

March 15, 2016

A special meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on Tuesday, March 15, 2016 in the Board Room of the high school.

Call to Order

President Weissglass called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. A roll call indicated the following members were present: Fred Arkin, Jennifer Cassell, Thomas F. Cofsky, Dr. Jackie Moore, Sara Dixon Spivy, and Jeff Weissglass. Also in attendance was Dr. Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; Tod Altenburg, Chief School Business Official; David Ruhland, Director of Human Resources; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum & Instruction; Michael Carioscio, Chief Information Officer; Dr. Gwen Walker-Qualls, Director of Pupil Support Services; and Sheila Hardin, Faculty Senate Representative and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Visitors

Karin Sullivan, Jason Dennis, John Stelzer, Regina Topf, John Hoerster, Jeff Bergmann, Meredith Newman, Ishana Euring, Lee Wade, Melody Brown, Linda Carlson, Katie Prendergast, Lisa Vincent, Earliana McLaurin, JP Coughlin, Paul Wright, Fred Galluzzo, OPRFHS faculty, staff, and coaches; Ellen Pimentel, community.

**Extracurricular
Program
Presentation**

Mr. Stelzer thanked the Board of Education for the opportunity to present an overview of the extracurricular program at OPRFHS and to provide an understanding of the role that coaches and sponsors provide to OPRFHS and the impact it has on positive outcomes for our students.

Mr. Coughlin reported that OPRFHS has 2,400 students participating in extracurricular activities across 30 sports and 94 teams. He continued, "Also 64 clubs and activities exist. Teacher, instructor, club sponsor, coach--at the core of each of these ideas is the responsibility for imparting knowledge, fostering growth and autonomy, and instilling wonder and curiosity. In a classroom, laboratory, gymnasium, field and court, we approach these with a curriculum for the subject or activity, with plans for explaining concepts and executing procedures, and ultimately achieving goals set by the curriculum."

He continued that while courses that occur during the first eight periods of the day fit the common understanding of a teacher-student process, the coaching relationship takes place in many settings before and after the bell-periods. Members of our teaching staff who choose to take on an "extracurricular" position are signing up for an extra prep; producing lesson plans complete with information, activity, projects, objectives and specific outcomes. Coaching a sport or sponsoring a club is a teaching and instructing opportunity, and while it should be, and is, an invigorating and enjoyable experience (for teacher and student), it is fundamentally a teaching responsibility.

Ms. Topf worked with Lee Wade, Melody Brown, and Katie Prendergast team to collect data for the PowerPoint presentation.

Ms. Brown spoke of her experience as a cheerleading coach and for 10 to 11 years she was an out-of-building coach. While she had felt connected with the athletes during that time, being an in-building coach, she is now connected academically, including behavior management, tutoring, attendance, etc. In addition, she does not have to travel to OPRFHS and recruitment efforts have increased.

The team talked about the survey results. It was reported: 136 students from sport teams and clubs were asked if they had a class with a teacher who is also your coach or sponsor, and if they were motivated to do well in that class? Ninety percent of the students surveyed said YES. They were also asked if they had a class with any teacher who is also involved at the school outside the classroom and if they were more motivated to do well in that class? Sixty-three percent said yes. When asked if a coach or sponsor made a positive impact on their high school experience, 73% said absolutely. Quotes from the students included: 1) someone to always encourage me to do my best; 2) they allowed me to become a better person, etc.

Universal data has to do with human capital, value to a nation or organization. It can be positive or negative. Students involved in high school sports have a higher value in terms of human capital. Athletes have a higher rate of achieving a bachelor degree than nonathletic. Athletics must prepare individuals for the labor market by creating human capital characteristics which are an investment in one's future.

John Hoerster read the following statement:

“The essence of my role in this presentation is to highlight the connections coaches, moderators, and sponsors make with the students of Oak Park and River Forest High School.

“While there is no doubt a tremendous amount of influence and mentorship provided by teachers in their role in the classroom, this sphere of influence increases exponentially when the teacher also serves the students outside of the classroom.

