

The regular Board meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on Thursday, June 23, 2016, in the Board Room of the OPRFHS.

**Call to Order**

President Weissglass called the meeting to order at 6:33 p.m. A roll call indicated the following Board of Education members were present: Fred Arkin, Jennifer Cassell, Thomas F. Cofsky, Dr. Steven Gevinson, Dr. Jackie Moore (departed at 9:39 p.m.), Sara Spivy, and Jeff Weissglass. Also present were Dr. Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; Frank Danes, Interim Superintendent for Human Resources; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant Clerk of the Board.

**Closed Session**

At 7:44 p.m. on Thursday, January 23, 2016, 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; Litigation, when an action against, affecting or on behalf of the particular District has been filed and is pending before a court or administrative tribunal, or when the District finds that an action is probable or imminent, in which case the basis for the finding shall be recorded and entered into the closed meeting minutes 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(1), as amended by PA.93—57; Collective negotiating matters between the District and its employees or their representatives or deliberations concerning salary schedules for one or more classes of employees. 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(2); Individual Student Matters; seconded by Dr. Moore. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

At 7:44 p.m., the Board of Education resumed open session.

**Visitors**

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; Dr. Gwen Walker-Qualls, Director of Pupil Personnel Services; Karin Sullivan, Director of Communications and Community Relations; Elizabeth M. Hennessy of William Blair & Company; Ireland Flannery, Nellie Kamenitsa-Hale, Sydney Battington, Hanna Hassan, Hen sidoccon, Kath santiago, Allison Smart, and Ellie Ziegler students; Mel Kolbusz, Gary Miller, and JP Coughlin, coaches; John Stelzer, Athletic Director; John Bokum, Frank Heitzman and Garret Eakin community members; Rob Wrobbles, Robin Randall, Mike Maloney of Legat Architects Karin Danganan of Citizens Council, John Bokum, Larry Christmas, Monica Sheehan, Robert Zeh, Wayne Franklin, Bruce and Maureen Kleinman, Mary Haley of the League of Women Voters, OPRFHS teachers Lisa Faulkner, Katie O'Keefe, Dan Woman, Jessica Young, and Eric Palm, Village of River

Forest Manager

**Public Hearing**

At 7:49 p.m. Mr. Weissglass called the Public Hearing to order on Thursday, June 23, 2016 for the Oak Park and River Forest High School 2015-2016 Amended Budget. This amended budget was placed on display for public inspection on May 18, 2016 for 30 days per state code. Notice of this Public Hearing appeared in the Wednesday, May 18, 2016 edition of the Wednesday Journal Newspaper. Mr. Weissglass closed the hearing at 7:50 p.m.

**Student Recognition**

The Board of Education congratulated the Girls’ Softball Team members for achieving first place in the IHSA’s 2016 Softball Competition – Class 4A State Tournament as follows:

- |                       |                  |
|-----------------------|------------------|
| Sydney Babbington     | Maeve Nelson     |
| Emily Cekander        | Katie O’Shea     |
| Taylor Divello        | Emily Richardson |
| Ireland Flannery      | Mellizza Rosario |
| Fiona Girardot        | Caitlyn Santiago |
| Chardonnay Harris     | Mariah Scott     |
| Hannah Hassan         | Allison Smart    |
| Nellie Kamenitsa-Hale | Ellie Ziegler    |
| Samantha Linde        |                  |

And, the coaches: Mel Kolbusz, Head Coach, and Gary Miller, JP Coughlin, Leah Carlin, Ellayne Watson, Jen Stinich, and Kristin Wirtz, Assistant coaches

Mr. Weissglass reported that the Board of Education, at its self-evaluation retreat and as part of its conversation about its governing role, made a decision to reorient the room and have the Board members, superintendent, and clerk at that Board table. While the administration and the Faculty Senate were appreciated, this is a Broad decision and is not to be construed as connected with any future superintendent.

**Public Comments**

Bruce Kleinman read a statement from Monica Sheehan which said that neither plan accurately respects the pool plan. Plan A describes it inappropriately as building a parking garage. The pool in plan b should state it is a new 40-meter pool and parking garage. She wanted to know the true needs of the school articulated clearly. In short, each should be definable by a truly justified need and not want. She encouraged the Board of Education to be clear in its wording of the referendum as nonspecific wording would not pass.

