

A special meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on Tuesday, April 14, 2015 in the Board Room of the high school.

Call to Order

President Phelan called the meeting to order at 9:00 p.m. A roll call indicated the following members were present: Thomas F. Cofsky, Dr. Ralph H. Lee, Dr. Jackie Moore, Sharon Patchak Layman, Jeff Weissglass, and John Phelan. Also in attendance was Dr. Steve T. Isoye, Superintendent; Tod Altenburg, Chief School Business Official; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum & Instruction; Amy Hill, Director of Assessment and Learning; David Ruhland, Director of Human Resources; Sheila Hardin, Faculty Senate Representative; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Visitors

Representatives of Carl Walker, Inc., Liam Cribbin, Connie Coleman, Dana & Joel Connell, Sheree Johnson, Tom Kindler, Allison Lundeen, Community, Ellen Pimentel, Peter Ryan, Sara Spivy, Mark Trinka, Brandi Ambrose, Heidi Lynch, Kevin McKittrick, Carolyn Ojikutu, Christina Smith, OPRFHS faculty and staff; Ryan Borgdorff of the *Trapeze*, Jill Veland of the Village of Oak Park; Terry Dean of the *Oak Leaves*.

Public Comments

Mark Trinka, resident of 600 Fair Oaks Avenue, Oak Park, wanted all of the facilities to stay on campus and for that reason, he supported building the pool on the garage site.

Kartemquin Film

Mr. Phelan moved to approve the contract with Kartemquin Film, as presented; seconded by Mr. Weissglass. Mr. Weissglass stated that the contract had been amended to reflect the Board of Education's conversation about the film at the March Board of Education meeting, which centered on the description of the film and its emphasis on the achievement gap and the concerns about framing the film. Mr. James was asked to rework it and address some of the legal questions that came in up in the course of the contract. The main change in the contract is Exhibit 1, in the description.

Ms. Patchak-Layman reminded the Board of Education of the following unanswered questions.

- 1) How will the concerns of the Superintendent and administrators raised at the last meeting be addressed. Dr. Isoye stated that there had not been an opportunity for everyone to meet, but he recognized that the Board of Education had approved the contract and they will work with the director and hope that their feedback will be accepted.
- 2) How is Mr. Condne to be paid and how will he do his work during the day? Mr. Ruhland stated that Mr. Condne's role with the film is separate from his work during the day. While there is the possibility of developing an independent study, he would still be functioning as a teacher. Legal counsel was asked to review Board of Education policy, the Illinois School Code and State Statute. Although Mr. Condne would be employed outside of the school day to work on the film, he is not a shareholder nor an employee and no consideration is flowing back and from the District to the film company.

OPRFHS is giving access only. Mr. Condne will not be working as a conduit between faculty, staff, and the film company. Mr. James added that in his capacity as a teacher, he will not be doing that work while engaged as a teacher. As a producer on the film, a teacher, and a contributor to the idea, Mr. James will draw on his knowledge and expertise. He already has contributed with meetings and teachers. It is only to the benefit of the school and film that he play some role, while not impeding on his teaching.

- 3) How will students be approached to be in the film and how will the filming during the day be reconciled with the Student Records Act? What is the process for choosing students? Who will have that information? A question of privacy exists if they are being approached. Teachers have students' confidential information. If Mr. Condne is going to be finding the students, will he have that information? Mr. James suggested getting ideas from parents who have heard about the project as to other parents and their students, organically. The concerns about student confidentiality will not apply in the sense that Mr. James would be approaching the parent first. He would be interested in talking to guidance counselors, the outreach coordinator, and some teachers. His concern is that they act as the first liaison before he meets the student to preserve those rights until there is an interest expressed and he did not imagine any conversations occurring without parents reaching first. Ms. Patchak-Layman suggested sending a form to freshman, sophomores or juniors to see if they had an interest in participating. She was concerned about counselors using that confidential information and she did not want them or teachers to be in a position of asking to talk with the parent. Ms. Patchak-Layman moved to add another exhibit that discusses the form of release for participants to approach someone; no second. Mr. Weissglass asked the administration to work with the producer on putting in place a procedure that protects the students. Ms. Patchak-Layman felt it was too soon to approve the process because the process of approaching families and confidentiality had not yet been developed. It would be a different scenario if Mr. James already had 5 families who agreed to this. She continued that the school and all of the people in the school are the focus, not just 3 or 5 families that happen to go to the school. There could be a violation of privacy when bringing the names of students forward to Mr. James.

Dr. Moore appreciated the clarification in the contract and the approach about the center being about race and relationships in the school.

