The regular Board meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on Thursday, March 26, 2015, in the Board Room of the OPRFHS.

Call to Order
Vice President Weissglass called the meeting to order at 6:45 p.m. A roll call indicated the following Board of Education members were present: Thomas F. Cofsky, Dr. Steven Gevinson (telephonically from 9:00 to 10:46 p.m.), Dr. Ralph H. Lee, Dr. Jackie Moore, Sharon Patchak Layman, John Phelan (telephonically from 9:00 to 10:46 p.m.) and Jeff Weissglass. Also present were Dr. Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant Clerk of the Board.

Closed Session
At 6:47 p.m. on Thursday, March 26, 2015, Mr. Weissglass moved to enter closed session for the purpose of discussing the appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of specific employees of the District or legal counsel for the District, including hearing testimony on a complaint lodged against an employee or against legal counsel for the District to determine its validity. 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(1), as amended by PA.93—57; seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

At 7:30 p.m., the Board of Education resumed open session.

Visitors
Joining the meeting were Tod Altenburg, Chief School Business Official; Michael Carioscio, Chief Information Officer; Amy Hill, Director of Assessment and Research; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal (departed at 11:09 p.m.); Dr. Gwen Walker-Qualls, Interim Director of Pupil Personnel; David Ruhlend, Director of Human Resources; Karin Sullivan, Director of Communications and Community Relations; Annika Holdeboer, Student Council Liaison Representative; and Sheila Hardin, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair.

Visitors
Fred Arkin, John Bokum, DeJarie Boldon, Pierce Boyd Bogley, Gil Cabacungan, Jennifer Cassell, Connie Coleman, Joe Connell, Stephen Jackson, Steve James, Katherine Lieb, Kevin Peppard, Darrell Radliszewski, Peter Ryan, Riley Stewart, Sara Spivy and Chris Williams, community members; Mary Haley, League of Women Voters, Jo Murray of Links, Inc., Meghan Cahill, Anthony Clark, John Conde, John Costopoulos, Jason Dennis, Julie Fuentes, Jacqueline Hanson, Joseph Herbst, Ron Johnson, Scyla Murray Baelli, Peter Nixen, Carolyn Ojikutu, and Jessica Stovall, OPRFHS faculty and staff; Sebastian Braghen, Michael Filac, Dale Marie Johannason, Dallas Koelum, and Mariel Seals, students; George Brennan of the Trapeze, and Michael Romain of the Wednesday Journal.

Public Comments
Chris Williams, 600 S. Lombard, resident of Oak Park, addressed the informal plan to place tennis courts on the parking lot at the Village of Oak Park (VOP). For the past 3 years, his neighbors have been dealing with various governmental bodies that have plan to build on this parking lot; every plan involved underground parking. The plan formulating now is to put an
OPRFHS tennis facility on it. His takeaways were: 1) how it affects the residents, and 2) it is a village-wide issue. The underground parking place cost is $50,000 per space and, thus, 200 spaces would cost $10 million. He did not believe that made fiscal sense and it was not the appropriate place. The VOP says that its building is zoned B: the lot is zoned R4 and any zoning variance would have serious opposition and litigation attached to it.

John Bokum, resident of 629 Home, Oak Park, presented the facts regarding the pool site. In January, the Board of Education proposed building the pool where the current baseball field or tennis courts exist. The Board of Education has until April 23, 2015 to find a place to move the baseball field, tennis courts, or softball fields, or go to parking garage site. Moving any of the 3 sports will set those sports back considerably. He did not want green space destroyed. The Village wants to dispose of the parking garage and the dead space south of Lake Street. He suggested putting the garage there instead.

Phil Prale, an OPRFHS administrator, and a member of the District Equity Leadership Team read its statement.

“The DELT (District Equity Leadership Team) is composed of administrators and faculty members who focus leadership efforts on racial equity and are working on a framework to promote racial equity at a systemic level. I serve on the DELT along with several district colleagues. This work includes examining school culture and climate through the lens of race and equity and identifying equity strategies and action plans to improve student experiences. A few weeks ago, we talked with Steve James and John Condne about the proposed media project under consideration. Our thanks to Steve James and John Condne for talking and taking the dialogue into several public spaces. We honor and respect them both as artists and as individuals. However, we have three concerns regarding the proposed project centered on the “racial achievement gap.”

“First, we see a difference between a focus on the “racial achievement gap” and one on “systemic racial educational disparities.” The phrase “racial achievement gap” has historically been used to put the focus on students of color and the struggle to produce educational outcomes similar to white peers. This traditional narrative has been used to ask what is wrong with students of color and what programs can be put in place in order to “fix” them, identifying those most affected by racism in our school systems as the problem. We encourage shifting the focus to a critical understanding of how our school system operates to produce racially inequitable educational experiences for our students.

“Second, believing that our racial equity work should focus upon our system, rather than upon the students most affected by systemic inequities, we questioned the intent of the proposal to further our racial equity work. When achievement data is disaggregated by race, disparities in outcomes are evident, that has been well established at OPRF and nationally. If the intent is to deepen our understanding of the ways these disparities persist despite the efforts of caring, well-intentioned individuals, we recommend an approach rooted in scholarship rather than media.
“Finally, we think the proposed project carries potential risks to the students, adults, and the larger institution. A movie made from a year’s worth of film footage, in the end, can portray only a series of snapshots. We are concerned about the unintended consequences for those who participate in the project, and for those who do not. The intentions of the filmmakers are good; their project proposal seeks to shed light on the persistent problem of racial educational disparities. Nonetheless, perpetuating systemic racism does not require bad intent. Without a grounded and critical understanding of race and a continuous awareness of how people of color have and continue to be identified as the problem with regard to racism in America, we are left with concerns about the project’s negative potential for our students and our school.

“As of today, DELT members oppose moving forward with the proposed project. Our focus in our ongoing racial equity work is on addressing systemic disparities based on race and the disservice they do to all of our students, most particularly our students of color and their families, rather than a focus on those students and families themselves.”