Bruce Kleinman has concerns were that an underground pool had risk management and safety issues, and he was worried about fire. It is an unusual proposal, and it would be risky for the students. He said he might reconsider it if

the fire commissioner could make assuring statements. The safety measures by architects are not adequate.

Maureen Kleinman stated that according to information presented by William Blair the estimated costs of Options A, B and C (page 5 of their report presented 6/23) include both the costs associated with the swimming pool construction (whether rebuilt or new) plus the costs of other expected capital improvements over the next five years. The financing for all options includes using \$20 million from fund balances and the remainder from bond financing, with no differentiation as to which costs are to be paid by each funding source. In the discussion of possible phrasing for the ballot question of a bond issue referendum, the examples are either totally vague or, at best, significantly vague and include not only pool improvements but also other capital improvements such as classroom and performing arts spaces. She strongly encouraged the Board to separate the costs if the bond issue were used entirely to fund the swimming pool improvements, so that when the voters go to the polls, they know exactly what a yes or a no vote meant. Phrase the referendum question to explicitly describe the scope of the project. It should be clear whether a new parking garage is to be built with a new swimming pool; or whether the existing garage will remain with rebuilt pools within the footprint of the Field House. Attempting to be too vague and opaque in the scope of the project will be detrimental to your efforts to pass a referendum. The fund balances can be used then at the Board of Education's discretion to pay for whatever capital improvement projects felt most needed.

Eric Palm, River Forest Village Manager, offered to answer any questions that the Board of Education members might have regarding the River Forest Madison Street TIF. While many times school districts have an unflattering view of TIF districts, the Village of River Forest has had successful experiences, including the Lake Street TIF, which returned \$63 million and which gave \$5 million to the taxing bodies to split. He also wished Dr. Isoye well.

Jessica Young, a teacher since 1994, spoke on behalf of the unanimously-approved choice of candidate for history noting that everyone on the hiring committee had supported that candidate. She asked for an explanation as to why that candidate was not being brought forward for approval. The candidate had 27 years of teaching experience, is a student magnet, has participated and won mock trial competitions, has written AP philosophy, serves on the AP test committee (a position that takes patience), a trainer to adults and a trainer of AP consultants to teach the AP work to teachers all over of the country. This teacher can teach AP philosophy and AP Euro, and if the District means that it is about giving to the students, the District should hire him.

Dan Wolman, second-year teacher, also spoke about the history hire. Fellow teachers rely on the most senior teachers. Teachers face lots of anxiety and fear, not just about learning their place in the History Department, but the educational landscape as well. If salary was the reason he was not being hired, he hoped the Board of Education would consider the immeasurable and qualitative benefits that would transcend the cost of any person. It is not just about a person's present day cost; it is also about more experienced teachers mentoring younger teachers.

Larry Christmas, resident of 721 Ontario St., Oak Park, stated that he wrote a recent letter that appeared in the *Wednesday Journal* praising the advancing of an underground pool closely resembling the one designed by Frank Heitzman and Garret Eakin, but he may have praised the idea too quickly. The Board of Education is now presented with an underground pool plan that is much larger and more expensive underground pool designed by Legat. One of the virtues of the Heitzman/Eakin design is that it started by scaling it to the current aquatics program at OPRFHS. This results in a 40-meter pool, not a 50-meter pool, together with needed ancillary features. Option 5C, authored by Legat, starts from a different place, namely from Option 1, ultimate luxury and pool design and is Option 5C is 50% larger and costs \$15 million. This is the strong man based to make options 2 and 3 look better. The public should have the opportunity to compare all of the options side by side. He found the working committee's objection to the public commenting on all options incomprehensible.

Lisa Faulkner, the 12-year history teacher at OPRFHS, spoke as a parent and community member. She was disappointed that the school seemingly was missing an opportunity to hire one of the finest and most accomplished teachers around. She and her husband moved to Oak Park, in large part, because of the exceptional quality of teaching at OPRFHS. More than modern facilities and new technology, she wanted her children—and those throughout the community—to be taught by teachers like Steve Goldberg, Kristin Knake, and Jessica Young. The teacher whom the History Division hiring committee had recommended is one of those teachers. In considering what's best for students, no factor has a greater positive effect on student learning, engagement, and outcomes than the caliber of a teacher. She hoped that this consideration is foremost on the minds of the administration and Board when making crucial hiring decisions such as this one.

