

The regular Board meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on Thursday, March 24, 2016, in the Board Room of the OPRFHS.

Call to Order

President Weissglass called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. A roll call indicated the following Board of Education members were present: Fred Arkin, Jennifer Cassell, Thomas F. Cofsky, Dr. Steven Gevinson, Sara Dixon Spivy, and Jeff Weissglass. Also present were Dr. Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant Clerk of the Board.

Closed Session

At 6:36 p.m. on Thursday, March 24, 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 and 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; seconded by Ms. Cassell. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

At 7:38 p.m., the Board of Education resumed open session.

Joining the meeting were 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; Sheila Hardin, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair; and Hattie Grimm, Student Council Liaison..

Visitors

OPRFHS faculty and staff Jason Dennis, Sara Roodhouse, Kennedi Dixon, Clay Regan, Julie Frey, Jennifer Hoffmann, Julie Griffin Mary Haley, Chris Thieme John Stelzer, Earliana McLaurin, and Lisa Vincent; Julie Griffith of APPLAUSE!; Noah Hellenbach, Elizabeth Perkins, Grade Kavinsky, Jane Roarty, Sammy Levy, Julia Fortman, Erin McCanmond Watts, and Declan Ryan, students; and Michael Romain of the *Wednesday Journal*.

**Public
Comments**

Julie Griffin, president of Applause, reported that on March 5, 2016, Julia Fortman and Erin McCanmond Watts sang a duet at the IHSA Solo Competition. They sang for the Board of Education “I will Never Leave You” and they were accompanied by Declan Ryan on the piano.

Clay Reagan spoke on behalf of his fellow division heads. “We want to see all of our students and teachers succeed during their high school and teaching careers. We believe in the importance and impact of guiding teachers in the classroom as it relates to student success. Research shows that supporting teachers will increase student success by providing student-centered instruction in the classroom. With the passage of the state’s Illinois Performance Evaluation Reform Act (PERA), our district has an opportunity to use this process as a vehicle for division heads and teachers to work consistently and collaboratively to improve student learning through instruction. It is our wish that we will be given more time to spend with our teachers in their classrooms and assist them in ensuring student growth takes place. This can be achieved by allowing division heads who teach two sections to teach 1 section. Currently, non-tenured teachers are evaluated three times per year. Each evaluation requires a pre and post conference meeting. At the conclusion of the evaluation cycle, a summative meeting is held to review the teacher’s performance. Beginning next year we will also include meetings with all teachers on cycle to discuss student growth and how it will influence their evaluation. This will most likely require additional meetings to ensure we provide teachers with the necessary guidance and collaboration that this new process requires.

“Allowing our teaching assignments to shift from two sections to one will still allow us to connect with our students and teachers as instructors while also allowing us more time in classrooms with teachers. We can engage in meaningful observation practices that allow us to conduct performance evaluations accurately and consistently. Teaching one class will provide us the time necessary to hold in-depth pre-observation conferences designed to share key information between teacher and observer, and engage in more frequent observations and provide timely feedback to teachers. Additionally, this time will allow us to focus on specialized programs within each of our departments in an effort to enhance our students’ capacity to learn. This time, will also provide teachers and division heads the opportunity to examine and discuss observation evidence as it relates to the rubric, and determine appropriate ways to provide meaningful feedback. More time will allow division heads and teachers to review student learning objectives, practice assessment data analysis, and evaluate the effectiveness of instructional practices as it relates to student achievement. Finally, more time will provide greater opportunities for evaluators to reflect and evaluate our leadership work in terms of effectively improving teaching and learning in the department. Reflection and analysis are components important to observation practices designed to improve student growth and educator success.

“Currently, we all oversee no less than 20 teachers and paraprofessional/support staff and teach two sections. This year I observed a total of 17 teachers, many of whom are non-tenured and will need to be evaluated next year with the new

student growth component. For reasons noted above, I believe that teaching one class next year will allow us to be connected to our students, teachers, and curriculum in a more meaningful way than ever before. Thank you for your service, time, and consideration.”

