

legal and provide the knowledge as to the range of the impact of having 300 more cars on the street on a daily basis. It was noted that Park District drawings showed that what was behind Scoville was the end of a storm drain and no utilities. Would the consultants contact the police and fire departments? What was the deadline for meeting with the village?

Mr. Phelan stated that from preliminary discussions with the village, he did not feel that acquiring the Scoville stub would be a problem, although it would require public hearings and there is public resistance. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked for 1) a list of requirements from the village and the timeline for that space, 2) what the process and timeframe would be for all of the activities with regard to selling the parking garage to the high school or using the street, and 3) the process and timeline for obtaining a variance on the building on west field. Mr. Wroble stated that not enough was known about the final decision and the length of the building. If there the building were 5 ft. into the setback, it could reduce the building by 5 ft. Mr. Phelan stated that at the time of the vote on the site, the Board of Education will not have determined every detail that will be needed. There are many hurdles yet to navigate. Mr. Cofsky asked the cost of the architect and the engineering services to be done upfront prior to the referendum. Mr. Phelan stated that when the information is gathered, a special meeting may have to be called between now and the regular meeting in September.

Recessed to Board room at 10:22 p.m. and resumed at 10:35 p.m.

- |                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <b>FOIA Requests</b>           | Ms. Kalmerton reported that 8 FOIA requests had been received and 7 were resolved.  |
| <b>Student Council Report</b>  | None  |
| <b>Faculty Report</b>          | Ms. Hardin reported that the faculty was enjoying the start of school year, and she thanked the staff and administrators who worked over the summer. It was a strong, first start. She noted that the faculty was extremely concerned at the comments and quickness with which some people are willing to get rid of the parking garage. The faculty and staff are all important and extremely concerned. With regard to the number of student permits being down as stated earlier, she noted that permits were not issued before the parking garage was built. Out of respect, faculty members were asked not to come to this meeting as said she said she would report this for them. She was concerned. |
| <b>Superintendent's Report</b> | Dr. Isoye reported that faculty and staff were welcomed back from summer break on Thursday, August 14, with the District's traditional Institute Day breakfast. Of particular note, this year OPRFHS welcomed 25 new faculty members, representing 10% of the faculty. Institute Day and Friday's staff development sessions included updates on key changes in state testing, school technology, and safety practices, opportunities for engagement on the vision, mission, and goals of the strategic plan, divisional collaboration time, and the first meeting of the 2014-2015 learning strands.   |

Dr. Isoye reported that 850 freshman students were welcomed on Monday, August 19, with the sixth annual Huskie Kick-Off day. They participated in activities throughout the day that were led by 225 upper-class mentors. The students walked through their schedule and met their teachers in the classroom. Sophomores, juniors and seniors returned for classes on Tuesday, August 20. As of August 28, 2014, enrollment stands at 3,298 students.

Dr. Isoye reported that all fall sports teams began competing this week.

- Boys Golf placed fifth out of 18 teams at the prestigious Mt. Carmel invitational last Saturday.
- The football team—ranked #18 in the state—plays at No. 8-ranked Lincoln Way East on Friday night at 7:30 pm.

Dr. Isoye reported that both students nominated to participate in the American Chemical Society (ACS) Annual Scholarship Examination in Chemistry last spring received top awards. This is an extremely difficult chemistry test. Junior Conrad Brenneman was the 3<sup>rd</sup> highest-scoring student and won \$2,500, while junior Arjun Rawal placed 4<sup>th</sup> and received \$1,500.

The following items were removed from consent agenda: A.5., Construction Supervisor; B. Amendment of Policies; and D. Minutes

#### **Consent Items**

Mr. Phelan moved to approve the following consent items; seconded by Mr. Cofsky.