Toni Biasiello, a 12-year teacher of history, has served on hiring committees. It is rare to see such an impressive resume. The best people are not going into education right now; perhaps that is due to the media. It is alarming that in the last few years, some of the most senior people in the history department have left. Teachers are feeling stretched thin and felt demoralized because fundamental programs could be dismantled. Does the Board of Education think that the

teachers and the students are not worth it? Who will be the inspiration for teachers who are in the middle of their careers? She wanted someone from whom to learn. Ms. Biasiello also was embarrassed that it took so long for this candidate to get a response from the District. It was not handled well, and she hoped the Board of Education would have a conversation about that in the future.

Wayne Franklin, resident of 308 Home Avenue, Oak Park, spoke to some of the comments that had been made. The pool construction has always been part of an LTFP, and it needs to be included for the people to vote on it. The plan should not be dismantled. An apples-to-apples comparison is needed.

Katie O'Keefe has taught for 13 years and spoke about the history position. She reported that the committee hiring team process was subverted and that goes against the diligent work of the committee. The candidate who was clearly above the other candidates was discarded without reason. If cost were the issue, the committee had been given no direction about that criteria. She was upset that the committee's recommendation was not being considered.

Frank Heitzman, resident of Oak Park, stated that being an architect is extremely demanding. It is frustrating and unrewarding in many ways. One thinks that the designs meet everyone wishes, but then something happens. He and Mr. Eakin understand the distress that Rob Wroble and his staff are experiencing. They are being pulled in many directions. As fellow architects, they want to see the best outcome for the school. Option 5C was similar to Option 1. Option 5B was a 47,500 sq. ft. at a cost \$33,600,000. Option 5C has a footprint of 54,000 sq. ft. and may cost an additional \$5 million.

To achieve getting the best building, they requested working with Legat and the working committee to speed up this work. Examples of how to reduce the square footage included: 1) eliminate the isolated scorekeeper area and instead provide temporary tables and chairs, 2) reduce coaches' office space and private shower to a reasonable area from 1300 to 500 sq ft., 3) eliminate redundant pair of shower/locker rooms which visiting team would use only if they could not use the main locker rooms, 4) reduce instructional space by half as swim instruction typically takes place on deck, 5) reduce dry land which is used by those who have been excused from swimming one day, 6) reduce concession and storage areas, 7) reduce family changing area from 750 to 200 as it will be lightly used, 8) reduce security space from 300 to 100, as security will be centralized and more easily controlled, 9) use geothermal cooling and heating as it would take less space than what is in Option 5C. He hoped for a beneficial outcome.

**Status of FOIA  
Requests**

Ms. Kalmerton reported that 2 FOIA requests were received and 2 were resolved.

**Superintendent  
Report**

Dr. Isoye remarked on his tenure at OPRFHS, that it had been terrific to serve this community and the students, and working with both villages to build strong relationships. Dr. Isoye thanked the faculty and staff for their innovation and collaboration and keeping equity at the forefront of the issues being worked on at the school. He thanked both the Board of Education for their experience, knowledge and probing questions. After working with 16 Board of Education members over six years, it was clear to him that everyone who serves on the Board of Education does so because of their love for the school. He thanked DLT members for helping to put reports together, moving the initiatives forward every day, and for supporting him. He was also thankful to the parents and partners of the school.

Mr. Weissglass appreciated the service that Dr. Isoye gave to the district for over six years.

**Changes to Consent  
Agenda**

The personnel report and the following policies were removed from the consent agenda: 7:325, Student Fund-raising Activities, Policy 7:300, Extracurricular Activities, and Policy 8:10, Connection with Community.

