

September 26, 2013

The regular Board meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on Thursday, September 26, 2013, in the Board Room of the OPRFHS.

Call to Order

President Phelan called the meeting to order at 7:30 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; Tod Altenburg, Chief Financial Officer; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; Michael Carioscio, Chief Information Officer; Amy Hill, Director of Assessment and Research; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Karin Sullivan, Director of Communications and Community Relations; Joey Cofsky, Student Council Liaison Representative; Sheila Hardin, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board and FOIA Officer.

Visitors

Ashby, George Adiack, Julie Blanksheimer, Luke and Amie Casson, Karyn Chandra, Katharine Christmas, Aleta Clardy, Dana, Emma, Hannah and Joe Connell, Diane Dygert, Julie and Olivia Elinger, Linda Girardot, Carol Gronwold, Nancy Heezen, Kayla Iando, Diane Johnson, Wyanetta Johnson, John Kennedy, Deborah and Kyle Kent, William Kroeschell, Julie Lloyd, Allison Lundeen, John Murphy, Peter Nolan, John Obrecht, Ellen Pimentel, Cynthia Quan, Ellie Raidt, Mary Colleen Roberts, Renee Rotatorian, Anders, Charlie, and Peter Ryan, Ian and R. Silber, Karen Steward Nolan, Mary Stewart, Helen Thomason, Rick Tucci, Carol Ungaretti, Ken West, and Alison Whit community members; Nancy Leavy, League of Women Voters; Rebecca Bibbs of Oak Leaves; Jason Dennis, Joyce Gajda, Clyde Lundgren John Stelzer of OPRFHS; Charlotte Eriksen of Patch.com; Terry Dean of Wednesday Journal; Elizabeth Hennessey of William Blair; and Patrick Brosnan and Robert Wroble of Legat Architects.

Public Hearing on Budget

At 7:31 p.m., Mr. Phelan called the Public Hearing to order on Thursday, September 26, 2013 for the Oak Park River Forest High School 2013 – 14 Budget. This budget was presented to be placed on display at the August 22 Board of Education meeting per state code for 30 days prior to final adoption. Notice of this Public Hearing appeared in the Thursday, August 22 publication of the Oak Leaves Newspaper and the Wednesday, August 21 publication of the Wednesday Journal Newspaper. Receiving no written or oral comments, Mr. Phelan closed the hearing at 7:32 p.m.

Public Comments

John Murphy, resident of 537 S. Highland, Oak Park, addressed the Board of Education regarding the location of the swimming pool. He opposed any location that removed the high school's indoor track. His son and 200 other boys and girls, of all diversities, run track.

Peter Ryan, resident of 414 August, Oak Park, thanked the Board of Education for taking on the task of facilities. Advocating for the aquatics community, he urged the building of a new 50-meter pool in the area of the garage, that is nearing obsolescence, in order to serve the school, the athletes, and the community for the next 50 years.

Luke Casson, resident of 315 S. Grove, Oak Park, parent of a current varsity swim team member, provided a handout with respect to a natatorium proposal. Two years ago he addressed the prior board, and since that time the serious problems with the pool facilities, the locker room facilities, and the surrounding facilities were much discussed. This board has seen the wisdom in taking significant steps in addressing some of the issues and everyone was appreciative of its commitment to addressing a serious problem of past years. The Board must decide what is best for the school in the next ten years, the next two years, and the present students. OPRFHS has some of the worst pool facilities in the area. It would make no sense to build something that will soon become obsolete and costly. The appropriate space would be the parking garage as a 50-meter pool could be accommodated and it is not any other part of the controlled facilities on the campus. A 50-meter pool makes the most sense economically, and from the taxpayer's standpoint.

Bill Kroeschell, resident of 830 N. Elmwood, Oak Park, supported the need for pool facilities within reason. He advocated for not interfering with the field and the track facilities as they are currently used by over 200 students. Track has both indoor and outdoor seasons. Not having the availability of an indoor track would be detrimental to the students. Track and Field is not a sport that students have to start at the age of five. He spoke of his own daughter's experience as a freshman as a pole-vaulter. She progressed so well, even though a shy girl, that a university awarded her a scholarship. Thirty-five boys and girls participate in pole vaulting. He asked the Board of Education not to take away this opportunity for these students.

Helen Thamason (42 Ashland, River Forest), Emma Connell (538 N. Elmwood, Oak Park), and Maura Dahl (100 Bishop Quarter Lane, Oak Park), OPRFHS students, are all swim team captains. Their other credits include being Huskies' swim camp instructors, captain of this year's water polo team, lifeguard for Special Education summer program, PE leaders, and a member of the water polo team. They thanked the administration, the Board of Education, the faculty, and the coaches for their support and addressing their needs around the pool issues. They believed that investing in the replacement of the pool would enhance water safety for all students during PE classes as well as athletes in swimming diving synchronized swimming, water polo and other aquatic activities. They want to provide students better opportunities to reach their full potential.

Joe Connell, resident of 538 N. Elmwood, Oak Park, parent of two girl swimmers who came through the TOPS training program and swam at the YMCA, Ridgeland, Triton, both OPRFHS pools and Riverside Brookfield, commented on the size, configuration, and flexibility required to meet the needs of the aquatics community at large. The information contained in the distributed document noted that a 50-meter pool versus an 8-lane stretch pool would allow versatility for aquatic users for the next 50 years. He noted that there was the thought that wide lanes versus narrow lanes would increase swimming capacity, but that is not the case. Swimming capacity is based on length, not width. Length is what adds capacity to pools and adds more versatility for their exercises and drills. Anywhere between 2 and 22 people (depending on expertise and age of the swimmers) can be in a lane depending on the length (details were included in the packet). The most versatile pool is 25 yards (8 lanes) by 50 meters (allows for a long course). That configuration of pool can be divided between diving and synchronized swimming, polo and swimming, special instruction and kayaking,

all at the same time. Riverside Brookfield, York, and Lyons Township High Schools all wished they had bigger pools.