Scyla Murray Baielli, OPRFHS faculty member, made the following comments: “As an African-American OPRF graduate, faculty member and soon to be OPRF parent, I am very aware and protective of the reputation of the school and its place in the community at large. Because we will be held up to intense criticism as a result of this project, I would like to make sure these questions are answered before there is a discussion of setting up a documentary crew in house. I am asking the Board of Education to table the film proposal until the community has had further discussion. What is the purpose of the project? What is it that one is trying to expose or change? This is not about what the project is about or what is the subject of the film? What is the timetable? Why is the timetable so quick? What is the projected budget? Are we/the District taxpayers paying? Can the public see a treatment, artist statement, proposal, and sample work before the Board of Education votes on this? This same kind of documentation required for a grant should be provided. Is the Board of Education asking for in-kind funds? What did the outreach coordinator say about the project? How many schools were considered to be profiled for failing their students? What are the benefits for choosing to be profiled as a failing school? How does this benefit the students, faculty, staff, and the community at large? How many faculty of color were advised about the film? What local or community groups were advised about the film? Who will represent the school at press junkets, panel discussions, etc. after the project is released to the media? How will students for academic deficiencies be vetted? What feeder junior high and elementary schools in Oak Park, River Forest and in Chicago will be profiled? How many years will the students be followed? Where does the problem start? How will the film help? If the argument is that by bringing outsiders into the school this will illuminate the problem, the issue becomes the problem and it will be dissected on a national level. The school will be the face of the problem, nothing will be able to be addressed. If a problem exists, it should be addressed without cameras or national scrutiny. Does the teacher bringing this get producer credit? If so, is that ethical? Do faculty get credit? Is the faculty getting taxpayer release time to help with this production? How many years will faculty be tied up with this
project? Is that a contractual issue? What is the actual premise of the film? Who are the filmmakers? Are there people of color on the film crew? How will the failing students be selected? At its core, documentary filmmaking is storytelling. It is biased by nature in order to tell a compelling narrative. What story will be told about OPRFHS? Without shooting a single frame, we already know the film will show a school failing students led by teachers and a board of education that have turned their back to the students’ needs. This is the permanent portrayal the Board of Education is supporting. Is this what this diverse community wants?

John Costopoulos, teacher at OPRFHS and 1980 graduate, spoke in favor of the film. Having heard some concerns regarding the film agreeing with the strong points, he felt other issues needed addressing. It is 2015 and it was sickening, sad and upsetting that these were still issues. He felt it was worth the risk to be able to glean insight from the students through this documentary to help this community and the nation solve this problem. Mr. James and Mr. Condne have dealt with delicate issues. Mr. James is a community member and Mr. Condne is a faculty member. This is an opportunity to do something significant and transcendent and impactful to solve this problem. He supported the film because it was one way for the students’ voice to be heard.

Jessica Stovall, teacher at OPRFHS, spoke in support of the film, listing the numerous ways she participates at the school to support it. While she believes in OPRFHS and the work it is doing, she felt it was not enough. After doing research in New Zealand, she finds that she has much hope. This film is about the students and she supported anything that would give the District clues as to how to eradicate this problem. Turning the camera on the District will be an opportunity to learn and to grow. For her own personal growth and for the students, she supported the filming.

Anthony Clark, teacher at OPRFHS, 2001 OPRFHS graduate, read the following statement:

“On our website, Oak Park and River Forest high school’s mission states the school provides a supportive learning environment that cultivates among other things equity and excellence for all students. The vision states the school will become an ever-improving model of equity and excellence, enabling students to achieve their full potential.

“As we stand now, our current paradigm/current model does not cultivate an environment that would nurture/promote such a mission and vision within the school and the community.

“Tackling the achievement gap continues to be a daunting task, which to this point has cultivated numerous conversations without identifying a source to the issue and any solutions.

“In life, I have always believed that it is harder to see the problem, when the problem could be you! Perhaps an unbiased lens would provide us with the opportunity to gain true perspective on the issue. Parents, students, administrators, and teachers must be empowered through insight and reflection.
A radical change needs to occur as our current paradigm is not working. For a paradigm shift to occur, a model must be created that will account for as many observations as possible with a coherent framework.

“Therefore, I throw my support behind this documentary if it is filmed without bias and without premade assumptions. The biography should not focus on one demographic: only teachers, only students, only successful students, only failing students, only black students. But capture a representation of every demographic at this school in order to account for those observations required to cultivate a paradigm shift. If this occurs, the documentary can be influential in making change.”

Mariel Seals, student, spoke in support of the film.

Steven Jackson, 702 S. Oak Street, River Forest, advocated for filming of achievement gap in this community. He read the following statement.

“Our community can learn a lesson about different realities here in our community. I know students families that spend $40,000 in one night on going to a bulls game and I know students that are homeless.

“We have said that we are doing something about these gaps that directly affect the African-American male population. If it was guaranteed that your son had a higher probability of being in the disciplines system or not excelling in this school as a parent this issue would be huge issue for you. Mind you I am a father of a young African-American male. The fact that this is a nationwide epidemic one would think that we could come up with a solution. I am hoping that this documentary can inspire someone to come up with a viable solution or see if what we are actively doing is a viable solution.

“Why not? I love my community. In family structures when someone has an issue the family as a whole sometimes has to have an intervention. This may be just that.

“Steve James is one of us. He is an Oak Parker. He is an artist. We pride our community to be known for the arts. If we can’t support our very own what does that say about us?

“This is a moment. Every great occurrence in history started with a thought. The thought was eventually transmuted into action. I live by three initials. TSA. Thought Speech and Action. This has been thought about. The community is speaking on this. Let's act on this right now Oak Park.”

Mr. Jackson read a statement from Latonia Jackson, the mother of 3 male students, and OPRFHS staff member, supporting the documentary.

Joe Herbst, OPRFHS counselor, read the following statement: “The core question at the heart of our work as counselors is ‘what is best for all kids?’ This question guides us through spirited debates, varying opinions, and multiple perspectives. Nothing else is more important than the litmus test of this question. As we conducted a time study this past fall, gathered comparative data from other high school counseling programs, and critically evaluated the
ways we address the needs of our students, this question guided our reflection and resulted in a proposal for the addition of a 5th PSS team, comprised of three counselors, one student intervention director, and one youth therapist for the 2015-16 school year. A 5th PSS team aligns with the Board’s efforts to build relationships in every area of our school because it is only by working in relationship that we will achieve our school’s mission. This belief statement of the Board could not be more closely aligned with a counselor’s work with students.

“Our PSS proposal was submitted to the Administration in December. We were given an indication that we could present to the Instruction Committee first possibly in January, then in February and finally in March. Much to our dismay, an opportunity to present the proposal did not materialize, and the 2015-16 Staffing Proposal document under Board consideration this evening contains no aspect of it. We have been informed that our proposal may be included as part of an instructional support FTE discussion at the April 23rd Board meeting. I am troubled by the lack of process and timeline for the consideration of our request. I am puzzled by the distinction between “instructional” staffing and “instructional support” staffing and its discussion at two separate board meetings.

“During my tenure, I have witnessed numerous initiatives that have been employed in the name of fostering student achievement. By far, most attention has been paid to what occurs within the classroom. I would like to shed light on the equal importance of what occurs under the auspices of Student Services. While I applaud the Board of Education for reducing class sizes in an effort to meet the learning needs of all students, I urge you to consider the preconditions to learning: how a students’ social emotional well-being is essential to learning readiness, classroom behavior, and academic performance. While the classroom for a counselor may be a hallway, our office, or even a stairwell, the place we encounter our students is no less integral to student achievement. Growing student enrollment is driving higher caseloads and affecting relationship building with all of our students. Yet we continually strive to know each of our students personally and staunchly defend our individual counseling time while other districts have moved to a group counseling modality. Our students deserve more than the status quo in a school that strives to provide so much more in so many other ways. I implore the Board to consider the full proposal of FTE requests before them, rather than having two separate deliberations. The space in which students learn should not be the distinguishing factor in determining the allocation of resources. Instead the unifying question should be the same as the one guiding the work of counselors: ‘What is best for all kids?’”