**Consent**

Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the following consent items:

- A. Check Disbursements and Financial Resolutions dated June 23, 2016
- B. Monthly Treasurer's Report
- C. Monthly Financials
- E. Prevailing Wage Rates
- F. Hotel Contract for Prom 2017
- G. Contract with Health Pro for Occupational Therapy Services
- H. Contract with Supplemental Health for Physical Therapy Services
- I. Renewal of Annual Property, Casualty, Liability, and Worker's Compensation Insurance (CLIC)
- J. Transfer of Operations & Maintenance Fund to Capital Projects Fund
- K. Adoption of 2015-16 Amended Budget
- L. Salary Increases for Non-Affiliated Personnel for the 2016-17 School Year
- M. Contract with Lincoln Chandler
- N. Appointment of Citizens' Council Membership for the 2016-17 School Year
- O. Institute Day Plans and Dates for 2016-17 School Year
- P. Policies for First Reading
  - 1. Policy 6:40, Student Travel
  - 2. Policy 7:220, Bus Conduct
  - 4. Policy 7:310, Restrictions on Publications
- Q. Amendment of Policy 7:190, Student Behavior

R. Open and Closed Session Minutes of April 28, 2016, and a declaraton that the closed session audiotapes of October and November 2014 be destroyed

seconded by Ms. Spivy. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

**Policy 7:300** Mr. Weissglass moved to approve Policy 7:300, Extracurricular Activities, as Amended for first reading; seconded by Dr. Moore. Discussion ensued. It was noted that the paragraphs were out of order in item 4 and 5. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

**Policy 7:325** Mr. Weissglass moved to approve Policy 7:325 as presented for first reading; seconded by Ms. Spivy. Ms. Spivy noted that the IASB presented two options for solicitation by students: 1) the school prohibited and 2) the school discouraged. The policy as written is for option 1. The Board of Education concurred. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

**Policy 8:30** Mr. Weissglass moved to approve Policy 8:30, Visitors to and Conduct on School Property, for first reading; seconded by Mr. Cassell. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried. Attorney recommendation with regard to signs would be forthcoming.

**Personnel Recommendation** Ms. Brenda Horton was introduced as the new Director of Human Resources. Ms. Horton had experience at the Proviso School District and is the corporate world. She is certified through SHERMS and had completed her MBA. Dr. Isoye thanked Dr. Danes for his help and that he would continue to serve in the transition as a consultant.

**Certification of June 2016 Graduates** Mr. Weissglass moved to certify the June 2016 Graduates, as presented; seconded by Ms. Spivy. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

**Selection of Interim Superintendent** No Action

**Pool Option 5B & 5C** Legat provided Pool Option 5C. It referenced the Program Verification document that was included in the memorandum which includes a line by line every space, square footage. The size was identified as what was most suitable for the high school's needs.

The program verification was reviewed with all of the stakeholders in the building and community, and meetings were held with those groups and asked how they would anticipate using a facility. The administration tried to identify those spaces and highlights in Option 5c. This building size is what was identified as most suitable for community.

Legat reviewed each of one of the floor plans, highlight each area on those levels.

Level 1:

- 1) Its entry point would be aligned with the athletic corridor and access at the south end of the building.
- 2) With a pool this size, the filtration equipment size would necessitate another access point for repairs.
- 3) Another exit point was added at the SW corner.
- 4) Another air intake and shaft space were added.
- 5) Spectator seating would be 450 seats
- 6) North end Mechanical space with two air-handling units.
- 7) South end mechanical space and classroom space
- 8) Natural light could be incorporated for the spectator seating.

Lower Level 2

- 1) Locker room bank at the south end, coaches rooms, family changing area (2 separate changing areas and shared locker, dry land for exercising by those who can't take swimming, etc.
- 2) North end has storage and fresh air, and a shaft for access
- 3) Separate PE locker rooms for both men and women, laundry station
- 3) Stairs off the pool deck and secondary exist in the locker room.

Lower Level 3

- 1) Pool filtration search tank
- 2) Diving area at 14 ft.
- 3) Access to the fresh air and hoist away of equipment, etc.

The deepest level is 42' underground. The current water table is 5 to 13 feet and will create challenges during construction and the operation of the facility.

Ms. Spivy to approve Option 5C to include in community engagement meetings in July; seconded by Dr. Moore. Discussion ensued. One member was frustrated to have two sets of architects arguing about the needs of the school. While Pool Option 1 was vetted by the community, it is difficult to know needs versus of wants. Discussion also ensued about the amount of square footage in different versions as that would have a direct effect on cost. Part of the difference is how the program is applied. It easier to apply the program to an open site versus Options 2, 3, 4 where the programs were split and fit within the existing building.