Cycle Lundgren, resident of 715 S. Elmwood, Oak Park and a boys' and girls' swimming coach and science teacher, spoke about pool logistics. He attempted to calculate the cost of building a pool over its life span. The Board of Education would be making a decision that would have ramifications for the next 80 years, as that is how old the current pools are. All 3,200 students are required to take swimming in PE during the day. The boys' and girls' swim teams, TOPS, synchronized swimming, or the diving program which is now placed at Riverside-Brookfield also use the pools. An 8-lane stretch pool will not be adequate. An 8-lane, 50-meter, 25-yard pool will be the wisest decision for the high school and the community.

George Adcock, resident of 115 Harrison, Oak Park, coach of girls' and boys' swimming, head coach of the TOPS program which runs out of the YMCA and uses the OPRFHS daily, noted that his program has grown from 130 to 200 students and this was the first year that girls' swimming was a cut sport. He spoke of how much the school and the community uses the pools. Some students now train until almost 9:00 p.m. because they must do so because of all of the aquatic sports competing at the same time, even some 9-year olds. In addition, many of students teach Huskie swimming camp. A reoccurring comment is why the program is not continued throughout the year. The availability to swim for students and the community has been dramatically reduced with the closing of the Concordia and YMCA pool. Understanding that the first focus must be the current student body, this is also about future students in the community. The aquatics community is very big and it has nowhere to go.

Karyn Chandra, resident of 1407 Lathrop, River Forest, asked the Board of Education to consider how a 50-meter facility could be a revenue source for the school. A bigger pool would be able to host competitive swim meets, diving meets, water pool meets, swim lessons, and additional swim camp programs. The average cost for a swim meet at UIC ranges from \$5,000 to \$8,000 for a weekend. If the high school rented the pool out for 20 weekends at a rate of \$7,000, less the cost of staff (approximately \$1,500), it could profit \$100,000. Swimming lessons are needed as drowning is the second leading cost of accidental death with nine people drowning each day in the United States per a 2008 report. The market rate for club rentals is \$15 per hour, per lane. She suggested the Board of Education review the pages starting at 45 in the document provided and offered to have additional discussion if that was the desire.

Ian Silber, resident of 228 Westlake, Oak Park, is the parent of four children, two who went through TOPS, stated that this was an opportunity to do something correct. He felt there should be a way to engineer the pool so that it did not interfere with the track team. He asked the Board of Education to make something of quality and to think bigger and broader.

Julie L. Blankmeister, resident of 247 S. Euclid, Oak Park, is the mother of four children, 1 who graduated from OPRFHS and 3 who are presently enrolled. Her children have participated in both track and swim. She supported a new pool because of their poor condition. Her daughter developed a cough that lasted the swimming season. She also referred to a *Wednesday Journal* cartoon that showed that there are some people thought an investment in the pools would lead to a decreased capacity to

teach mathematics and she hoped that the Superintendent and Board of Education were providing the resources for academic programs that will not be impacted by the building of a new pool. She also spoke about the importance of extracurricular for high school students, in particular sports, as colleges consider them as important as grades. They want students to be well rounded. These communities need the space to run an aquatics program. The pools are busy all of the time and more and younger children will need these facilities for years to come. A 50-meter pool is critical for competition. To accommodate a pool of that size, the parking garage site makes the most sense and it would keep the pool connected to the athletic wing of the school.

Debbie Kent, resident of 930 Home, Oak Park, mother of a senior on the track team and an architect, noted that the question of changing the school was significant to her. She concurred with the need for a pool but she had recently learned that the Fieldhouse was one of the first ones ever built in the country for a high school and not only was it was used for track and field events but other events as well. She asked that the proper architectural solution be found in order to keep the quality of that space and plan for the growth as well.

Long Term Facilities

Dr. Isoye thanked the parents for speaking on behalf of swim and track and field athletes as well as for the support they give to their children. He reviewed the process thus far as was written in his report. The original pool committee used the lens of criteria and came up with three top location possibilities (parking garage, the east pool and south gym, and the west pool into the Field House). When the report was moved to the Long Term Facilities Committee, the architects met with coaches, faculty and staff and the report from the parents, concerns were discussed from the Stantec report and the ramifications for a variety of sports, volleyball, basketball, track and field, etc. As such, four options were provided, including the Fieldhouse. However, the Fieldhouse option was ruled out and the Board of Education will not be asked to consider that option. It was provided as background information only. This presentation is for the Board of Education to have a first look at options for 1) the pool, and 2) academic and athletic space. No action will be taken. Questions will be requested that could further refine these proposals for continued discussion with the Board of Education over several meetings.

Pool Location

Patrick Brosnan reviewed the four proposed options for the pool, including the site and the components that could be included in that site, and the pros and cons of each site. All of the options have estimated costs, without detailed drawings.

- 1) The site of the existing tennis courts
 - a. No impact on existing spaces, except for the tennis courts, which would be moved. A possibility was putting the tennis courts on the roof of the 8-lane stretch pool building with a barrier wall to make it a safe place for tennis courts.
 - b. Estimated cost: \$16 to \$19 million.
- 2) Within the existing building in SE corner, utilizing the existing structure and building and building new pool within existing boundaries.
 - a. Digging down to create the pool itself and developing the decks, i.e., building a new pool within an existing structure.
 - b. Less impact on parking deck
 - c. While no impact on playing fields, multiple sports would be affected
 - d. Pool would be close to the other athletic components in the building.
 - e. It would affect the building.