“On the poster, in the shared Google sheet, and in the handout, you will see three items. First, you will see several examples of a typical “day in the life” of a teacher who also happens to serve our students outside the classroom. The sheer weight of the contact minutes invested in our young men and women illustrate the significance our coaches and sponsors have upon the student body. Not only do these adults invest their time in the classroom, but they also serve our students before school, during their lunch break, during their prep periods, after school, on

the weekends, and over the summer; these men and women serve more of our school community than just the students who appear on their rosters.

“The next items are letters, one written by a recent graduate, and the other, written by parents of a recent grad, two current students, and two future students. The voice we can hear from all of these individuals is one of gratitude, praise, and love.

“Simmie Cobbs Jr., a sophomore at Indiana University, whose coaches often played the role of father-figure, writes, ‘I love my coaches to death, and would do anything for them because they did everything for me.’ Simmie also writes that he appreciates his coaches, ‘...because without their help I wouldn’t be where I am today.’ The opportunity that Simmie now has, and the future that is ahead of him, can be directly connected to the relationships built, and the mentorship given, by the coaches he had the opportunity to work with at OPRF.

“In the second letter, the Nelson’s write that the coaches ‘...made a significant impact on our (children’s’) lives and were extremely important in shaping (their) futures.’ They also write about their daughter Allie, saying that the coaches, ‘...have taken an interest in her, her college choices, and her life. These relationships and interest are impossible if coaches aren’t employed full-time at OPRF.’ The Nelson’s are great examples of parents who’ve seen the amazingly positive impacts coaches have made on their children, and are looking forward to their two youngest, Grace and Johnny, having the benefit of these amazing adults in the future.

“Finally, you will have the opportunity to see a short video highlighting our coaches, sponsors, mentors, and students who can speak directly to the amazing benefits of OPRF extra-curricular activities and the impact the activities and the adults involved have upon the student body of OPRF.

“The connections made through extra-curricular activities have the potential to make a deep impact on students: grades, discipline, attitude, leadership, and buy in all are affected by the positive relationships developed between adult and student. These connections don’t just affect the students; they affect the teachers as well. The investment in the building and the ties to the students bring these coaches and moderators closer to the school and the surrounding community as well—while also making them even more impactful teachers. These men and women truly exemplify ‘Those Things that are Best.’”

Paul Wright made the following statement:

“The value of a coach or club sponsor is an important part of the OPRF school community. One of the School Board’s goals has been to increase student participation and engagement in extracurricular activities and the school community in general, so that each student may feel connected to OPRF.

“Tonight, you have heard how students who are involved in extracurricular activities do better academically and socially during their tenure in high school. They also tend to be successful in their post-high school activities as well. We have over 200 teachers and staff members who are coaching, sponsoring, mentoring and role-modeling our students every day after the academic day ends. We feel that this part of the students’ education is equally as important as their academics, and we are asking the school board to continue to prioritize and find ways to support and provide additional resources for extra-curricular activities in the way they need to be supported, in order to continue the success and tradition at OPRFHS.

“We hope that you will support the Stipend Review Committee’s proposal for additional stipends for both activities and athletics, which will support programs that have increased participation numbers over the past 5 years, are in need of additional staff to provide appropriate and safe support for our students, or are providing a space for students who otherwise wouldn’t be connected to the school in a beneficial way.

“We are also requesting that the district administration and school board work together to develop a consistent process by which involvement in extracurricular activities becomes an integral part of the district’s hiring process.

“Most importantly, we hope that we have been able to provide some information and insight into the importance that extra-curricular activities plays in the overall education of our students, as well as the role that coaches and sponsors play in affecting positive outcomes for students.”