Legat responded to the question about whether the 10% construction contingency was sufficient, considering there were so many unknowns. Legat had discussed this internally and felt that it would, but that due diligence before the project begins is paramount to mitigate risk.



Board of Education members voiced concerns about life safety issues, such as smoke, fire, and evacuation. Legat concurred and felt that studying egress was imperative. A smoke control system was recommended and included in the pricing. The final depth of the building is still unknown so then are the thresholds in buildings. A decision as to whether grass or turf also will make a difference.

The water table is high, and water always goes to least the resistance. Because that risk will be there 24 hours, seven days per week, Legat recommended an emergency generator to keep life safety systems operational. The only guarantee with concrete is that it is going to crack. Legat suggested having double exterior walls, one for the earth and one for water. The space between the double exterior walls would allow for inspections to find out if there were cracks, etc.

A question was asked about the fields and baseball, softball, football, marching band, and PE classes about how much disruption would occur on the fields and if they would be returned in a way that would be similar to how they are utilized now. Legat stated that because construction would take two years and then the fields would have to be seeded, it could take three years before they would be playable. If geothermal were used, wells would have to be spaced 50 ft. apart, so perhaps the same size space would be transferred to the baseball field. A safety fence around the perimeter of the construction would be put in place, and the areas outside of the fence could be used safely while construction was in progress. One member was concerned about issues such as air, noise, etc.

Legat had not discovered any place where a 40-meter pool already been built underground, but Water Technologies was in the design phase at the University of Wisconsin.

Discussion ensued about the discrepancies of cost for each of the designs. One of the reasons for the discrepancy was that the square footage was larger more in the Legat plan. Legat stated that it would take approximately one month to meet with all of the stakeholders about scaling back spaces and reworking this design.

Legat stated that its team had asked the following questions throughout this Process: Is it reasonable? Is it responsible? Is it possible? Legat determined that it was possible, but was it reasonable. There are higher risks and higher operational costs with an underground pool. The responsibility would be the Districts, and it has to consider whether it wants to take on the responsibility. The major risks are operations, existing construction (double wall), code, lack of precedence in a high school. However, Oak Park may be the environment in which that this may happen as there is precedence, i.e., Ernest Hemingway, Frank Lloyd Wright, etc.

Legat agreed to make a line-by-line comparison of space and cost of the Option being considered and will include the rationale for additional cafeteria space that was developed from the stakeholders' comments. While discussion ensued about having a presentation of the program verification process and perhaps taking action on it, the consensus was that it was not necessary to reconsider it.

Mr. Heitzman and Mr. Eakin were not invited to give comment on a plan at the next meeting, as Legat is the architect of the school.

After an option is chosen, it would not need to be reverified. If Legat evaluates on the vetted program as it stands, as it is selected, the design would be revisited to make sure it is what is needed and wanted, as that was decided a year ago by different stakeholders and the Board.

Dr. Gevinson thanked Mr. Heitzman and Mr. Garrett for their volunteerism and publicly noted their altruistic work. He also thanked the Christmas family. He understood that Option 1 with pool reduced in size as Option 5C with a 40-meter pool. He did not support that plan, and he does not want to be associated with it, even though he liked the idea of an underground pool. He also liked the fact that Mr. Heitzman was gracious with Legat and the timeframe. In the memo to the Board of Education, it stated that Legat would reach out to Frank Heitzman and Garret Eakin as they prepare the design in preparation for this meeting. That did not happen. The communication was yesterday after five separate attempts to get something scheduled. Dr. Gevinson had wished that the collaboration would have happened, which is what the Board of Education voted to do. Noting the significant differences in designs, size, and cost for the same underground pool, he did not know how to resolve that fact. These are two professional groups of architects. His sense of the options available for building a pool comes down to thinking that there is still limited understanding. An underground pool that was cost effective and beautifully designed would be the best option for the school. He was cognizant of the fact that there is a short time frame for a successful referendum, and he did not see any way forward for Option 5c. He did not think it was viable to pass a referendum. It is an unconventional possibility. He did not support 5C as drawn because the building was too big and too expensive. Fundamental disagreements exist as to what is necessary. As drawn it has no chance of passing a referendum. It is much more costly than it needs to be. The other plan has a high price tag and will knock down a workable garage, which could be maintained for another 25 years, is three times as high and would cause a disruption inside the school.