- f. More cost effective.
 - g. It fits within existing footprint, programmatically
 - h. It would be difficult to build.
 - i. Estimated cost: \$15 to \$18 million.
- 3) The site of the existing parking structure.
- a. The proximity is close to the present locker rooms, other athletic components, and it is a visible element on Lake Street.
 - b. Parking deck would be lost and there would be a loss of investment on the structure.
 - c. Estimated cost: \$18 to \$22 million and would include purchase of the existing structure, demolition, and the building of the pool.
- 4) Building new pool structure north of the Stadium field with tennis courts on top.
- a. This option has not had community input.
 - b. Adjacent to other athletic components.
 - c. Construction would not affect the building.
 - d. Site is large enough to build an eight-lane stretch pool.
 - e. Playing fields to the north would be unusable for two seasons. They would eventually be shifted to the tennis courts site. Long term the playing fields would eventually have to be replaced.
 - f. The existing building could be connected to this building and it was in close proximity to the stadium.
 - g. Estimated cost: \$19 to \$22 million, because of the fieldwork, tennis courts, etc.

Discussion ensued. The architects responded to Board of Education questions. At this point changing the concept of an 8-lane stretch pool (35 meters) to a 50-meter pool would not have a significant effect on pricing. A 50-meter pool is actually a pool and a half with a movable wall (bulkhead). The Board of Education will be provided with the guidelines and diagrams for the different size pools.

Long Term Facilities Plan

The purpose of this presentation is to update the Board of Education about the overall planning. This is about setting a course and culture for the building long-term. The current building was designed at an age when classes were one way. Many classrooms are smaller, 540 to 550 square feet, and still do work for certain kinds of instruction/lecture. Legat developed an assessment and worked with various people within the building about the future. Many educators talked about how teaching is becoming more collaborative and they are looking to capture 21st century learning skills, i.e., collaboration, teaching, and learning. Because students work in pairs, individually, in groups, a need exists to create relevance within a classroom as to what is happening in the outside world, the infiltration of technology as a tool, and connecting all of the student learning spaces to the world. It is exciting to understand instructional delivery and how classrooms can help change the way teachers work with students. As such, Legat provided two long-term, facilities planning concepts.

Concept C1:

- 85% utilization.
 - a. Considerations:
 - i. Classrooms would be available 3 out of 8 periods for other teachers to use.
 - ii. Spaces for teachers to go to for their planning periods would need to be created.

- iii. Faculty studios would be created to allow teachers to have a place to work together and to have a permanent workstation.
- iv. Estimated Cost: \$40 to \$46 million, not including pool-related construction and contingency costs.

A review of the schematics of each floor was provided.

- First Floor would be comparable to the present and would include a relocation of the Welcome Center and related student services.
- Second floor, would include faculty studio, a tutoring center, think tank space for 21st century skill building (debate/collaboration/team presentations/discovery).
- Third floor would be a similar theme as the second floor.
- Fourth floor would be a similar theme as the second floor.

This diagram shows the space that may be needed over time as the population grows. Additional classrooms would be needed over time. OPRFHS has a plan for completing capital improvements over time. There is a point where capital improvements blended with the master plan decision will allow dollars to be spent one time in a single area rather than twice in the same area.

Option D.1.

- 62.5% utilization.
 - Continue current culture of teachers having their own classrooms (teach five classes and utilize the classroom during the plan period and lunch, with the exception of the science and math department). More classrooms would need to be created to accommodate that model.
 - The cost ranges from \$35 to \$42 million, without pool.

A review of the schematics of each floor was provided.

- First Floor would be comparable to the present.
- Parameter of the building would be used for lab spaces and larger classrooms and less collaboration space.
- Third floor, similar layout but with collaborative spaces and think tanks would fit.
- Fourth floor, created a think tank for students and think space for students.

In this scenario, 14 additional large classrooms would be necessary as each instructor would continue to own the classroom. Science is already at the 85% utilization rate. In round numbers, the question might be what is the thinking about science? Years ago, rather than building more science labs, the decision was made to create a science office. Teachers shared the labs and during planning and team periods, they would go to the science office. That allowed the district to have fewer labs today. Over time, the differential between now and as the population, 6 additional science labs would be necessary.

The question is a concept level with two pathways, either 62% or 85% utilization. The Board of Education and the administration must think about what sets the course for the future and what is the best direction overall with regard to updating the facility. Is there a desire to create larger spaces for collaboration both for students and teachers as well as update classrooms or does the District want to invest in creating more classroom spaces and maintain a culture of classroom ownership?

Discussion ensued. Teachers would still have assigned classrooms in order for students to be available to find them. Typically, in a comprehensive high school, a

faculty office might be located on the second floor of the building and a teacher would work out of one classroom for 4 or 5 periods and be in assigned to another classroom for the other one or two periods. The opportunity to have department offices adjacent to the faculty studio is to create a student resource center where students could come for assistance, perhaps not with the same teacher, but another teacher.

The 85% utilization plan changes the entrance during the school day and allows security to better monitor people and verify who should be in the building. for an event in the auditorium, both entrances would be open. Moving the entrance is about having a dedicated space closer to where visitors may be coming from, i.e., Lake Street, the parking garage, etc. Student services would also be located near the entrance change.