- Monthly Treasurer's Report
- Personnel Recommendations, including New Hires, Transfers, Status Changes, Rescind Resignation, Retirements, and Resignations
- Contracts with Thrive
- Contract with All-Ways Medical Transportation
- Contract with Special Education Systems Transportation for Hillside Academy
- RFP for Beverages
- Policies for First Reading
  - Policy 2:260, Uniform Grievance Procedure
  - Policy 5:10, Equal Employment Opportunity and Minority Recruitment
  - Policy 5:20, Workplace Harassment
  - Policy 7:20, Harassment of Students Prohibited

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

#### **Construction Supervisor**

Mr. Phelan moved to approve the construction supervisor position, as presented; seconded by Dr. Lee. Discussion ensued. Ms. Patchak-Layman understood that from reading contract with Henry Bros is more than just one person, it is also accounting, site safety, and estimating. If a construction supervisor was hired, who would do those things? If a construction supervisor is hired, does the high school have liability for the subcontractors? The response was that the District's attorney, pending Board of Education approval, will rewrite the contracts for Legat and it will assume the responsibility of Henry Bros., and Legat will have a general contractor who would do some of

the work that the construction manager would do at no extra cost. The liability will rest with general contractor. The construction supervision will be a liaison between the architect and the general manager. The amount of general contract work will be reduced because a piece has been removed. Legat will do the estimating process when the high school goes through the 14-month process and Mr. Zummallen will work with Legat, as he has in the past, to describe/form that scope of work. Legat will get the estimates of all of the work when the general trades come in. This will not include the work of the pool, as an architect and construction management service would be needed for the pool. Legat has the same database and cliental and OPRFHS will have still have plenty of bidders. The in-house construction supervisor can help with the pool. Larger projects often have an architect, construction management firm and an owners' representative. The reason for this model at this time is that since 2008, OPRFHS has been aggressive in its projects and now as the scope of the work decreases, it is only dealing with 1 or 2 possible trades. Thus, it does not make economic sense to have a construction management service. Whether this position would be eliminated in 2022 would depend on the LTFC that will reconvene and if the scope of the work already on the docket is expanded. This would be a non-affiliated, staff/administrative support position.

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

**Amendment of Policies**

Mr. Phelan moved to amend the following policies, as presented; seconded by Dr. Moore. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

1. Policy 1:30, School Philosophy
2. Policy 4:100, Insurance
3. Policy 4:170, Safety
4. Policy 4:175, Convicted Child Sex Offender; Criminal Background Check and/or Screen; Notifications
5. Policy 5:35, Compliance with the Fair Labor Standards Act
6. Policy 5:180, Temporary Illness or Temporary Incapacity
7. Policy 5:280, Duties and Qualifications
8. Policy 6:150, Home and Hospital Instruction

**Policy 7:250**

Dr. Gevinson moved to approve Policy 7250, Student Support Services, as amended; seconded by Dr. Moore. A voice vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Number 1, Line 3: Add word "or" after the word "disease" and keep in the struck out words.

**Minutes**

Mr. Phelan moved to approve the open and closed session minutes of May 22, May 27, and May 30, June 17 and June 26, and July 10, 2014 and to declare that the closed session audiotapes of December 2012 and January 2013 be destroyed; seconded by Dr. Lee. A voice vote resulted motion carried. Ms. Patchak-Layman objected to the destruction of the closed session audiotapes.

**Policy 7:250**

Dr. Gevinson moved to approve Policy 7250, Student Support Services, as amended; seconded by Dr. Moore. A voice vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Number 1, Line 3: Add word “or” after the word “disease” and keep in the struck out words.

**Board Member  
Conference Fees**

Mr. Phelan moved to approve Ms. Patchak-Layman’s request for the District to pay the registration for the Summit for Courageous Conversation, in New Orleans, October 25-29, 2014, per Policy 2:125, Board Member Expenses; seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in six ayes and one abstention. Mr. Weissglass abstained because he wanted more discussion on the work of Pacific Education Group. Motion carried.

**Superintendent  
Conference  
Registration Fee  
& Travel**

Mr. Phelan moved to approve Dr. Isoye’s request to attend the above out-of-state conferences; seconded by Dr. Moore. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Information will be provided to Board of Education members about any appropriate conferences in the future.