Mr. Weissglass appreciated both views as he is an athlete and is the parent of children who were all involved in the performing arts. Mr. Cofsky echoed Mr. Weissglass’ comments and thanked them for the personal impact they had made on his children. In response to how many coaches and/sponsors are faculty members and how many have multiple positions, Ms. Topf stated that the stipends reflect 64 sponsor position and 8 of them are filled by someone out of building. Two clubs do not have any in-house people and 62% of the athletic coaches are in building. Volunteer positions testify to faculty/staff satisfaction in participating in these endeavors.

Mr. Arkin too thanked them for coming. Having been an out-of-building coach, he attested to the fact that by not being in the building one does not get access to the students, and there is travel time. However, one does not have access to students and parents all day to be a good coach and/or a mentor. It is important to have head coaches in the building. Faculty should not be stretched too thin and he wanted to talk about integrating recruitment of coaches and sponsors into the hiring process.

Closed Session At 7:13 p.m., Mr. Weissglass moved to enter closed session for the purpose of discussing the collective bargaining and/or negotiations; seconded by Dr. Moore. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

At 7:15 p.m., the Board of Education resumed its open session.

IMRF Resolution Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the IMRF Resolution as presented; seconded by Mr. Cofsky. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Personnel Recommendations Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the personnel recommendations as presented; seconded by Ms. Cassell. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried. OPRFHS has only informal conversations when people leave, no exit interviews.

Approval of Buildings and Grounds Contract Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the Agreement Between the Board of Education of Oak Park And River Forest High School District 200, Cook County and Service Employees International Union, Local 73, Buildings and Grounds Custodial and Maintenance Contract July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2019; seconded by Mr. Arkin. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Approval of Food and Nutrition Contract Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the Agreement Between the Board of Education of Oak Park And River Forest High School District 200, Cook County and Service Employees International Union, Local 73, Food and Nutrition Services Contract July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2019; seconded by Dr. Moore. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Approval of Safety & Support Team Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the Agreement Between the Board of Education of Oak Park And River Forest High School District 200, Cook County and Service Employees International Union, Local 73, Safety and Support Team Contract July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2019; seconded by Mr. Cofsky. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Mr. Weissglass noted that the Board of Education was pleased to be extending these contracts for 3 years.

FTE and Stipend Information Dr. Isoye referred to the packet regarding administrative recommendations for staff both instructional support and non-instructional support, and stipends and that recommendations for nonaffiliated and administrative compensation would be coming in the future.

The presentation provided the Board of Education with a balcony view and how these recommendations fit in the financial aspects of the district. The presentation is for discussion only with the final vote will come on Thursday, March 24. This process begins with registration process in November, freshman registration in February, and staffing needs which are completed in March. PMA

created four different analysis as to how the District is tracking its anchor model and having lost \$10 million 2 years in a row. Financially, this will help to plan for a future referendum. The administration also looked at how to support students within the Board of Education's parameters for spending and then how to distribute the support to students.

The bullet points were:

Specifically, this memorandum presents information with respect to three basic categories of staffing, an update on PMA models, and an update of the compensation work related to non-affiliated staff for the 2016-2017 school year:

- Categories of staffing:
 - a. Staffing recommendations for instructional (classroom) positions.
Staffing for instructional support (non-classroom) positions
 - b. Stipend recommendations as presented by the Advisory Stipend Review Committee (ASRC)
- PMA update
- Update on compensation recommendations for Non-Affiliated positions, including Administration.

Staffing for instruction cannot be completed until the February registration process and course selections are completed. The recommendation is for 214.7 FTE for 2016-17, which is approximately 1.5 FTE above the model. The following year, due to increased enrollment, the recommendation will be to hire 5.72 Teachers. This recommendation is being made because the District has already provided PD to these teachers and they have begun to build relationship with students. To have a reduction in force only to have to hire more people next year would not be in the District's best interest. Recognizing that this is not on track with the model, it is the right thing to do. The 1.5 FTE comes from a variety of places, i.e., as it is based on sectioning needs.

Staffing for support for non-instructional positions.

504 Coordinator. Currently, Jennifer Hoffmann has had this title and works with an outside psychologist. The request is for a part time position but because 504 plans are growing, the position may grow to 1.0 FTE. Ms. Hoffmann would remain involved during more difficult conversations.