Several Board of Education members originally thought that these proposed changes were being considered because of anticipated increased enrollment. When asked if something existed that would help the members get a clearer vision of how instruction will be delivered in the 21st century, the response was that every district is dealing with how to deliver instruction as the state introduces the Common Core State Standards, getting students to be career ready, etc. This is about how instruction will be delivered today and in the future. Classrooms as they presently exist may not be appropriate for the future. This is not just about enrollment; it is about the instruction that leads to utilization. The architect reflected that the Board of Education wanted understanding in the shift in how students will learn in the future and its driving force as to how instruction would be delivered and if status quo had been considered as an option, and then the doomsday scenario that might follow. The process of the master plan was to determine how teaching was being accomplished today, what it will look like 5 and 20 years from now. From the focus groups' conversations, Legat learned how that might change over time. They then looked at the facilities and how they might change in the future. Dr. Isoye stated that the instructional piece was not ignored because there had been discussion relative to think tank spaces and collaborative areas. Ms. Patchak-Layman stated that an example before the Board of Education was if there was, a transition program for seniors with junior colleges and students would participate in both places part time, what kind of educational facility would be beneficial? What if a "small school" were to be formed? How would that extend into an educational program plan and how would that affect facilities. Other schools have these kinds of conversations and programs, outside of the Project Lead the Way. Mr. Wroble felt the focus group members were asked how they teach today and how they would teach in five years. In many instances, they did not feel it would change much, but over time, there would be opportunity for interdisciplinary teaching, i.e., flexibility in classroom or movement from one area to another. The focus group was not about should the District make a global shift. In both scenarios, whether the facilities help or hinder the assumptions, education will continue to evolve and how the building supports or has an impact will continue to evolve. In some places, an impact may not be made. Renovation work has to happen over time anyway so if a positive impact on learning can be made, it should be.

Dr. Lee and Ms. Patchak-Layman participated on the Pool Committee and the Long-Term Facilities Planning Committee. Dr. Lee did not remember a discussion about a new teaching model but he did remember that the emphasis was on the need for greater flexibility in the one teacher/one room concept. Ms. Patchak-Layman felt that the delivery of instruction was not discussed because the strategic plan was occurring

simultaneously. What came out of the Strategic Plan would be reflected in the facility plan. What is missing is where the District wants to be educationally in 5 years and beyond. How does that mesh with what happens in the future, i.e., collaboration areas, furniture, etc. Discussion included flexibility in a brainstorming way. Many felt there was a composite of Concept C and D. Mr. Bronson stated that overtime there would be an opportunity for interdisciplinary discussions, but that was not the subject of the focus groups or how or should the school make a shift. Some of the focus group members felt instruction would be much different in the future and the tools would be different, but others did not think it would change that much.

Dr. Gevinson reflected on the school in past years when there were 4,000 students, a school within a school programs, and fewer Special Education students. The school has had much reconfiguration, i.e., technology with lots of computer labs, etc. Much change had occurred without a huge investment previously. Multipurpose rooms, such as Rooms 370 and 371, could be configured to be more usable. Mr. Brosnan clarified that the diagrams meant use of space, not necessarily a rebuilding, or renovation, just a block of rooms for a particular use. If the finishes need to be updated, this is a look into the future 10 to 15 years. It is not about renovating space, but the use of space.

Dr. Isoye stated that a key driver in bringing this to the Board of Education was for it to have a first look as to potential costs as this will be presented to the FAC because it is discussing fund balances. Discussion will continue with faculty and staff. Knowing the philosophy and direction provides flexibility in phasing in work and being cost efficient. This is not the same discussion as the pool. The Board of Education was invited to provide additional questions.

Mr. Weissglass appreciated Ms. Patchak-Layman's comments regarding the Strategic Plan and Dr. Isoye's comments. He wanted to revisit this when the strategic plan is completed. While he supports collaborative space, he had many questions. He was concerned about the cost, as it is bigger than anticipated from that presented at the Finance committee meeting. Presently the budget projections provide for annual capital outlays, some of which is deferred work of about \$5 million per year. Could some of this money overlap with the estimates for renovation? The period of a master plan is over ten years and financing options would change. Mr. Brosnan reported that there is a plan to replace mechanical systems, lights, door hardware, etc. and is updated through the present program. The Master Plan lays out the space for the long term. There should be an agreed upon roadmap for the long term so that the dollars can be blended for the maximum benefit.

Ms. Hennessey presented an overview of the District's debt. She highlighted the following points:

- 1) The cost differential for OPRFHS between a AAA Bond and a AA bond on a bond issue for \$36 million would be about \$900,000 which would amount to a 2% to 2 ½% different in the long run.
- 2) OPRFHS has two bonds that are paid with debt service levy, 2009 limited and 2005. The bonds for the roof are callable December 2013, they are paid out of the O&M Funds, and there is no separate levy for them. Discussion last year ensued about paying these bonds off early with cash-on-hand and saving \$1,255,000 in interest costs.

- 3) The chart on page 8 refers to outstanding debt service, principal and interest, that is paid. From the 2012 year, start with EAV and debt service extension base (\$2.5 million). This DSEB was established under the tax cap in 1994. It allows the District to pay off the same amount of debt service as it did in 1994 with a CPI factor added to it. This amount rose by CPI and assume that after 2014 a CPI growth rate. The District has payments against nonreferendum debt that go through 2016. Last year the District abated the entire levy for the nonreferendum bonds outstanding, so zero tax rate then. Otherwise, debt is about \$2.5 million per year. The blue section represented bonding capacity in the future. She noted that \$5 million in the capital fund could be enhanced from non-referendum bonds from this revenue source, which is allowed under the tax cap, extending the debt into the future with a CPI factor added to it.
- 4) Page 9 set out the options of non-referendum and referendum options paired with the use of funds on hand and starting with \$5 million annually for facilities and \$600,000 of the Life Safety levy currently used to pay debt service on debt certificates for a project estimated at \$50 million.
- 5) Page 10 showed OPRFHS's preliminary operating budget for 2014 to be \$113 million at end of 6/2013. The drawdown for capital projects out of Operations & Maintenance Fund (O&M) and the abatement are now reflected in the Fund Balance, which is \$111 million or 185% fund balance of expenditures. Ms. Hennessey presented the Board of Education with accumulated fund balances along with bonding options for a project of \$50 million, a hypothetical number.