Meghan Cahill, Counseling Division, read the following statement: “As a five year member of the counseling division, I left my department chair position in student services at another district because returning to my destination high school was my final career goal. Just as it was when I left as an intern, OPRF continues to value student services as I have never seen elsewhere in a large comprehensive high school. From the minute students arrive, they are with their counselor and PSS team members, getting to know their go-to personnel in a sea of transition and vast opportunities. Our offices are a hub where
students seek us out to get things done. I have had the privilege of working on every social emotional need from the most significant life threatening crisis to the departure of Zayn from One Direction in the last 24 hours.

“No two days look the same. We have streamlined our registration procedures this school year to preserve individual time with students. Despite the extraordinary benefit of class sizes at an all-time low, we are concerned that our individual time with students and families is in jeopardy as caseloads continue to rise and approach their all-time high. The data from comparative districts indicate lower caseloads yield more individual time with students and an enhanced counseling curriculum. It is the intention and tenor of this proposal to maintain our current level of high quality individual service, while continuing to expand smaller workshops to specific diversified populations in need (i.e. first generation college students, support for minority students in AP/honors program, and non-cognitive skills development), to name a few.

The supportive learning environment board goal advocates for “a learning environment where every student feels known and supported by at least one adult in the school community.” From the moment they meet us as incoming freshmen, we are that first person, and from there the relationship building begins. This is a thoughtful proposal that underpins significant board goals, one we trust will come to the table and be given full consideration.”

Jacqueline Hanson, distributed a proposal and read the following statement:

“The time afforded us by the addition of a fifth PSS Team would give counselors the ability to roll out more opportunities for students. Some options already discussed include but are not limited to the following programming ideas:

1. Increase proactive, individual grade-level meetings from 2 per year for all students
2. Expand current group, grade-level curriculum presentations/workshops to one per semester for all grade levels
   a. Add a meeting with students at the end of senior year, using our established relationship with them to address topics relating to transitioning to college safely and successfully.
   b. Implement group meetings for students to take the Learning Style and Interest Inventories in Naviance, our college and career planning software; right now students only take the Personality Test, “Do What You Are.”
   c. Move the Goal-Setting portion of our fall sophomore lesson to spring of freshman year so that we can build on the goals and monitor and adapt them as the student goes through high school.
3. Develop more small groups targeted to the academic, personal/social, and college/career needs of our diverse student body.
4. Create a plan for increasing student participation in co- and extracurricular activities.
5. Add a mini-college fair for in-state colleges commonly attended by our students to the Senior College Information Night parent presentation.
6. For the last two years counselors have brought a select group of African-American Juniors to the Black Student Leadership Conference at the College of DuPage in February. We’d like to build on the
energy and excitement students feel after the Conference by following up with college preparation and readiness workshops to keep the momentum going strong through college application season and beyond;
a. My strong hope is that OPRFHS will have more successful programs to present at upcoming MSAN conferences; OPRFHS needs to be a leader among peer MSAN schools, and I believe the counselors can play a pivotal role in making this happen.

7. Implement Check-and-Connect systems with our most at-risk students who need more attention and hands-on assistance regularly.

8. Join with our youth therapists to offer more social-emotional and academic skill-development groups, before, during, and after school.

9. If the student-led advisory proposal is approved to begin next year, the counselors will be able to create a developmentally-appropriate, proactive counseling curriculum to address issues that affect students at this school, including substance use and abuse, conflict resolution, social intelligence, grit, teen pregnancy, positive relationship building, to name a few.

“My colleagues and I are salivating to implement these proactive, holistic concepts. We will be able to start work this coming fall if the 5th PSS Team is approved.”

Carolyn Ojikutu, counselor, reading the following statement. “Teaching inspired me to become a counselor. As a teacher, I was often startled and saddened by stories my students shared with me via their writing, in classroom discussions, and in private conferences. In order to become better equipped to help my students, I began my training in school counseling. Since then, I have worked in three districts and am immensely proud to be at OPRF. Being a Counselor here has allowed me to carve out a unique kind of learning space. I was drawn to being a counselor in THIS high school because of its reputation and focus on the whole child. Structures and Leaders have changed quite a bit during my 12 years here, but the focus on the individual student remains.

“At an earlier Board meeting, it was suggested that counselors track their work hours to provide a picture of what we do. We have done so. Most revealing to me was that I spent twice the time on Indirect Services as compared to Direct Services. This means communicating about students with partners such as parents and guardians, teachers, case managers, college admissions officers, probation officers, private tutors, private therapists, hospital liaisons, and so on. As important as these relationships are, the most essential relationship I develop is with my students. Directly.

“Typical days? There are none. The more open my appointment schedule appears to be, the more open I am to receive unplanned visits--often accompanied by bursts of emotion. This week alone I am working individually with two students who are transitioning from extended hospital stays for emotional health issues; a student whose parent died unexpectedly; another who is torn between parents in an ugly divorce. I have been meeting with a transfer student who is overwhelmed by the demands and expectations of his teachers. I have numerous students accepted to colleges of their choice, now
trying to figure out from where the money will come. We are reviewing financial aid award letters—making sense of those, conducting scholarship searches; on the other spectrum I am meeting with a student who is still frozen by the application process—we write a few sections of her personal statement together per period. And then there are the phone and email messages…… Providing these services day in and day out take a toll—we are stretched beyond belief as we wear numerous hats at any given moment. Thankfully, I love my job. I am personally and emotionally fulfilled by my work and I feel honored to play such a pivotal role in the lives of young people. As hard as I work and as dedicated as I am to my job, I could be much better. And my students could be better served. I believe that an additional PSS team would help all of us to serve our kids better. Just like a smaller classroom, a smaller caseload would grant students more direct access to their counselors and allow us to serve the whole child.

“My primary objective is to Build Strong and Meaningful Relationships—one of the most essential factors in Student Achievement. I don’t want any student to feel overlooked. I want every student under my watch to feel as if I know who they are, what is important to them, and that they trust that I will help them along their personal journey. I welcome the opportunity to deepen existing relationships with my students. I believe that implementing an additional PSS team and reducing current caseloads will be beneficial to all. Finally, our Department Chair, Kris Johnson, who is unable to be here this evening will be emailing her remarks for the record. Thank you for taking my thoughts into consideration.”

Katherine Liebl, the mother of 3 adopted African-American students attending District 97, spoke in support of Steve James. She is already seeing inequalities and systemic issues in the first and third grades as this is not just a District 200 issue. She hoped that this would look at the elementary schools as well, as another lens is needed. She felt the film would allow the opportunity to hear from the students, teachers, parents, and community leaders. She stated that the community was ready for dialogue and change, and that the community should not be scared of it.