**Election  
Representative  
Designee**

Mr. Phelan moved to appoint Gail A. Kalmerton, as designated representative, to handle the receiving of petitions for the submission of a public question to referenda and forwarding them to the proper election officer and otherwise provide information to the community concerning District elections. Authority is further given to her to delegate authority to carry out these duties when she is absent; seconded by Dr. Lee. A voice vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

**Student Discipline  
Facilitator Proposal**

Mr. Phelan moved to approve the proposal and cost of no more than \$25,000 for the student discipline facilitators, Mr. Richard Gray and Mr. Gregory Hodge; seconded by Mr. Weissglass. Discussion ensued.

Dr. Moore explored people who were doing work with school reform. Dr. Isoye and she were able to have a conference call with Mr. Gray in which they discussed a framework and timeline and how he and his consultant, Mr. Hodge, would facilitate bringing forward changes to the Student Handbook by April. The most exciting aspect was the fact that at the end, it would not be about having a report but helping the Board of Education devise an action plan and the subsequent steps that would follow such a retreat. The process they will provide will be similar to that used for the Strategic Plan or the Board of Education goals in that the Board of Education will be able to talk about next steps. They will 1) interview Board of Education members and stakeholders, 2) convene focus groups, 3) review existing data and then use that to inform an agenda for the discipline retreat. The Board of Education will then be able to talk about the direction in terms of discipline policy and what its philosophy of discipline would be as it relates to the Strategic Plan.

Dr. Gevinson and Mr. Weissglass found this to be exciting and promising. Mr. Weissglass was impressed with the consultants' backgrounds and the plan between now and the Board of Education retreat made sense. He asked 1) how this work related to the work of the implementation teams around the equity piece, and 2) when will the PTAC discussion occur. PTAC member should be at the retreat to observe the Board of Education discussion. Implementation team members would also be invited to attend.

Mr. Phelan appreciated Dr. Moore's leadership in this endeavor.

The fee covers up through the retreat and a debriefing. It is similar to that as the consultants who were doing the special education review and what Dr. Alson charged for the Strategic Plan: \$1600 for full days of work for 2 people and their travel. Ms. Patchak-Layman knew the fees for the Strategic Plan were higher than what was initially proposed because additional activities were added, i.e., the number of focus groups, etc., and the amount of money was contingent on that fact. Dr. Moore stated that the District was told that the way this was scoped out, at the end of the process, the Board of Education would be equipped to move forward in terms of philosophy decisions, and be in alignment with the Strategic Plan and the implementation teams. They are highly trained facilitators who have done lots of this work for other school districts and the point of wanting more focus groups or more information that will not be an issue.

The contract will not exceed \$25,000.

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

### **Update on Strategic**

Dr. Isoye reported that during the first two days that the faculty and staff returned for the 2014-15 school year, August 14 and 15, they attended a variety of meetings, with some of the time devoted specifically to the strategic plan. The keynote addresses by Mr. Phelan, Dr. Isoye, and Mr. Rouse spoke about the strategic plan through various lens, i.e., a Board perspective, a vision from the district level, and the work in the building.

During the first day, the faculty and most staff were divided into interdepartmental groups. This was a chance for people to meet other people and to hear about the various perspectives that come from working with students in different capacities. The groups met for an hour to examine the vision and mission statements and to discuss their thoughts about two questions.

- 1) What would it look like in your work?
- 2) What would it look like for the whole school?

The following day each person was placed in a new interdepartmental group based on their interest in the goal areas. Individuals that did not submit an interest were assigned. The goal discussions lasted thirty minutes each and the groups were asked to reflect on two questions.

- 1) What are the current strengths at OPRFHS in relation to this goal?



2) What are the areas where we could improve related to this goal?

This discussion was to provide an opportunity hear perspectives from many working groups in the building and to hear how they interpreted the vision, mission, and goals as it relates to their sphere of influence with students and parents.

Dr. Isoye has sent out requests for participant in implementation team.