Option I: Project cost of \$50 million using \$36.6 million (20 years) Max Limited Bonds and \$13,400,000 funds on hand. The chart on Page 12 listed the remaining debt service capacity. OPRFHS would have no additional non-referendum bonding authority for 20 years. The tax rate level would be \$.13 or \$.14. If the high school were to take this approach, the ending fund balance for 2014 would be \$93,608, 897, or 156.12% fund balance of expenditures.

Option II: Project cost of \$50 million using \$30 Million Limited Bonds and \$20 million funds on hand. The district would have additional non-referendum bond authority in nine years. If this approach were used, the FY 2014 ending fund balance would be \$93 million instead of \$111 million or 146.58% fund balance of expenditures.

Option III: Project cost of \$50 million using \$20 million Limited Bonds and \$30 million funds on hand. The district will have additional non-referendum bonding authority in 10 years with all debt repaid by 2024 levy year. If this approach were used, the FY 2014 ending fund balance would be \$79, 240,931, or 132.16% fund balance of expenditures.

Below are the election dates at which the District could go for a referendum for information only.

- March 18, 2014 (the Board of Education would have to make a decision by December of this year.)
- November 4, 2014
- February 2014
- April 14, 2015
- March 15, 2016

- November 8, 2016
- February 28, 2017
- April 4, 2017

Options IV: Project cost of \$50 million with \$36.6 million in referendum bonds and \$13.4 million in funds on hands. This would be similar to paying off a 20-year mortgage with level debt service. In 2015, the District would have non-referendum bonding capacity. If this approach were used, the FY 2014 ending fund balance would be \$97 million or 163% fund balance of expenditures. Interest payment would be approximately \$2.9 million and would cost the owner of a \$300,000 home approximately \$133 per year, an increase of \$.13 or \$.14 in 2014, 2015, and 2016. As the tax rate goes up from \$.13 to \$.28, it would then drop down after the 2016 non-referendum bonds were paid off.

Option V: Project cost of \$50 million with \$30 million referendum bonds and \$20 million funds on hand. The additional payments would be approximately \$2.4 million per year. Homeowners of a \$300,000 home would pay approximately \$109 more in taxes. The Fund balance would be \$91 million or 152% fund balance of expenditures.

Option VI: Project cost of \$50 million with \$20 million referendum bonds and \$30 million funds on hand. If this approach were used, the FY 2014 ending fund balance would be \$81 million or 135.52% fund balance of expenditures.

Discussion ensued. The taxpayer would be impacted similarly no matter which bonds were used. Using referendum bonds would keep debt service available, allowing options.

Mr. Weissglass, responding to several community members' inquiries about the appropriateness or legality of raising funds through operating referendum for facilities, noted that facilities, under the law, are considered as educational purposes. Mr. Weissglass continued that having a Triple A Bond Rating was critical at the time bonds are issued, but not when they are being paid.

Ms. Hennessey reiterated that if the District paid off \$5.2 million bonds the District would save approximately \$1.250 million in interest, but that would not affect the total fund balance.

At 9:40 p.m., the Board of Education recessed to move back into the Board Room. At 9:47 p.m. the meeting resumed.

Status of FOIA Reports

Ms. Kalmerton reported that four FOIA requests had been received and four were resolved.

Student Council Representative

Joe Cofsky spoke on behalf of Student Council and the student body. He believed it had been a smooth transition from summer school and that the school year had started well. He reported on FOX 32 coming to OPRFHS to film a live segment featuring many of its clubs, activities, and sports teams. The full football and field hockey teams were to be present to celebrate a great start to their seasons as well as the field hockey invitational that is being held at the high school this weekend. Saturday October 5th is homecoming and Boom Entertainment will be the DJ. The theme for this

year's dance is Galaxy. Spirit week is prior to the dance is spirit week, and Powder Puff and special football and soccer games will be held the weekend of the dance.

Student Council's "Bring it to the Board" Facebook page is back in full force. Both positive and negative comments have been posted about the school and its operations. While unsure of just how many posts were made to the website, four major posts occurred with additional comments.

The tutoring center has received very positive feedback and students have been accessing it before, during, and after school. As students enter the Center, they indicate in which area they need help. That data will be used to determine in which areas of help are most needed. Thus far, the most request help is for math. While appreciative of the resource, questions arise as to why one subject would require so much more help. Is it a lack of instruction in the classroom? Is the curriculum moving too quickly? Student Council intends to work on finding an answer.

Sometimes students go the Tutoring Center and have not been able to get support in a specific subject. It was suggested to more strategically place teachers in a subject area or outwardly, post the tutoring schedule throughout the school was made so that the students can plan when they need to seek help.

Some students have said that there has been a lack of food 6th period. Student Council will do a survey to determine what types of food are most desired and discuss setting aside a certain quantity of food for each period. If the trend of food consumption can be determined per period, plans can be made accordingly. Student Council is in the information-gathering period now about food and the tutoring center and when that is complete, it will determine the best route to take. Student Council hoped the Board of Education would support the changes.

Faculty Senate

No Comments

Superintendent Report

Dr. Isoye reported the following:

The 2012-2013 Tabula recently won a first place award in the American Scholastic Press Association's annual contest for school yearbooks, magazines, and newspapers. Judges gave Tabula a score of 940 out of a possible 1,000. Congratulations to Tabula advisers Dan Ganschow and Michelle Carrow and all the students who helped create such an outstanding yearbook.

The OPRF football program is having a remarkable season so far, with all four team levels currently 4-0. Athletic Director John Stelzer did a quick search of historical records going back to 1981, and found that never during that time have all four football teams been 4-0. This includes the early 1980s when the Huskies were state semifinalists three times.