Steve James, a 30-year resident of Oak Park, responded to those who had spoken both for and against the film, appreciating all of the questions. He addressed first the concerns of DELT. Both he and Mr. Condne wanted to look at the “achievement gap” more systemically, as a result of conversations with people they have met with. While DELT felt that research would be better than a film would be a good idea, it was not known if it has had much impact; the film and the research are not mutually exclusive. If research were conducted, it would be great to see that progress in the film. The film addresses things for the more general audience, the students, people outside of the community, etc. They take very seriously unintended consequences. They want students and families to participate in this because they believe in the mission. The intent is not to do a series of snapshots, but to delve deeply into the lives and issues. Even though the center would be the school, it would not be about just the school, but a much larger community. People care passionately about it.
Mike Filac, junior at OPRFHS and filmmaker, spoke in support of the film. He had taken 3 of Mr. Conyne’s’ classes and had the highest regard for him. He felt blessed and thankful to have a great school and a mentor in filmmaking. He believed the film would be enlightening and a solution to the problem will appear.

Lauren Lee, OPRFHS English teacher since 2003, spoke in opposition to the film. Originally hired by Dr. Steve Gevinson, she also worked briefly in the history department. She read the following statement: “I have worked in other suburban districts, in Chicago Public Schools, and I have biracial children who attended CPS.

“In short, I am opposed to the proposed Steve James film project. I have taught two of Steve’s’ children, and I have met with Steve and his wife multiple times. They are good people, and I like him and I believe in his good intentions. At the same time, I feel that a film focusing on the ‘Achievement Gap,’ which is a (pejorative) term focused on African-American students, contributes to the very problem we are attempting to address. The Achievement Gap is truly an ‘Education Debt,’ which, along with systemized racism embedded in our society for decades, if not centuries, manifests itself in test scores—which are themselves culturally biased. A film or project focusing on THAT problem would go far beyond the scope of any high school.

“By focusing on one, or on a few, African-American students—even if one is a ‘good’ student and another is ‘challenged’ or ‘disadvantaged,’ we run the risk of typifying African-American students as ‘good’ or ‘bad.’ African-American students become even more identified with an educational ‘problem,’ or a ‘disadvantage,’ further stigmatizing them in our society. I’m also not sure that District 200 appreciates that the perception some African-American families have toward OPRFHS is not necessarily as positive as it could be—and that this film could further discourage those families from sending their children to the high school. Although my understanding is second-hand, some families may believe that our expectations for African-American students could be higher, or that those students are viewed as problematic or somehow limited. I am concerned that this proposed film could worsen that perception, and that it could result in fewer African-American families wanting to send their children to our school. Black students walking in our doors will automatically be associated with the “achievement gap.” I’d like to ask the white board members: would you like that label to apply to your children? Does that label communicate uniformly high expectations for all of our students?

“In terms of teaching, I myself would not be comfortable having the cameras in my classroom; I feel that having or even not having the cameras in could be professionally prejudicial. Once a piece is edited, people can be portrayed in any way at all on film. An offhand comment or an unintentional slight could make a teacher seem uncaring or biased on film. Some teachers with high standards and expectations for all students would decline to participate at all. Others, who may relish the attention and the opportunity for some kind of fame or advancement, may participate for the wrong reasons. Aside from a last-minute Faculty Senate meeting with Steve James, we have had no other opportunity as a faculty to express our concerns about this project: pushing the
project forward without such an opportunity could create dissent in the building.

“All in all, I am most concerned about objectifying a student portrayed as weak or limited in some way through the film, and the possibly life-long repercussions of such a portrayal for him or her. In addition, I am worried that such a film could exacerbate the perception of African-Americans as a source of trouble or limitation in our community, our school, or our country. Furthermore, I think that the very concept of a white person portraying a black cultural ‘issue’ or ‘problem’ has the built in fallacy of creating a sense of ‘otherness’ through his outsider’s portrayal of another’s cultural experience.

‘Finally, given our recent notoriety in the national and international media (‘the Bali killer,’ the Black Lives Matter assembly, the Jon play appropriateness issue), this film could simply add on to a negative public perception of our school and community, which I believe is undeserved. We have nothing to gain from this project, from a public relations standpoint. It won’t improve instruction, and we cannot afford further damage to our reputation.”

Dale Marie Johannason, student, spoke about the importance of bringing the achievement gap to light but she did not believe that would achieved by only filming African-American students below the gap. She felt it should be broadened and both White and Black students above the gap should be filmed.

The comments of Mr. Patrick Pearson, OPRFHS faculty member, were read into the minutes as he was on tour in Italy with the orchestra. “…I would like to offer my personal opinion about the proposed film documentary, directed by Steve James and produced by John Condne. Please know that these are simply my personal feelings and that no one or nothing influenced my opinion, other than the knowledge I received from Mr. James and Mr. Condne at various public forums where they explained their intent, purpose and process.

“I am in support of the film because I think our school has been in a dark and negative light when it comes to our community, who for the most part, are not within our walls to really experience what happens at our wonderful high school. I am proud of Oak Park and River Forest High School and I know the great things that happen in this school outweigh the negative. Although the positive aspects are publicized, the negative aspects always attract more attention and everyone, particularly outsiders, feel they can complain or solve the issue(s). Granted, this film will not solve our issues, but it will offer an inside perspective of what we do in the school.

“We have been dealing with this minority achievement gap for decades and we still have not found an answer. Will we ever? Maybe not. What the film could do is show that we are not and have not been ignoring the issue, but trying to remedy the issue, as it relates to race. Again, stressing that this is my personal opinion, I agree that the race issues in this school are systemic, which makes it difficult to remedy. Maybe the naysayers are afraid that this systemic issue will be exposed. Maybe the film will expose it, but first, we have to recognize the issue and fix it. Yes, this is a tremendous risk to the reputation of
our school, especially in light of the BLM Assembly publicity, which segues to my next point.

“Before the BLM issue, I was in favor of the film. Now that we are in the midst of the aftermath of the BLM, I am even more in favor of the film, because the film could offer a more accurate depiction of what happens in our school. As a Black person, who sat on the panel of the assembly, I am appalled at the comments of the people who were not even there. But I am not writing to speak of BLM, that’s for another time. This film could help dispel the rumors and accusations of BLM.

“What about the Black students and teachers who will be part of the film? Will they have to endure public ridicule? May, maybe not, but again, as a Black man, I can assure you that Black people have endured public ridicule all of our lives, whether it is direct, indirect, subliminal, or systemic. We live and deal with intentional and unintentional racism every day. This is nothing new. The difference is now everyone will experience the systemic racism through the film.

“In closing, I would like to say that this is the opportunity to stand up for our school and live up to really moving forward with educating our public on what really happens in our awesome school. In addition, we need town up to and be transparent of the mistakes we make as well as the strides. I have full faith in Mr. James and Mr. Condne and full support their efforts to dig into this issue.”

FOIA Requests
Ms. Kalmerton reported that 3 FOIA requests had been received and 3 resolved.

Student Council
Ms. Holdeboer reported on Student Council’s charity events. Over $300 was raised at the Brown Cow and the Mr. OPRFHS event. The Magic Foundation in Oak Park will receive a $200 donation.