A roll call vote resulted in 6 ayes and one nay. Ms. Patchak-Layman voted nay. Motion carried.

Pool Update

The motion that was approved on January 13, 2015 follows:

To construct a new, attached, long course pool facility on the baseball field and to secure a site for the baseball program as first priority or alternatively the softball or tennis program as second and third priority by the April 23, 2015 Board meeting and if not build on the parking garage with a parking plan determined to be suitable at the April 23, 2015 Board meeting or build on the parking garage with an estimated 118 spaces within the building.

Background was provided in the packet as to what had taken place since that time. The committee consisting of Mr. Phelan, Mr. Weissglass, Mr. Altenburg and Dr. Isoye worked on potential sites based on the motion. Four sites had been identified for consideration.

- Triton College for softball
- Parking garage site with no new parking in structure
- New parking facility on vacated Scoville Ave.
- Pool facility with 118 spots within building

The District also hired Carl Walker, Inc. to help explore the option of putting a 1-story garage on the Lake Street field and put fields on the roof, review and confirm the design and cost estimates for the pool facility with 118 spots included in the building, explore the neighborhood for alternative locations for a building structure, advise regarding on-street parking plans, and provide designs and cost estimates for the Village Hall prospect.

Options and cost estimates of each were put into chart form. With regard to Option 1, Triton offered to build a new softball field with turf and lights plus use of its existing grass field for \$500,000 (\$25,000 for 20 years). Conversation continues about amenities, so the amount could be adjusted.

In Option 2, the District would have to acquire the parking garage.

Option 3 includes reconfiguring of the fields.

The cost of building a garage across the street underground is \$17 to \$19 million.

Mr. Phelan thanked Mr. Weissglass, Mr. Altenburg, and Dr. Isoye for the work they did on this. The Board of Education as a whole has put in a tremendous amount of work at this point and it will have to make a decision on this at the April 23 meeting. He also thanked the Oak Park Village President and Trustees for their support as well as Triton's College administration who have reached out and who have helped the villages act efficiently. At the April 23 meeting, the idea will be to narrow down the four options to two options so that one will have the majority of support from 4 of the Board of Education members. If there is not a consensus on a first vote, it can be narrowed down to 2 options.

With regard to Triton, the conversations have been about the District's use as to how it is being used now. The understanding is that it would be for the District's after-school use. Triton was open to discussing with Oak Park Youth Softball the potential use of the new field, but that was not negotiated. In the August 19, 2014 plan, the field would have been moved and turf put down the whole length. Softball lines could be drawn and the feeder groups may be able to use the District's turf field, as well as some at Triton. The decision was made to move softball, because there was not enough space for baseball. Triton is adding to its facility. A question arose about only allocating 15 minutes for travel time to Triton. The upside to moving softball would be that it would have turf and lights. A request was made to get the additional costs for transporting students. It

was noted that by changing the baseball field to synthetic turf, it makes it more available and more land will be available for use for school-related activities, i.e., marching band, soccer, etc. Nothing had been budgeted for changing the fields, if the pool were built on the garage site.

With regard to Option 3, Scoville Avenue, it would affect field hockey and neighbors were adverse to that location because of the traffic with the closing of Scoville. In addition, a full Village process would necessitate several hearings. Whether or not the traffic commission would approve it, would be an open question. That is true of offsite only parking, some spaces are already available and other actions that would open up.

The Village of Oak Park's property would have worked for tennis, but it was too costly.

The Board of Education will talk about the financial considerations of decision.

Closed Session

At 10:08 p.m., 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. Collective negotiating matters between the District and its employees or their representatives or deliberations concerning salary schedules for one or more classes of employees; seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

At 10:56 p.m., the Board of Education resumed its open session.

Student Discipline

Mr. Phelan moved to expel Student EXP 04-14-15-03, but to hold the expulsion in abeyance pending successful completion at an appropriate alternative educational setting through the end of the 2015-2016 school year. OPRFHS staff will work with the alternative setting staff to provide necessary and recommended drug counseling and other necessary services. The student will have a review in December 2015 with consideration for a change in placement for the start of the spring semester of the 2015-2016 school year; seconded by Mr. Cofsky. A roll call vote resulted in 4 ayes and 3 nays. Mr. Weissglass, Dr. Moore, and Ms. Patchak-Layman voted nay. Motion carried.

Adjournment

At 10:58 p.m., Mr. Phelan moved to adjourn the Special Board Meeting; seconded by Mr. Cofsky. A voice vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

John Phelan
President

Dr. Jackie Moore
Secretary

Submitted by
Gail Kalmerton
Clerk of the Board