Physics teacher Aaron Podolner published the book *How Would You Handle It?* His work is based on the notion that the worst time for a teacher to figure out how to handle a tough situation is while it is happening. A series of 400 reality-based questions and scenarios help teachers prepare ahead of time. The Chicago Tribune wrote about Mr. Podolner and his book.

Congratulations went to Japanese teacher Yoko Schmadeke for earning a \$5,000 grant from the Japanese Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Chicago Foundation. The grant will be used for the annual cultural festival that Ms. Schmadeke and her students put on each winter.

During the past two weeks, eleven German students stayed with Oak Park and River Forest host families and shadowed their host students throughout the school day. They were to return to Germany that weekend.

Oak Park and River Forest High School students and staff will be featured live on Fox on Friday, September 27. As part of his "Patrick's People and Places," reporter Patrick Elwood will visit locations in Oak Park and River Forest during his morning broadcast. OPRF football and field hockey players, Marching Band, cheer and drill teams, many student-club members, Mr. Rouse, and coaches will be on the football field for a live, four-minute segment scheduled for 7:30 a.m.

November 5 and November 25 have been scheduled as the next Strategic Planning Board Retreats. The finalization of the Strategic Plan could take place early next year versus this calendar year.

Dr. Isoye reminded Board of Education members that under the District Reports portion of the agenda, short notes could be included about their liaison responsibilities.

Items VI. 6, Thrive Contracts, 7, Residency Confirmation Officer Contracts, and 17, Minutes were removed from the consent agenda.

Thrive Contracts

Ms. Patchak-Layman was interested in the reasons for the turnover of Thrive staff and what effect it has on serving students involved with this staff. Two people did not return last year. Is the District attempting to keep the staff here so that students will have them longer than one year? Is it a problem that there is different staff each year? What are the reasons they are not returning? The administration responded that the goal was to have the same people every year and that they were leaving because of personal reasons, not performance review. No other information as to why they were leaving was had. Ms. Patchak-Layman suggested that information might be of interest. While it is great to have external contracts in order to control overtime and expense, there is also less continuity or the meshing of staff with the District's own staff, and have less turnover. Mr. Phelan did not want to get involved in the administration's responsibility of retaining people. The Board of Education only approves the contract, not how the administration interacts.

Residency Confirmation Officer

Questions were raised about the amount of money being spent on residency confirmations, i.e., how many leases were expected to be reviewed with the new system, etc. As there were many competing uses for this money, Ms. Patchak-Layman wanted to make sure the money was well spent. She was concerned that the contract had no specifics about the number of residencies that needed verification, etc. She felt the contract was too open-ended. The administration responded that answers will not be forthcoming for another year or two with regard to expenditures as a pattern has not yet been established with this new process. However, the contracts do have a not-to-exceed clause in them. Board of Education members urged that perhaps an updated residency report for the year be provided in November.

In addition, an October report will be presented that will address

Consent Items

Mr. Phelan moved to approve the following consent items:

- Check Disbursements and Financial Resolutions dated September 26, 2013
- Monthly Treasurer's Report
- Personnel Recommendations, including Stipends and Resignations
- Gifts and Donations
- Boom Entertainment Contract
- Special Education Systems Transportation Contract for Hillside Academy
- Mass Transit Exclusion Board Resolution
- Attendance at Out-of-State Conferences
- Policy 2.90, Nepotism, for First Reading
- Policy 2:105, Ethics and Gift Ban, for First Reading
- Policy 2:120, Board Member Development, for First Reading
- Policy 4:50, Payment Procedures, for First Reading
- Policy 6:120, Education of Children with Disabilities, for First Reading
- Policy 7:230 Misconduct for Students with Disabilities, for First Reading

seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Thrive Contracts

Mr. Phelan moved to approve the contracts with Thrive Counseling for the Student Advocate, Substance Abuse Counselors, and four Resource Managers as presented; seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

**Residency
Confirmation
Officers**

Mr. Phelan moved to approve the Residency Confirmation Officers contracts, as presented; seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in 6 ayes and one nay. Ms. Patchak-Layman voted nay. Motion carried.

Minutes

Mr. Phelan moved to approve the Open and Closed Session Minutes June 18 (Instruction), August 13 (Technology, Instruction, Finance, Policy, Special), 22, and September 16, 2013 and declaration that the closed session audiotapes of February 2012 be destroyed; seconded by Dr. Lee. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

Ms. Patchak-Layman did not support the destruction of the closed session audiotapes.

**Adoption of
Budget for FY 2014**

Mr. Phelan moved to adopt the Budget for FY 2014; seconded by Mr. Weissglass. A roll call voted resulted in 6 ayes and one nay. Ms. Patchak-Layman voted nay. Motion carried.

Ms. Patchak-Layman felt that administrative costs and the fund balance were too high and she questioned where funds were being notated in terms of administrative costs, i.e. salaries for administration, remediation, and support programs. If only \$66,000 is provided for support then there is an imbalance and more support needs to be provided to accommodate students.

Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that while the Downtown of Oak Park (DTOP) TIF dollars were listed in the budget, the Madison Street TIF dollars were not and the District should be receiving hundreds of thousands of dollars. OPRFHS had been part of the decision to allow the buyback of District 97's building and that debt is paid. That

money should be coming to all of the taxing bodies. That would make a big difference in the budget, in the fund balance and in the areas where the District can support students.

Mr. Phelan did not believe that a “yes” vote implied that the fund balance is appropriate, and a compensation philosophy will be discussed in the future. Because there is no philosophy of compensation at this time should not dissuade anyone for voting for the budget; the District is dealing with those issues in other venues and he did not vote against it because it would leave the District without a budget, and he felt that would be a lead to a wrong perception.