Mr. Weissglass moved to table the motion to approve consideration of option 5c during the community engagement meetings and to develop an LTF concept that incorporates option 5c, subject to the prior approval of the Board; seconded by Ms. Cassell. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

The Board of Education recessed at 9:53 p.m. and resumed at 10:02 p.m.

**First Amendment to Intergovernmental Agreement for the Purchase of Services Pertaining to Early Childhood Education And Contract for Early Childhood Education Services** Mr. Weissglass moved to amend the IGA for the Purchase of Services Pertaining to Early Childhood Education and the contract for Early Childhood Education Services; seconded by Ms. Spivy. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.  
Dr. Moore and Mr. Weissglass spoke to the reason for the amendments which was the experience, and included changes to invoices, the evening out of payments to Collaboration which were causing problems in grant writing, etc. resolution was discussed at the Joint Board Meeting last year as to how to The adoption of a handle surplus fund balances and to memorialize in these agreements the election of officers, meeting schedule, assignment of former government officials to help with new members and solicit new entities to the IGA.

**Board of Education Budget** Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the Board of Education Budget for the 2016-17 school year; seconded by Ms. Cassell. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried. Dr. Moore was absent from this vote.

**Tradition of Excellence Award Recipients** Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the Tradition of Excellence Award Recipients as presented; seconded by Dr. Gevinson. A voice vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried. Dr. Moore was absent from this vote.

Mr. Cofsky explained that only prior recipients were removed from the list of candidates. Every year a new group of students and support staff who make the selection. It is a process that the students have used successfully.

**Student Discipline** None

**Pool Funding Option Financing Plan** Ms. Hennessey reviewed her PowerPoint presentation in the packet with the Board of Education members. She noted that interest rates were low and were continuing to stay low. OPRFHS has little outstanding debt which will be completely retired by December 2017. The debt capacity is \$121 million.

The District is considering these scenarios for addressing its capital needs in the next five years:

Option A:

- Renovate two pools in place
- Build performing arts addition
- Renovated locker rooms
- Build additional instructional space
- Total Cost Estimated at \$40M

Option B: Build Natatorium and parking garage addition

- Expand performing arts space
- Renovated locker rooms
- Build additional instructional space
- Total Cost Estimated at \$55M
- Option C:
- Build underground Natatorium
- Expand performing arts space
- Renovated locker rooms
- Build additional instructional space
- Total Cost Estimated at TBD

In each option the District intends to use \$20M of its fund balance so the resulting bond financing questions would be of \$20M for Option A and \$35M for Option B. Option C bond amount is not yet known. Ms. Hennessey reviewed the impact on the fund balance and the impact on the homeowners' property taxes which were in the presentation.

A summary of the two options and the fund balance is below:

Estimated Project Cost	\$40,000,000	\$55,000,000
Amount of Bonds	\$20,000,000	\$35,000,000
Estimated Tax Rate Increase	0.07	0.09
Estimated Impact on \$362,000 Home (OP)	\$72.67	\$127.15
Estimated Impact on \$394,000 Home (RF)	\$79.59	\$139.27
Fund Balance Used for Project	\$20,000,000	\$20,000,000
FY 2017 Operating Fund Balance	\$61,205,590	\$61,205,590
Estimated After Paying \$20M for Project		
FY2016 Fund Balance as % of Expenditures	93%	93%

Ms. Hennessey provided the referendum dates for the upcoming elections.

<u>Election Date</u>	<u>Election Type</u>	<u>Resolution Deadline</u>
November 8, 2016	General Election	August 27, 2016
April 4, 2017	Consolidated Election	January 15, 2017
March 13, 2018	General Primary Election	December 24, 2017
November 6, 2018	General Election	August 25, 2018
April 2, 2019	Consolidated Election	January 13, 2019

The District has latitude with regard to what is described in the referendum ballot language. It is important to consider that if the referendum is approved, all that is described in the ballot question must be completed. Examples of ballot language range from the very general to more descriptive and specific were provided only as a way to begin a discussion about the ballot question.