It was noted that school issues, such as the film, are discussed if time allows, but Student Council may not have a recommendation.

Faculty Report
Faculty had its first run with the state testing and gearing up for AP testing. Faculty is working hard to support students.

Superintendent’s Report
Dr. Isoye reported the following:

Tymmarah Anderson and Hannah Green won the national-level Scholastic Writing Awards. Tymmarah won a gold medal as well as being the only regional American Voices nominee in poetry. Hannah won a silver medal. Both students have been invited to the awards ceremony at Carnegie Hall in New York.

Many OPRFHS students won awards at the 2015 National German Exam/Competition sponsored by the American Association of Teachers of German. Congratulations go to Cole Tamondong, Damian Anton, Elliot Brandt, Micah Cioppa, Nathan Brown, Emmett Lavin. Camille Gallo, Patrick Gardner, Emily Wood, Miriam Cortinovis, Oskar Muller, and Rachel Nitzsche.
Junior Maya Breitenstein recently took second place overall in the regional Junior Science and Humanities Symposia (JSHS) Program, one of the toughest juried science competitions that exists for students. Maya built two different prototypes of wind turbines and investigated which would be more efficient. Her award qualifies her to present at the national competition.

Astronomy and physics teacher Kevin McCarron is one of the 28 U.S. educators chosen for NASA’s highly competitive Airborne Astronomy Ambassadors program. He will be a member of one of the 14 two-person teams that are paired with professional astronomers and fly on 10-hour overnight science missions.

The Huskie wrestling team repeated as the IHSA class 3A state champs. In addition, at the state meet of the Illinois Wrestling Coaches and Officials Association, Peter Ogunsanya was the state champ in the 101-pound weight class.

The Special Olympics Orange Team took home second place in Division 10 at the state basketball tournament. Congratulations to Erik Cox, Matt Cox, Kobe Crawford, Kameron Curtis, Michael Gardner, Mattie Kotlowitz, and Brandon Schneider.

Ellora Jaggi was on the winning team at the Re:Imagine24 design competition. Working closely with design mentors, 100 teen participants spent 24 hours at the Art Institute brainstorming and building projects.

Hip Hop Club members Donnie Booker, Kedrick Chalmers, Taniya Seanior, Marquette Davis, Anthony Brooks, and Raymond Williams worked with the young people of Opportunity Knocks during its Just Dance program. Plans are for Hip Hop to continue the partnership with the nonprofit, which serves young people with developmental disabilities.

Several students took first place awards at the ICTM Regional Math Competition, which automatically qualified them for the state tournament. Congratulations to Arjun Rawal, Sanjeev VenKatesan, Alex Schoeny, Noah Banholzer, Sarah Kreider, Ethan Mertz, Lauren Pritz, and Grayson Uhlir. Several other students received second- and third-place awards.

Art students Brian Cassidy, Anastasiia Sevriukova, Margaret Hillengas, and Lize Muraiti and Declan Ryan too home top awards in a competition held at the Zhou Art Gallery in Bridgeport.

The following items were removed from consent agenda:
D. Personnel Recommendations
E. Comprehensive Instructional Staffing Overview 2015-16
J. Substitute Rates for the 2015-16 School Year
P. Textbook RFP for 2015-16 School Year

Consent Items

Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the following consent items:
• Check Disbursements and Financial Resolutions dated March 26, 2015
• Monthly Treasurer’s Report
• Monthly Financial Reports
• Non-Certified Personnel List for FY 2015
• 2015 Certified Staff Seniority List
• Release of Probationary Non-Tenured Staff
• Athletic Uniform Bids
• NIIPC Dairy Products RFP
• NIIPC Juice Products RFP
• Grand Prairie Transit, Inc. Contract Renewal
• Multifunction School Activity Busy (MFSAB) and Special Education
  Yellow Bus Purchase
• Gala Fireworks Request
• Renewal of IHSA Membership Form
• Open and Closed Session Minutes of February 26, 2015 and a declaration
  that the closed session audiotapes of August 2013 be destroyed

seconded by Dr. Moore. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried. Mr. Phelan and Dr. Gevinson were absent from this vote.

**Personnel Recommendations**

Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the personnel recommendations as presented, including New Hires, Status Change, Transfer, Retirements, Resignations, Leave of Absence; seconded by Mr. Cofsky.

Mr. Weissglass moved to amend his motion to approve the personnel recommendations, except for the Director of Student Activities, as presented; seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried. Mr. Phelan and Dr. Gevinson were absent from this vote.

** Substitute Proposal**

Mr. Weissglass moved to accept the Substitute Proposal, as presented: seconded by Dr. Moore. Discussion ensued.

1. Pay substitutes an additional $10 for any period they teach beyond 6 periods in a given day
   □ Substitutes are routinely retained to cover for a faculty member who teaches 5 periods and covers a supervisory period. There are times when substitutes are assigned to cover a class period during the period blocked out for planning. In those instances, it is reasonable to provide additional compensation for their added responsibilities.

2. Increase the daily rate from $110/day to $120/day for each day of full day substituting beyond the 20th day that a sub works for the District in a given year (resets annually)
   □ By increasing the daily rate after the 20th day, the District acknowledge their loyalty and further incentivize them to continue to look to us first for daily work.

3. Pay substitutes an additional incentive representing $10/day for the full-day assignments they cover beyond the 50th day, up to a
maximum incentive of $500, with such incentive being paid at the end of the school year.

To further recognize their ongoing commitment to serve OPRFHS, as evidenced by their total days of work for OPRFHS, and to encourage them to look to OPRFHS first with the knowledge that they will be recognized with the year-end payment.

OPRFHS does not have enough substitutes available to meet its needs which average 20 substitutes per day at a cost of $475,000. One member noted that 20 substitutes represented approximately 10% of the faculty and that equates to 17 days of absence. If a student is absent for 10%, his/her success is greatly diminished. On average, 10% of the students do not have their primary instructor in front of the class. Several members wanted a better understanding of the data to determine the reasons for the absences and then to look at policies to maximize instructional time. Another concern was raised about whether the substitutes were highly qualified in the areas in which they were substituting asking how they are evaluated.

It was the consensus of the Board of Education members to ask the administration and the Instruction Committee to add this to its agenda so that the committee can review the history and determine whether there is a policy issue. It was noted that this was the first year that the District has data to pull out and that substitutes are needed for things such as IEPs, etc. This is a problem with which every district struggles.

A roll call vote resulted in one aye and 4 nays. Mr. Weissglass voted aye. Motion failed. Mr. Phelan and Dr. Gevinson were absent from this vote.

**Director of Student Activities**

Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the appointment of Regina Topka to the Director of Student Activities position; seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in 3 ayes and 2 nays. Ms. Patchak-Layman and Dr. Moore voted nay. Motion carried. Mr. Phelan and Dr. Gevinson were absent from this vote.

The meeting recessed at 9:03 p.m. and resumed at 9:10 p.m.