SPED Employment Specialist. This position, came through the audit, the person would look at transition programs as students leave school. This position will be paid through a grant and not come out of the Education Fund. These funds are accessible and the state grant has been in place for a long time.

School Refusal Program is a cost containment program.

Educational Technology. If the Board of Education supports 1:1, the District asks for an additional 1.0 FTE. If the Board of Education does not support 1:1,

the District is requesting an additional .5 for the instructional support role. This would be new dollars. Part-time staff would be hired to manage requests for support. Being a noncertified position will allow more flexibility in terms of salary. The salary was determined by the previous person in that job and the HAY Group. While the desire is to have students help with the 1:1 program, Mr. Carioscio noted that after working with Mr. Hostrawser and looking at the program at Leyden, it will take time to develop a vocational approach, and to authentic experiences. This will not be available for next year. One member encouraged this for career readiness. Has the Instruction Committee had this discussion and is there an operating philosophy on how the District will implement this technology piece educationally? What is the District's philosophy on how it uses technology at the school? The response was that the District is looking at student and teacher standards and the relevance of the work regarding the Board of Education goals, best practices for teaching and learning with an equity lens. It is about digital collaboration, creativity, communication, and critical thinking for all students to engage students as global citizens in and beyond the classroom.

Revised Division Head Teaching Duty. Due to the Performance Education Reform Act (PERA), the responsibilities involved in evaluating certified staff have increased and next year the student growth model will be added. This will require even more meetings between Division Heads and their teachers in setting up goals for student growth, resetting midpoints and evaluating at the end of the year. Substantive conversations will need to occur and the recommendation is for those Division Heads who are teaching 2 sections to teach only 1.

Leadership & Launch. This is a request to an additional .4 to the present .4

Discussion ensued. One member suggested adding another column that would show what the replacement cost in order to compare.

Stipend recommendations. The Stipend Review Committee has a process and made this recommendation. The link provided gave a more detailed report by the committee. It includes stipend changes, new clubs and stipend eliminations.

The numbers of students participating in the activities and those that are not being participating was requested. This information will be presented to the Board of Education at the March meeting, as it was part of the annual report given in the fall. Another question was how does the metrics correlate with needs and was made for a more standardized way to look at the justification in order to make an informed decision.

What was the saturation point as currently 72% of students participate? Is having a goal of 100% participation realistic? The request calls for 22 or 23 additional sponsors/coaches. Are the benchmarking stipends and levels of participation

relative to peer groups being considered? Are students' other responsibilities accounted for in the numbers? The levels are part of the bargaining unit's contract and based on one's years of experience as a sponsor. The saturation point has not been reached. Enrollment in athletics and clubs is increasing. Some athletic activities are equal in number but not in stipends. Some of the requested increase is to backtrack on the freezes that were taken. Faculty are also volunteering. The Board of Education will receive a comparison chart as to what peer schools and it was discussed by the Stipend Review Committee. Many of the new proposals are targeting groups of students who have not been engaged. With regard to stipends for new clubs or activities, to be considered an official club, 15 students must be participating and the sponsor needs to be willing to continue. New positions are ideally placed with proper hiring policies. With only 62% of the faculty involved, more can contribute. Dr. Moore will email questions relative to student participation, and the reason for new clubs and how students are engaged.

It was reiterated that standardized information was needed. Will giving stipends to the coaches diminish the needed for volunteers, as former students also volunteer. Was every volunteer requesting a stipend? Ms. Topf stated that when she had her first sponsor meeting the topic was how to engage students not already engaged. One suggestion was to go to the lunch tables and talked to the students. As a result, a cosmetology club was formed as black students wanted to learn how to do makeup. Skyla Murray started this club, and 30 boys and girls have been meeting since January. Anthony Clark reaches out to more students via his comedy club. These students are not in any other activity. Some activities are curriculum-based, i.e., foreign language, piano ensemble, etc. This is impacting students.