Discussion ensued about whether the Board of Education had made the final decision to include monies for the Long-term Facilities Plan in the referendum. The Board of Education held a series of communities meetings in April and the overwhelming the public wanted to know how the LTFP needs would be incorporated with the pool needs. The public did not want the District a year later asking for something else. The pool working group and the administration recommended going for a higher amount to incorporate everything.

The Finance Advisory Committee had recommended returning a portion of the fund balance to the taxpayers and to draw down the fund balance. As such, the District has been paying debt service out of the budget for four years, and approximately \$10 million in taxes were not collected.

Ms. Hennessey reported that it was possible to extend the bond longer than 20 years with special legislation; it has to do with exceeding the debt limit. Typically districts speak with their representations and ask them to write the legislation which does not pass until the referendum is passed. The referendum only specifies the dollar amount not how long it would take to pay it back. Even though the pool would last 30 to 40 years and the cost might be spread out over 30 to 40 years, it would not lower taxes by much.

## **Financial Metrics**

Mr. Cofsky reported that the Board of Education charged the Finance Committee to develop financial metrics. The financial metrics presented compared OPRFHS to the other school districts in the NWPA (Northwest Personnel Association). The statistical data comes from the 2014 Ed.dat Databook Volume II: School Finance Data and PMA's 5Sight database. The financial metrics are grouped into three categories: 1. Operating Expenses Per Pupil 2. Fund Balance as a % of Expenses 3. Tax Burden on a \$400,000 Home At the top of each metric page, there is a ranking of all the NWPA schools. A history of the data specific to OPRFHS D200, along with a line graph, appears at the bottom portion of each metric page. At the request of the Finance Committee, Barrington 220 was taken off the metrics since it is a unit district rather than a high school district.

The questions to consider are: Should the Board of Education start with these or use others and then how would they be used? Should they be part of a scoreboard? Where does the Board want to be in metrics 2 and 3?

Discussion ensued. Is this something that would be asterisked to let the public know where the District is going? How does the Board of Education want to use this in terms of presenting? What information will be put out to the public? One member was comfortable with the fund balance and perhaps the per pupil expense, but No. 3 was problematic, as New Trier and Leyden had high taxes on a \$400,000 home. Another member stated that because this community is so

dependent on residential real estate taxes, it will always have high taxes. Another issue is using \$400,000 as it is above the median house price in this community, but the median can be significantly above or below in other towns. In the New Trier school district, a \$400,000 house would have much less square footage. A suggestion was made to compare taxes per sq. footage of the house. The trend data on the \$400,000 was helpful, but the comparison against others was not. The per pupil expense is a really an important measure. The fund balance has \$20 million in capital improvements included in it and, if it were removed, it would have a significant effect.

The Finance Committee had discussed pulling costs for things such as special education, transportation, etc., out of the comparables, but this comparison is more universal across the board, and across districts.

Mr. Cofsky stated that the operating expenses per pupil would tell the tax liability. In 2014, the operating expenses per pupil were \$20,838 and it is projected to be \$23,603 for FY 2017. It was noted that the Board of Education made a decision to hire another PSST and social workers, instead of teachers.

#### **River Forest TIF**

Mr. Altenburg reviewed his memo included in the packet regarding the River Forest TIF. He noted that opposition had been expressed by single family homeowners because of the Village's right to eminent domain. The Joint Review Committee will meet again on June 28 and will recommend eligibility and moving forward with the TIF. Mr. Palm affirmed that the major issue was eminent domain and that the Village Board had not expressed any intent to do that. The River Forest Village Board will discuss the business points of the IGA and will the eminent domain language, which it hopes will assuage the resident's concerns. At some point shortly the River Forest Village Board will consider that and take action on it. Mr. Weissglass stated that the Village had given the governmental bodies \$5 million after 23 years and after the school district received its money. The structure is tricky, however. How does the IGA and the possibility of surplus payments relate to the decision to be made at the Joint Review Board meeting. Mr. Palm responded that the Village was working to approve a TIF and revenue sharing agreement, both on Madison Street and North Avenue.