**Filming**

Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the contract with Kartenquin Films, as presented; seconded by Mr. Phelan. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Phelan was approached by Mr. James and Mr. Condne in December about the prospects of doing a documentary at the high school concerning efforts of the District and the community to address the achievement gap over the years. The concept was how it was that a district that really represented a cross section of the population of the United States and Chicago, is affluent, cares a great deal about education, is a great high school, has had difficulty addressing the achievement gap. His trust of the project was based on the importance of understanding the facts underlying the achievement gap. The District has made devoted resources, time and effort regarding equity and achievement. He was hopeful when heard that the filmmaker, has been long member of community, has 3 children who attended here, has a great reputation, cares about issue and the school, is respected in his field, and is noted for being fair and bringing out
facts. He met with Mr. Condne, Mr. James, and Dr. Isoye in February. The administration was interested in making sure that the idea was properly vetted, that different stakeholder groups had an opportunity to hear about it, and to understand the intent and the project. Mr. Condne and Mr. James met with Citizens' Council, Faculty Senate, and countless varieties of other meetings, answering every question brought to them, as well as reaching out to the Board of Education members to make themselves available in advance. The District can learn a lot from this project. While the District might see things it does not like, it might see things it does not see. He felt this was a tremendous opportunity and he looked forward to the debate.

Mr. Weissglass acknowledged the extensive public comment as it was very thoughtful and heartfelt on both sides.

Dr. Isoye made the following statement:

“As with anything there are multiple perspectives about the benefits or lack of benefits to having a documentary filmed at our school. I am not in support of the film.

“I heard a lot of hope of what will be in the film and what it will portray. Many people described what they think it will be and given that, off their support. There were many different scenarios described for this film.

“From the onset, a movie does seem like an exciting proposal. Focus on our school, learn something new, focus on student experiences in front of the camera, and even have some of our students participate behind the camera. I have had a chance to sit through a variety of meetings with Steven James and John Condne about the project. I appreciate their willingness to come to as many meetings as possible to help inform our community of their proposal.

“A documentary about the achievement gap is really a documentary about race and how it plays out in our school and community. I do understand that there is no way to know how the final product will portray race; however, given the topic, I believe there will be many unintended consequences for the district and community to bear.

“To me, this film is no different than an article coming out about something that happened in the school or even at a Board meeting. Good intentions for informing, however, articles are written and captured through quotes and the journalist piecing events together. Context and subtleties will be missed. Those closest to the situation will understand the information, those furthest will draw conclusions based on the piece. This leads to misunderstandings or misinterpretations.

“I am concerned that by following individuals in our school, those individuals could unintentionally be seen as the problem or that they are not doing enough. So, our students of color may come across as the problem, needing to be fixed, rather than seeing a systemic issue. The systemic issue could even come across as the adults not doing enough, or adults pushing back not allowing for change. Leaving a taste of apathy, racism, or privilege when taken out of context. A
whole year compressed into 2-3 hours has to focus on the sensational clips, when it is truly the mundane, day to day that drives what we do. The film will have a permanent worldwide digital footprint that will follow the individuals for the rest of time.

“I do not think we need to have a documentary about OPRFHS and the achievement gap. I believe that there is a research basis for us to read, study, and implement towards continuous school improvement. I also believe we now have an opportunity to work with our community to better engage in the conversation about racial equity and our district. Conversations without a camera.

“The decision of the Board will impact future Boards. We will have some coming on to the Board in the next month, and some of you may decide not to run for a second term. Leaving any of the unintended consequences to others to answer to or resolve, not at a local level, but potentially a larger national level. I do not see how the energy spent on this project is worthwhile from a bigger scale as it is unclear to what benefit this serves our students, our school, and our community.”

Board of Education members commented.

While Dr. Lee did not believe there was an unbiased documentary, he felt the process of dealing with the documentary was important. Even through his criticism of the District, he never lost sight of the fact that during his tenure with OPRFHS, it makes an honest effort to deal with problems better than other district in the country. That is the reason he continues to pay high taxes rather than paying for better weather in some other places. Not many boards of education would allow this conversation because they would be too nervous to do so. He believed that between 1978 and 2000, OPRFHS was also too nervous. The achievement gap was identified in the early 1990’s. While no progress has occurred in the last 7 or 8 years with regard to statistics, more is known now about its nature. He favored doing the documentary because of its value and effort and he was proud that it was under consideration.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked where River Forest fit into this, because the contract speaks specifically about the history of OPRFHS? How would Mr. Condne’s salary, as a producer, conflict with his day-to-day work at the high school? How would confidentiality be treated? A teacher would know things that would not be known by the filmmaker. What lens will be used? How will the filmmaker personally enter into the project and what racial lens will be used? She was concerned about the students and the waivers students will be asked to sign when the only recourse is to be asked to be removed from the film, as opposed to being able to look at the film to see if it is harmful and/or helpful to the students involved. She also wondered whether teachers were mandated to be part of the film. Did they have to worry about whether or not they participated? She wanted more conversation to occur about the administration’s lack of support and the overall participation of coming into the school. Is the school the focus, as opposed to young people being followed? The dynamic is different in terms of who gets picked and who is involved. Concerned about student advocacy, she asked who will watch out for them.
Mr. Cofsky’s hesitancy was that the filming is a challenging topic and he appreciated the input from the community. Positives and risks are involved and it takes courage to address a challenging topic. He was concerned about the challenges posed because the administration did not support the film. While some of the speakers feel that the film will expose the answer, he questioned how that could happen in two hours. While hopeful, he was less hopeful that a film could compress, synthesize, and make judgments, when the District had already spent tens of hours talking about it. With the recent dialogue on the Black Lives Matter Assembly, it showed that OPRFHS is different from the rest of the nation and the polarization that has existed elsewhere. He was conflicted.

Dr. Moore met with Mr. James to get a better sense of the purpose, his rationale, and his interest in doing the documentary. The issues at hand are complex and include economics, equity, race, and race that transcends economics. It is not just about the achievement gap. There is a consistent aspect of the achievement gap that defies the wisdom of research. However, Oak Park is a unique community in its racial and economic demographics and few schools look like OPRFHS. OPRFHS graduates are able to go to college and talk about living in a community with all kinds of friends, which is unique and special. She had lived in Oak Park for 20 years and been involved in a racial incident. She was torn but hopeful that this would not be about figuring out what to do about the achievement issues but about showing the world what the District is doing because there are so many efforts going on to address achievement and racial equity. The Board of Education’s goal of “racial equity and racial diversity” is paramount. She stated that the word “will” should replace the word “might” when considering whether to focus on White students as well. This is not about helping black students. Pressures exist in this environment. The fact that only a few black students are in AP classes because they uncomfortable needs to be delved into and explored. If the District is dealing with access and equity and trying to make students feel comfortable, it has to realize that no matter who is the intended subject, the ramifications and the tremors affect everyone. It is about the experiences that White, Brown, and Black students are having in the school. She regretted that the student voice had not been involved and she hoped that as this continues the students will have an opportunity to understand the process and offer suggestions. No labels should be attached to the students followed. The audience can make its own judgment as to the different tracks, i.e., Honors, College Prep, Basic, etc.