**Resolution
Recognizing
Students**

Mr. Phelan moved to approve the Resolution Recognizing 2014 Semifinalists in the National Merit Scholarship, 2014 Semifinalists in the National Achievement Scholarship, the Scholars of Honorable Mention in the 2013-14 National Hispanic Recognition Program, and the Commended Students in the 2014 National Merit Program; seconded by Dr. Lee. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

**Recognition of
Schools**

Mr. Phelan moved to approve the Application for Recognition of Schools as presented; seconded by Dr. Lee. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

**Certification of
2013 Summer
Graduates**

Mr. Phelan moved to certify the 2013 Summer Graduates; seconded by Dr. Lee. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

**Policy 8:20,
Procedures
Community
Use of Facilities**

Mr. Phelan moved to approve the procedures for Policy 8:20, Community Use of Facilities for first reading; seconded by Mr. Cofsky. A voice vote resulted motion carried. The procedures will be posted online.

Student Discipline

None

**Administrative/
Teacher
Compensation
Report**

The Board of Education received the annual Administrative and Teacher Salary and Compensation Report which needs to be presented to the Board of Education prior to October 1 and then posted on the website. A suggestion was made to separate stipends from their teaching duties. Mr. Cofsky was eager to understand how compensation related to student performance and externally.

The administration uses information as to how many teachers are at every teaching lane during contract negotiations in a scatter gram for forecasting costs and succession planning. This data should be considered in the philosophy of compensation discussion, which should include the Chief Financial Officer and Director of Human Resources.

**Action Steps for
Board of Education
Goals**

Dr. Moore explained that a suggestion was made to bring forward for clarity the Board of Education’s fifth goal on governance. Suggestions were given for 5a, targets and outcomes, i.e., development of guidelines and board calendar, and with the new committee structure, how committees would provide information to the Board of Education. No targets or outcomes were suggested for 5b because it already a target. This is just for information as the Board of Education does not approve the targets. The administration asked for information as to the format as to the information should be brought forward relative to the Strategic Plan.

Relative to the new 3-member committee structure, it was suggested that each committee develop its charge and at the beginning of each meeting state its charge. It was suggested that this information be prioritized with deadlines and then come back to the full Board of Education.

**Foreign Exchange
Student Report**

The Foreign Exchange Report was presented to the Board of Education. Currently the high school has students from Germany, France, China, and Spain from the American Foreign Service and Rotary.

**Student Achievement
Indicators**

- Ms. Hill highlighted the key pieces of the Student Achievement Indicators report.
- 1) Focus is on attainment and growth measures. The Board of Education can help provide guidance as to balance as to which attainment and growth measures it wanted analyzed more.
 - 2) Attainment college readiness cores, ACT data, (now officially includes students with extended time) are now included. The comparison is complicated, but the data sets are equivalent. The average composite score in 2013 is the same as the composite score from 2012, 24.1. The average scores for African-American, multiracial and Asian are somewhat higher this year over last year. The District's efforts to reduce racial disparities have not produced a diminishment. Where there is evidence of change is in the college readiness benchmark data. Every racial group has experienced an increase in the percentage of students who are meeting all four college-readiness benchmark. The percent of attainment among racial groups is not celebratory, but the move is in the right direction. Starting in 2009, the percentage of attainment for black students for the four college-readiness benchmark was 9% and this year it was 15%, which is higher than both national and state average. Looking just at the attainment of who achieves college readiness benchmarks, 67% of white students met all four and 43% of black graduates met none. The number of students taking AP tests has increased, and the District is maintaining a relatively similar rate of passing at 83, 84, and 85 percent. This year it was 83%.
 - 3) With regard to PSAE and AYP, more groups in reading, in particular, attained AYP typically by virtual of Safe Harbor, a provision that allows if the District has not achieved by AYP in the previous year, if the gap was reduced by 10%. In doing so this year, there was improvement in every group in reading across the board. Just not enough students achieved the meets and exceeds level on PSAE in order to make AYP overall. However, it is the best performance on PSAE since 2006 and that the incremental move, particularly in reading, continues upward. The District hopes that continues and will continue to look why similar changes are not occurring in math.
 - 4) EXPLORE to ACT growth data. For a number of years incoming student data was broken down by race. At almost every point of entry for the EXPLORE test, black and white students had discrepant levels of growth. White students had greater growth than black students did. This discrepancy in growth is mirrored at both the state and national level. Because it is not unique to OPRFHS, there might be an alternative analysis and interest that would serve OPRFHS better. Ms. Hill began to look at an overall level of readiness using composite scores. From the time a student enters using the EXPLORE test until the time that the student graduated, was the District successful in helping them attain readiness. Of the 675 students in the class with matched scores approximately 80 more students were post-secondary ready by the time they took their ACT than when they took their EXPLORE test.

Sometimes the students who are on track are shifted over but a greater percentage had progressed. If a student entered off track, it is much harder for he/she to achieve readiness by the time they graduate compared to those students who were nearly on track. Over half of the students who were nearly on track and achieved readiness by the time they graduated and about 20% of those off track were able to accelerate to being on track. Approximately 100 students, disproportionately represented by black students, came in off track and did not move much. This is the kind of data that speaks to digging into student experiences to understand why those patterns exist. The conversation at the committee meeting was about the kinds of deeper and further analysis that the board might direct the administration to undertake as a means of having better understanding of students in order to do better. A suggestion was made to do case studies of seniors for whom there are EXPLORE and ACT data and interview them about their experiences. Other questions revolve around if the District had the right data, is the balance of the data appropriate for understanding student outcomes. The question is to consider the possible options for further analysis and, if able, decide where to dig in more fruitful or send it back to committee for further discussion.