**Board of Education  
Goals Update**

The Board of Education discussed how to evaluate the goals that were approved at the July Board of Education meeting. Mr. Phelan's vision is to the extent that the implementation teams are set up quickly, the Board of Education can measure on energy and the number and the difference those ideas make and in order to have assessment, the Board of Education needs to send message that it is serious. The sheer number of ideas and success will be the determiner of the success.

Dr. Isoye noted that all of the implementation teams will have faculty the key leaders with an administrator present. Some DLT members have been told that their knowledge will be needed all of the time. Certain leaders have been told they could nominate other people. Mr. Phelan reiterated that the Board of Education was very serious about this and it wanted ideas and for these people to take ownership for opportunities they have not in the past. Ms. Hardin stated that Faculty Senate has strongly encouraged faculty to get involved. Mr. Weissglass felt the Strategic Plan was inspirational and game changing. It can happen by 1) getting people excited, 2) collaboration of people at the school, and 3) having funds available. When the Finance Committee discusses the marginal deficit and fund balance, it will want to talk about the degree to which the fund balance can be used to support innovations. Ultimately, any idea has to be supported but this is the one-time cost to experimental as to how they would be sustainable over time. The Board of Education wants to make resources available and it needs to figure how to do that and formalize that in the next process and it moves into the levy decision next year. Dr. Gevinson wanted a full scorecard rather than just incremental resources. Some things will not cost any money. Dr. Lee rebels at the idea of reinforcing an idea that already exists. The word "incremental" reinforces the notion that anything one does requires additional money, but some things have to be done instead of others. Mr. Weissglass noted that this form was designed for unbudgeted items. Finding new ideas to offset others is critical.

The groups that met on Institute Day were led by faculty and staff members. Everyone, including all staff, was in different groups. Notes were taken by a participant. In terms of vision and mission, Dr. Isoye heard that there may be trends, but he was not ready to report out on the information.

**Special Education  
External Review**

As an informational item, the Board of Education was informed that Dr. Judy Hackett and Dr. Tim Thomas had been chosen by the administration to lead the review of the Special Education Program. A PowerPoint presentation provided an overview of the scope of their work. The expected cost range will be from \$15,000 to \$22,500 based on an estimated 10 to 15 days of work and thus did not need formal Board of Education approval.

Both Dr. Hackett and Dr. Thomas work in large cooperative special education districts and have performed reviews upon request with various member districts. Due to their flexibility in their contracts they are allowed to do this work. They will issue a survey and meet with focus groups that will include parents, students, staff, and administration. While they will compare OPRFHS to one district, they would be open to more if the Districts can make suggestions.

The Special Education Department knows that this is the next step and everyone is on board. The consultants are very professional and knowledgeable.

Mr. Weissglass was happy to hear about the organizational design as to effectiveness and efficiency. The Finance Committee asked the question about whether increasing costs for outplaced students were a common trend or just at OPRFHS.

### **IGOV Request**

Mr. Weissglass and Dr. Gevinson provided a summary of the IGOV meeting of July 12, 2014, noting that there is interest in having a joint meeting of local governmental boards to discuss key fiscal issues, either on Saturday October 25 or November 1 from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. Legislative representations may also be invited. The proposed topics for discussion include:

1. Future fiscal viability of local governments. Are all positioned to be "sustainable" from that perspective, and can all work together to help address any limiting factors?
2. Govt. funding challenges (could be federal, state or local). Are there opportunities for the governing bodies to all work together in making a community case, rather than each pursuing its own concerns alone?
3. Oak Park economic development. How does each governing body currently contribute, and are there ways we could collectively do more? This could be very healthy.

Discussion ensued. Invitation for first annual 3 hour meeting with fellow elected officials to talk about things that are broader than the school's concerns, followed by barbeque for elected officials afterwards.

Discussion ensued about the requirements of the Open Meetings Act. It was noted that four members of the Board of Education would have to be present.