Ms. Hardin added that the faculty had met with Mr. James and Mr. Condne. The faculty supported the Board of Education and administration and was in support of educating the students. The faculty was not taking an official stand, other than that of educating the students.

Mr. Prale reiterated DELT’s position that he had made earlier. Dr. Isoye noted that DELT made a collective effort to craft its statement and Dr. Isoye had crafted his own statement.

Dr. Gevinson too understood that undertaking such a project comes with much risk and he thought that the telling of stories through the documentary could be
useful, positive, and effective. At the same time, he understood that unintended consequences or misinterpretations could happen. The documentary titled “Waiting for Superman,” which was about education and reform, wrongly went after teachers. Some people will celebrate this documentary and others will decry. It is very complex and problematic to focus on the grades of the achievement gap. One would hope that one would come away with a deeper understanding. He was positive and supportive of the film because of his own knowledge of Mr. James, as a documentary filmmaker, having seen four of his films. He felt Mr. James could make the movie in a way that was fair, clear, and did justice to the complexities. The film could do a great service if done well and it could help with the local dialogue. It is about trusting the filmmaker.

Mr. Weissglass noted that there were caring, thoughtful, and committed people on both sides of this issue, some for the same reasons and analysis. Some see this exploration of equity and systemic issues as being vital to the District’s understanding, others not. It was confusing. The major positive would be that the more the District is open, the more it can deepen the exploration as an institution, and the better off it will be. A major con was the concern for the subjects, the students who will have digital footprints for time immemorial. Everyone who knows Mr. James, trusts him. In the movie, No Crossover, about Alan Iverson, a basketball player, numerous opportunities existed to characterize the people in that film, yet each was treated respectfully and went away feeling that respect. Work around diversity and equity and understanding the similarities will continue, and it will help the District focus on them even more. The District must find ways to have safe places without cameras and places to have cameras. He respected the administration’s concern and questions about the way the school is thinking about the conversation. It will shine a light on race and understanding of each other. He continued to have questions about the contract and he was not ready to approve it but, in principal, support the film. The term “achievement gap” is problematic in this conversation. He also wanted the questions about Mr. Condne’s role answered. He needed to understand the concerns, get the questions answered, and then bring it back to the Board of Education.

Mr. James responded to some of the comments and questions posed earlier. He thought River Forest would be part of the story. The term “achievement gap” will not be used in a revised contract, as using it had showed his own ignorance. He had thought it was a safe term, not knowing that it was thought of as baggage and peril. Part of the experience is the beginning of a ramp up for the film. For this film, in particular, it requires more education on his part. He has received readings, ordered books, met with Devon Alexander, etc. The film would begin next fall and that will allow him time to do the homework, including meeting with more people, including students, if the Board of Education approves the contract. His idea was always to deal with race. Originally, his premise was to first focus on teachers, administrators and students of colors but he had had other realizations. He wanted to focus on what it meant to be a student in a school like this.

While the school would have a general waiver, that would not mean one has to be in the film. In the classroom setting, it is a deeper question about who is to
be the subject. This will be pitched as a miniseries. Teacher participation is voluntary. Any time anyone opens themselves up to be in this film, it is because of personal choice. Mr. James did not want to stigmatize any teacher. People have to want to be involved. The desire will be to engage students and families who will care about the film because they see it as being a valuable experience for students and community. He does not make films “on people,” he makes them with people. It is a collaborative undertaking and that collaboration extends to seeing the film well before it is done. The movie Hoop Dreams spent much time on the educational lives of the students, it was about a system in place that causes them to struggle academically, not because they are “dumb”. What one saw is what caused them to struggle.

Mr. Phelan putting his fears aside, felt it was an opportunity and one that the District will be proud if it is courageous about it.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked 1) Mr. James and Mr. Conway to revise the contract to accommodate the conversation and comments at this meeting so that there is no ambiguity; 2) hold another conversation with the administration; and 3) determine what ways could be used to move this film forward that would be good for the students. She appreciated the student focus, but there were many other people at the school. Mr. James acknowledged that students would be an important focus but an importance piece will also be to focus on teachers, administrators, the outreach worker, guidance counselors, DELT, etc., as that will distinguish the film from other things being attempted. The contract will be updated to reflect their current thinking and for clarity.

Mr. James stated that he is receiving links to TED talks, books, articles, studies and that will be a part of it, but the other part is the conversations. Making the film itself is the biggest part of the education and that is the reason why it will not be shot in a month. It is a process of discovery and understanding.

Mr. Weissglass amended the motion to approve in principal the filming as described in the contract subject to the revisions brought forward by the Board of Education based on the Board of Education’s conversation; seconded by Mr. Phelan.

Ms. Patchak-Layman wanted the administrators and the filmmakers to talk about their concerns, as it is important for the activity of the film, and might not be a good working situation for the administration or anyone else in the building. She suggested that Mr. Weissglass rescind his original motion, so that no motion is on the table.

A roll call vote resulted in 6 ayes and 1 nay. Ms. Patchak-Layman voted nay. Motion carried.

Comprehensive Instructional Staffing Overview 2015-16

Mr. Weissglass moved to accept the Comprehensive Instructional Staffing Overview 2015-16, as amended at the table; seconded by Dr. Moore. Discussion ensued.

The administration explained that PMA’s projections include certified support staff and FTE. Moving forward, because of the increased enrollment, it will focus on FTE. This focus is on the classrooms and what they will look like
based on increased enrollment and programming. An evaluation mechanism is being put together to show next steps for co-teaching? The District must adhere to a 70/30 threshold. More support will be provided in reading and literacy support classes for juniors and seniors as well as more restrictive programming, including reading and mathematics. State guidelines will be followed. Considerations will still have to occur for the Strategic Plan Implementation Team ideas and programmatically.

The goal of the Human Resources Department is to get the Board of Education’s endorsement so that positions can begin to be posted. This is 1.84 additional FTE for next year over what was projected at an additional cost of $219,000 to $259,000. The Board of Education members asked that financial information be brought forward in any recommendation in the future.

In April, the administration will bring forward increased FTE for support staff.

Discussion ensued. Families have expressed concern about the overall impact on the Chinese Program if a course is cancelled because of lack of support for the program which may have resulted in low enrollment. One member felt that it should continue and that the Instruction Committee should look to see whether any extenuating circumstances existed. The school should support the opportunities that exist for the teacher to go into the community, i.e., working with the middle schools to bring the language forward, etc. A large group of families are already in a social group with adopted children from China. The administration responded that the District supports all elected offerings. Each Division Head works hard at promoting and supporting the programs. Scheduling is based on the number of students enrolled in classes and sometimes difficult decisions have to be made in order to be fiscally responsible and reflect the trends. Every class has a story as to why a class cannot run. ELL classes are required to run. The Chinese program is not being phased out, but it is in a downward trend in enrollment. When 18 students enroll, the course will run. Middle schools are saying that students interested. District 97 does not have a Mandarin program, but it uses the Rosetta Stone program. Thus, no clear cohort exists other than an ethnic cohort. Last year the Board of Education heard a concern about counselors discouraging students from taking Chinese.