Mr. Phelan commented that the data could be shared publically and wondered if feeder districts had similar data so that OPRFHS could see from Kindergarten to college or career information. If not, then perhaps they should. He also noted that while broad sets of data would be helpful, he wanted the administration to draw conclusions from its expertise to solve problems of education. Bring evidence of data that says a new program is needed, and then ask the Board of Education to approve that program. He was interested in what the data would say.

Dr. Lee did not believe the Board of Education could give direction to the administration. He wanted to find out from the administrators most conversant with the figures which 4 or 5 sets of indicators were the most significant and why. Could the Board of Education argue about those indicators to lead to an understanding? He wanted to be at the point where the Board of Education could admit that there were no pieces that data that would tell everything, but that it would be more useful to concentrate on a more-defined set of indicators. As the District concentrates on them, it will learn what data to consider. He wanted the confidence to say or not say, that the District was improving/making progress in closing the achievement gap, and yes there is a better understanding about the meaning of the term achievement gap. He wanted the administration's professional judgment on which data would be the upper indicators that could be concentrated on with the objective toward moving toward them or combining them. If deliberate, he felt the District could hone in on something that is more productive and enable it to evaluate how much better or worse it is doing over time. He did not sense a direction. He wanted to be able to say that if a program were changed, it would have a 60% chance of getting higher indicators that the Board of Education wants to move. It will take Ms. Hill's leadership to do this.

Mr. Cofsky supported getting elementary school data to line up with the District's data. Mr. Weissglass noted that the first meeting of Governing Board for the Collaboration of Early Childhood Care & Education discussed the need to collect data at all levels and across all systems.

Dr. Gevinson reiterated his desire for the district to focus on the grouping of white and black students who had taken the ACT and who were nearly on track when they took the

EXPLORE tests, because these students were still enrolled at OPRFHS. He suggested looking at their classes, discipline, counselor reports, doing interviews, etc. Forty-six out of 55 are now on track. The faculty would be happy to gather that information.

Mr. Weissglass suggested that there were two broad categories that could assist the District in 1) determining if it was making progress and 2) how to make progress. A decision should be made as to which pieces would be looked at over time. He did not know how to discern how this would help the current and future students. That is where the focus should be. He also wondered whether it was possible to find a comparison group of communities with similar demographics to compare OPRFHS as that would seem more relevant in terms of racial and economic makeup. Relative to math progress, students are going to the tutoring center in large numbers, there was a connection there. Does that imply a particular direction?

Mr. Phelan felt the data was useful to understand what the District wanted to do next but also useful to see what work was successful. When a program is instituted, it is important to have a way to determine if it were effective. Ms. Hill responded that the students who had the most opportunity to receive intensive reading support are now juniors. She plans to run the analysis on the interim data just received from the freshman PLAN and ACT scores. She continued that the math comments made were specific to PSAE, which is a snapshot in time. What is unknown is where students begin with their math. She was reluctant to make a connection from what is being seen in the PSAE and what Joey Cofsky said, while both are true. It was acknowledged that the way Skyward is organized is challenging because the District has to take multilines and render it as one long line, in addition to having additional information. Every data set that is reported on exists in different Skyward silos. The District is looking at software to help with the analysis and allowing teachers to have access to this data in order to understand what is going on in their domain. Board of Education will continue to discuss data at the Instruction Committee.

Common Core State Standards

The Instruction Committee reviewed a report outlining the faculty and staff's work on implementing common core state standards (CCSS) at the high school. A link to the report was provided. These standards will affect much of the work in the building for many years.

Data Warehousing

It was the consensus of the majority of the Board of Education members to support the District's continued exploration of employing a data warehousing system. All members of Finance Committee had supported forwarding this to the entire Board of Education. When the District originally began exploring this in the spring, it was unhappy with the results and a new board was being seated.

A data warehouse can take existing data and manipulate in different ways. Last spring when five vendors were identified, only 3 submitted proposals, and the cost was approximately \$200,000. The District surveyed the market again and found another vendor, but it was more expensive. While the District will explore a consultant arrangement, it will probably be more expensive. The reasons for embarking on this project are as follows:

- 1) Change data into information more effectively
- 2) Allow different constituents use
- 3) Consulting piece – data cleaning, mapping, reconciling and match, this

will change processing. It was noted that Skyward holds much data, many silos(such as Mastery Manager, SRI, discipline, athletics, activities, National School Clearing House, etc.), but it is difficult to connect the information

- 4) Expenditure in money and resource time to do this.

One Board of Education member noted that it was important for the District to report on the successfulness of being able to access data in the future. If this technology does what it is hoped, it will be very valuable. One member wanted to dig deeper into the data to find out what was working with individual students.

The cost of this technology will not have any hard savings; however, there will be soft savings. People will be able to do more value-added tasks. One member found it disconcerting for the District to continue to jump from program to program. There was the belief that teachers were already doing differentiation. Will this make that better? Another responded that education was ever changing and the needs are changing. Tools are constantly being developed to make it easier to differentiate. The faculty is providing differentiated instruction and information can be shared with other colleagues to help students be successful. Data needs to support that work. One member asked if the money were better spent on this technology rather than 3 more teachers or two counselors as it has been said that having contact with teachers, adults, etc., in the building is all important. Another member stated that this tool would provide a solution to a problem that has been frustrating. It will allow a good use of people's time and it is important for the Board of Education goals on equity and education, as some of that has to be made with quantitative and qualitative data; it is not a matter of this being more important than teachers or counselors.

One member cautioned the Board of Education about asking for more and more information from the District and it does take District resources to respond to requests.

Adjournment

At 11:32 p.m. on Thursday, September 26, 2013, Dr. Lee moved to adjourn this meeting; seconded by Mr. Cofsky. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

Mr. John Phelan
President

Dr. Jackie Moore
Secretary