As the Board of Education representative of the governmental group in River Forest, Mr. Arkin attended the Joint Review Board meeting where he heard much passionate commentary about eminent domain, and he had conversations with Village President Cathy Adduci who said the intention was not to use eminent domain and that the meeting next Monday, verbiage will be discussed to assuage those fears. Understanding that TIFs were created to get incremental income for years from underperforming properties that were very developable, he asked about the townhome property that had already passed the design and

development stage and was close to breaking ground. He felt that property should be developed outside of the TIF. He continued that the incremental will still be within the TIF and so all of that money will occur almost immediately within the first years of the TIF. He did not know the scale of that project as compared to the rest of the TIF. Mr. Palm stated that the townhome project would be more than half and its revenue will go into the pot to work on projects in other parts of the TIF. The District's attorney has asked for an immediate payment to come out based on triennial reassessment. The Village has bottomed out of EAV, and the attorney asked that when the tri-annual bump occurs the Village make a payment back the taxing bodies to help with that loss. Note: the administration has the authority to approve the creation of the TIF, but any IGA on revenue sharing the Board of Education would have to approve. The District is working with its attorney. Mr. Weissglass stated that TIF law was created before the tax cap law was created and from the school district's point of view, tax caps and TIF's do not work well together. Thus, when the triennial assessment occurs, and the EAV goes down, rates go up. When a freeze in the EAV in the TIF occurs, and the tax base changes, one gets more out of a TIF. The District is trying to determine how much tax payments all of the governing bodies are getting at the beginning of the TIF and then indexing the payments over time. The purpose of the TIF is to provide the benefits of real economic development rather than just inflation.

Mr. Altenburg invited the individual Board of Education members to provide him with his/her feedback on how they felt District 200 should vote at the meeting on June 28, 2016.

**Board Organization  
And Goals**

It was the consensus of the majority of the Board of Education members to go to a Committee of the Whole structure beginning in August rather than having only 3-member committees. The reasons for doing so included:

- 1) 3-member committees are challenging because of Open Meetings Act restrictions.
- 2) It would be a better of use of administration's time. The Committees go too far in the "weeds" and takes time away from value-added work. A couple of members voiced their like of the ability to dig deeper into subject areas with the 3-member committee, and it was a matter of trust.
- 3) It would relieve redundancy in that only one presentation would need to be made at one meeting.

However, the Strategic Plan Operations Committee was scheduled to meet July 14 and will continue as such on that date.

Mr. Weissglass will make a recommendation to the Board of Education

about how to move forward with the Strategic Plan and goal setting, with or without a facilitator. The future of the SPOC will be discussed as part of that conversation.

The Board of Education will explore participating in an IASB communication expectation workshop, and a suggestion was made address the protocols with the superintendent at that time.

**Board of Education Goals 2015-16 Update** The Policy, Evaluation, and Goals Committee had recommended that the Board of Education Goals Update for the 2015-16 school year be moved to the full Board of Education as an informational item.

**Report on Professional Development Activities** The Instruction Committee had recommended that the Report on Professional Development Activities be moved to the full Board of Education as an information item.

**Decision-making Workflow** The Policy, Evaluation, and Goals Committee had recommended that the Decision-making Workflow report be moved to the full Board of Education as an informational item.

**WIFI Presentation** The Instruction Committee had recommended that the Community WI-FI Presentation be moved forward to the full Board of Education as an informational Item.

**FY 2017 Preliminary Budget** The Finance Committee had recommended that the FY 2017 Preliminary Budget be moved to the full Board of Education as an informational item.

**Faculty Attendance Data 2015-16** The Board of Education was presented with a report on Faculty Attendance for 2015-16 school year as information only.

**Film Contract** No action was taken.

**District Reports** None.

The Board of Education recessed at 11:25 p.m., resumed closed session at 11:40 p.m. and resumed open at 12:50 a.m.

**Personnel Recommendations** Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the personnel recommendations as presented, including Daniel Martin in accordance with the personnel report put forward by the administration; seconded by Ms. Cassell. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried. Dr. Moore had already departed.



**Adjournment**

A 12:55 a.m., Mr. Weissglass moved to adjourn the regular Board of Education meeting; seconded by Ms. Cassell. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

Jeff Weissglass  
President

Sara Spivy  
Secretary

Submitted by Gail Kalmerton  
Clerk of the Board