The administration stated that this FTE represents the number of teachers needed in the classroom based on students enrolled and this will not change. In order to hire enough teachers, the Board of Education must approve this FTE.

A roll call vote resulted in 3 ayes and 2 nays. Ms. Patchak-Layman and Mr. Cofsky voted nay. Motion carried. Mr. Phelan and Dr. Gevinson were absent from this vote.

District Registration Fees for SY 2015-16

Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the base District Registration Fees for SY 2015-16, as follows; seconded by Mr. Cofsky. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Mr. Phelan and Dr. Gevinson were absent from this vote.
Freshman $50  Seniors $35
Junior $35  Pay to Play $55
Sophomore $45

Mr. Weissglass moved to authorize the administration to move forward with a waiver for the Driver Ed fee limitation to allow the District to include a portion of salaries and benefits in its Driver Ed Fee; seconded by Mr. Cofsky. A roll call vote resulted in 3 ayes and 2 nays. Dr. Moore and Ms. Patchak-Layman voted nay. Motion carried. Mr. Phelan and Dr. Gevinson were absent from this vote.

Ms. Patchak-Layman was not interested in students paying for personnel. She felt the District had erroneously charged students without a waiver and asked how the overcharge would be refunded. Mr. Weissglass took exception that the District would need to make refunds and asked that the administration bring this forward to the Finance Committee.

**Strategic Plan Update** Dr. Isoye reported that the Strategic Plan Operation Committee received 2 Implementation Team presentations, one from the Facilities and Finance Implementation Team and one from the Transformational Teaching and Learning Implementation Team.

The Facilities and Finance Implementation team’s presentation was about purchasing furniture. The purchase of the furniture will occur through the normal process. Annually the District budgets $10,000 to replace furniture in the classrooms. The District is attempting to restructure and redesign classrooms to be more collaborative using furniture that can be used in multiple ranges. Thus, this will be a pilot program for next year at a cost of $47,000.

Teachers were asked if they wanted to change furniture and the vendor gave options. Both student and teacher feedback had been sought.

The Strategic Plan Operation Committee were asked for its input on the Transformational Teaching and Learning proposal and to bring it forward to the full Board of Education for possible adoption. Mr. Dennis gave a brief overview of the proposal that was included in the packet.

Mr. Weissglass noted that conversations were occurring about how to go forward on the proposal and include clarity on budget issues. He suggested calling this a peer mentoring model rather than advisory. Dr. Moore suggested looking at grants for funding and data collection. Because this seemed to be a student-to-student relationship with the older student leaving after a year or two, she was concerned with substitutions and she wanted adults lead the discussions who are trained to go into deeper conversations. She was concerned about young people mentoring younger children when there is the possibility of having a much deeper level of conversation and their being responsible as they have their own issues and need their own support. Mr. Dennis noted that each space would have a faculty member who is equally charged in supporting the space. Activities that students can participate are play, tutoring, mentoring and when deeper level things come up, they can be redirected to resources in the building. No one would be forced to do something they did not want to do.
**Textbook RFP for 2015-16 School Year**

Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the Textbook Proposals for the 2015-16 school year, as presented; seconded by Mr. Cofsky. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried. Mr. Phelan and Dr. Gevinson were absent from this vote.

**Pool Site Update**

On April 14, 2015, at a Special Board Meeting, the planning team consisting of Dr. Isoye, Mr. Altenburg, Mr. Weissglass, Mr. Phelan, and the consultants, will bring forward alternative pool sites of Education to review. Options currently on the table are putting tennis courts at Village Hall. The consultants have been working to identify costs and get feedback from the community. However, it may be cost prohibitive. Another off campus possibility exists, but it is not for public disclosure at this time. The District is currently working with Village to develop a potential parking plan. The District is also working with Walker Bros on the Lake St field option; no cost has come forward.

**Chicago VOYCE**

Dr. Moore reported that the plan is to have a Student Voice event the last week of April facilitated by Chicago VOYCE regarding student discipline. A proposal from Chicago VOYCE and a timeline was included in the packet. Some students and adults, i.e., students who participated in MSAN, Snowball, Steven Jackson’s Mentoring Program, etc., have already been identified as possible participants. Chicago VOYCE has experience in facilitating these types of events. The contract/proposal does not need Board of Education approval as it is under the $25,000 threshold. One member requested moving forward. Although one member asked that the term “class” used under what the District would commit to be changed to “social-economic status,” it was noted that students use the term “class”, not economics.

**Course Registration**

Discussion ensued about classes coming to the Instruction Committee for review before they are canceled.

**Classroom Technology Implementation Plan (CTIP)**

Mr. Carioscio reviewed the slides on classroom impact of CTIP, its organizational readiness, PARCC, Platform/Device evaluation, budget impact, and professional development. A similar presentation had been made at the Instruction Committee meeting.

With regard to Platform/Device evaluation, the sum score of the IPAD was 19.23 versus 24.05 for the Chromebook. The scoring was based on content creation, ease of use, features, integration, and technology/management. Emerging area of focus are professional development, digital citizenship and creation versus consumption.

There was minimal technical difficulty using Chromebooks with PARCC testing and 98% of the freshmen took the ELA Performance-based Assessment (PBA) and 96% of Algebra 1-2 students took their PBA.

One slide showed how that the usage of Chromebooks versus the IPAD was increasing in the Chicagoland area. The cost of the IPAD is $849 versus $400 for the Chromebook.
More time for technology professional development is necessary and it needs to be job-embedded and ongoing. How to best fulfill the tech PD needs is being considered by the PD committees.

In April, Mr. Carioscio will be presenting the platform/device decision, the CTIP budget for Phase II, and a PD plan for CTIP.

**English Division Update**
The Instruction Committee recommended that the Update on the English Division be moved forward to the Board of Education. No discussion ensued.

**Mid-Year Goals**
The Board of Education received a mid-year update on its goals. No discussion ensued.

**PARCC 2015 End of Year Testing Plans**
The administration reported that from student and faculty feedback, the PARCC testing went well with the use of the Chromebooks. However, in order to improve and to lessen disruptions in the building because of bell schedules, movement in the hallways, etc., a revised testing plan will leverage the three late arrival dates already on the school calendar and add a late arrival date on Wednesday, May 13. Notice will be sent to families.

**District Reports**
Reports from the Huskies Boosters’ Club and APPLAUSE! were imbedded in the agenda.

**Adjournment**
At 12:41 a.m., on Friday, March 27, 2015, Mr. Weissglass moved to adjourn the Board of Education meeting; seconded by Dr. Lee. A voice vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried. Mr. Phelan and Dr. Gevinson were absent from this vote.
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