Currently \$1.3 million is spent on all extracurricular.

Mr. Weissglass honored Ms. Spivy's attendance at these meetings that night as she had to balance other interests that evening.

Leadership Stipends. These are linked to the bargaining agreement, programs, and how students are supported.

PMA Updates. Four PMA models were provided. Consideration was given to changing some of the assumptions based on the new Ehlers report, the audit report, and CPI so that the Board of Education could see how the lines on the charts will change. The Board of Education requested in its report on March 24 to include narrative as to what assumptions had changed. It was noted that the incremental change from the March pre-staffing to the staffing proposal in dollars was \$197,401 or .25 of the budget.

Board members were encouraged to send Dr. Isoye an email and copy Ms. Kalmerton with any other questions. Any changes to this proposal will cause a cascade of events and letters of Reduction in Force will have to be sent.

One Board of Education member referenced the recommendation to retain all FTE, recognizing that there is 1.5 more than is needed and that comes with an assumption that from a performance standpoint that the District is 100% satisfied with the teachers that have been hired, as this is an opportunity to reduce staff. The administration noted that if there were performance related concerns, the administrative staff would address those issues. This is independent from performance.

The Administration will debrief this meeting to make sure all of the information on division heads has been provided.

Ms. Hardin appreciated the conversation and the clarifying questions and cautioned the Board of Education that not voting on this in its entirety would have rippled effects. If the faculty does not receive the release of the 4 faculty slots, it would affect Leadership of Launch. To change one piece will affect others. Ms. Hardin appreciated the administration's thoughtfulness in keeping everything in line. Dr. Isoye also noted that any change would affect the metric.

Mr. Weissglass read a statement from Dr. Gevinson, who could not attend the meeting. "As a former division head, I have many thoughts about FTE issue 4, Revised Division Head Teaching Duty. I know why the current division head positions have different numbers of teaching assignments, as I was the Division Head who persuaded Sue Bridge to reduce the teaching load for English and Math Division Heads from 2 classes to 1. I don't remember when the Science Division Heads teaching load was reduced, but it was probably after Tech came into the division. I have real questions about how much extra time the PERA requirements will take. I have trouble believing it would justify another release period in the other four divisions. And if it would, how does it make sense not to eliminate the remaining teaching period for the English, Math, and Sci/Tech Division Heads? Those 3 Division Heads had their teaching loads reduced based on the number of teachers they supervise, which won't change -- and the discrepancies will still exist. That is, it would make much better sense to eliminate a teaching period for each division head rather than only for 4 of 7. If anything, PERA will add more work to English, Math, and Sci/Tech DHs than it will to the other 4 because English, Math, and Sci/Tech are the largest divisions. I'd recommend keeping things as they are and trying to figure out other efficiencies for dealing with PERA. Further, it's good for Division Heads to teach. The more they are teachers and the less administrators, the better. (Philosophically, by the way, I think the Division Heads position should be 50-50 in loyalty, regardless of how much a Division Head teaches. That is, he or she

should be a servant of two masters in equal proportion: half loyal to administration and half loyal to the division. Over the years, Division Heads have been pulled more and more away from their divisions and more into administration. This proposal would continue that unfortunate trend.) You'll say, "Wait a minute. Didn't you just say you argued for less teaching for yourself when you were English Division Head?" The answer is yes, but my supervisory load was way out of whack compared with other Division Heads because of the number of English teachers I supervised, and when you compared our system to systems at peer districts, you found that distinctions were made based on number of teachers supervised. On the one hand, I regretted teaching less, but, on the other, I appreciated a more equitable workload. In any case, I think the rationale for revised division head teaching duty is faulty, and I would vote against this piece of the FTE proposal."

Adjournment

At 8:45 p.m., Mr. Weissglass moved to adjourn the Special Board Meeting; seconded by Ms. Dixon Spivy. A voice vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

John Weissglass
President

Sara Dixon Spivy
Secretary

Submitted by
Gail Kalmerton
Clerk of the Board