Mr. Phelan, as president, built relationships with the officials of the Village of Oak Park and River Forest so when there were things they had to talk about, they already knew each other. He worried that this was just a once a year attempt to build a relationship.

### **Summer Student Travel Experience**

Students and staff presented to the Instruction Committee about the summer travel experiences to Costa Rica, Japan, Florida, and Spain. The written material and pictures detailed some of their activities.

Dr. Moore's daughter went to Spain and the teachers were wonderful; they work 24-7. There is no substitute for travel in learning and it is great that the Board of Education and community supports and endorses it.

**HARBOR/  
Ombudsman  
Report**

An update regarding credits earned by students attending Ombudsman Educational Services (OES) and HARBOR Academy was provided to the Instruction Committee on August 19, 2014. Of the 25 students who were referred to HARBOR or OES, 17 attended one or both of the programs and 8 students attained graduation, all from the OES program.

The report suggests that OPRFHS students had significantly better results attending Ombudsman in terms of earning credit and graduating from high school. Discussion with the staff at HARBOR to determine how students can improve their Harbor experiences commenced. A particular area of challenge for students attending HARBOR is transportation. While the District provides Ventra cards and budgets for students taking public transportation to both locations, students can travel to OES with more ease and in less time.

A transportation line will be included in the budget for next year. If a student refuses to go, some are referred to Ombudsman. OPRFHS is explore options.

**Update on Teacher  
Performance Review/  
Professional Growth  
Plan**

The Instruction Committee received an update of the work of a Collaborative group of teachers and administrations on a revision to the teacher performance review/professional growth plan on August 19, 2014. This group sought to align the District's plan more closely with The Danielson Framework for Teaching (EFT) and to reinforce a main purpose of the teacher performance review: to provide a supportive growth process as faculty participate in required evaluation procedures as well as. A timeline and list of documents for the Teacher Evaluation Process was included in the packet. Commitment of faculty and administration for the next several years. This year look to implement with fidelity and revise existing documents and begin to talk about groups who are no classroom teachers, counselors, librarians, instructional coaches, closer to the Danielson model and how to pilot incorporation of student growth.

Mr. Weissglass was awed by the complexity of the work teachers do and he had a deep respect for it. The Board of Education made a very clear decision after much work on the Strategic Planning process that it wanted to think about race, socio-economic factors, SES, gender, not just race. Mr. Prale responded that Common Core is not a separate conversation. It would appear in pre-conferences as to what they want to accomplish and how will they will know if they have accomplished it. The concepts of Common Core and what is behind Common Core shows up there. The assessment of those standards and formative summative assessments may appear in the student growth component that will be piloted next year. When talking about standards, it is a parallel conversation about assessment. On the race question, not to discount the other two, gender and social economic, they talked specifically about race and achievement. Social economic, gender and Special Education issues are seen through the lens of racial equity. He felt that this captured social economic and special education, but not necessarily gender, although in the preconference form, a question is asked about who is the room and that

awareness would incorporate other aspects. Mr. Weissglass respectfully disagreed and noted that more discussion was needed.

PARCC is only one of three assessments for student growth. Students will get a level score on a 5-point scale. The rubrics for the various components of the test do delineate levels of proficiency. While several people would like student growth to be part of the assessment, it is happening, just not in the summative evaluation process. These documents will be used this year across the board.

Mr. Phelan applauded the collaborative effort to move this forward. He appreciate the effort put into this and he looked forward to collaboration and relationship building.

**New Business**

Dr. Lee wanted to go back to the style used in the last several meetings that was not observable tonight, an urgency to shorten conversations to place time restrictions on how much time is spent on each agenda item.

**District, Community,  
And State Reports**

A report on APPLAUSE! was included in the packet.

**Adjournment**

At 12:15 p.m., on August 28, 2014, Mr. Phelan moved to adjourn the Board of Education meeting; seconded by Dr. Moore. A voice vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

John Phelan  
President

Dr. Jackie Moore  
Secretary

Submitted by  
Gail Kalmerton  
Clerk of the Board