Julie Frey, math Division Head, supported her fellow colleagues in the request to allow those division heads who were teaching two classes to teach only one class. It is a matter of equity.

Noah Hellenbach and Elizabeth Perkins, seniors, spoke about graduation attire noting that they had visited classrooms, made posters, and facilitate discussions. They made the following comments:

“Honorable Members of the Board, We are also seniors who support graduation dress reform.

The Voting Procedure and the Problem of Majority. Our efforts to raise awareness about this issue have garnered heartening support among the student body. The first poll of the students demonstrated the support for cap and gown; 184 students voted for cap and gown, which garnered more support than any other option. We hoped that the administration could make a decision based on that data alone, but a runoff election was held. The runoff election had a significantly lower turnout. The majority of seniors did not care enough about this issue to vote. We do not believe that the majority should decide this fundamental right issue, and we have spoken to administrators who agree. That being said, the fact that the majority is apathetic only adds to the absurdity of resting this decision in their hands. If there is even one student who is discriminated against by this dress code, no amount of appeal to tradition, aesthetics, or democracy should deny them their rights.

“This school has taken important steps toward recognizing the rights of non-binary students; this year we got gender-neutral bathrooms. A decision of such a personal and fundamental nature would never be up to a Democratic vote. The majority should not dictate issues of a minority’s fundamental rights.

Throughout the course of this campaign, we have heard numerous transphobic and ignorant arguments. One statement we have encountered is “This year we have to break that tradition and students have to wear cap and gowns because of the 1% of kids who can’t identify themselves as male or female. Give me a break!” This sentiment illustrates the problem with giving the majority of students the responsibility of choosing what their peers can wear at graduation. Students who have not considered the identity conflict the current attire creates for some other people cannot be expected to make an informed decision. A

process that allows the rights of a minority to be trampled on is contrary to OPRF's mission to create an equitable and inclusive environment.

“One response we have encountered is that if we adopt caps and gowns to accommodate non-binary and transgender students, what would prevent a student from demanding to wear, for example, green attire at graduation? This argument disregards the fact that being non-binary or transgender is an identity, not a choice. Furthermore, the argument equates an arbitrary preference to the expression of gender identity.

“Conclusion. OPRF has a commitment to fostering a ‘safe and respectful school community.’ As OPRF students, we have seen and felt how the graduation dress code excludes people. Non-binary and transgender students have rights that need to be recognized and recognized now before OPRF is on the wrong side of history. We ask that the school board upholds its responsibility to every student at OPRF by casting off this antiquated tradition that has blemished OPRF's dedication to equity.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.”

Sammy Levy read the following statement, “For my high school graduation, I decided to wear a white graduation gown, as opposed to the normal OPRF graduation attire of white dresses and black suits...because I felt most comfortable in attire that suited the occasion. My high school graduation should have been a day of pure joy and excitement. However, it was a stressful day for me. Before entering the school for my last official day at OPRF, I refused to leave the car in fear of being singled out but was met with a proud father who wouldn't let his daughter skip her graduation. Many people told me I was brave, but that day, I didn't feel brave at all. Instead, I was scared. Scared of what people would think of me and scared I should have just given in to what everyone else wanted me to wear. Today, though, I feel proud of the fact that I stayed true to myself on this incredibly important day. Without the amazing people pictured below (my parents and Ms. Heidi Lynch), I would not have been able to do it. This is a feeling no one deserves to feel on a day as momentous as a high school graduation because though it is still one of the proudest days of my high school career, it is also one of the most disappointing days of my high school career. I support the movement to welcome caps and gowns to the OPRF Graduation Ceremony to give everyone the opportunity to wear what they want without feeling separate from their peers. This day should be a day of unity and strength, and I hope that future OPRF students will be able to experience that.”

Status of FOIA Requests

Ms. Kalmerton reported that 3 FOIA requests were received and resolved.

Student Council

Ms. Grimm stated that Student Council was still working on its charity events. The Pack the Potbelly event went well. Conversations are occurring about offices for next year and sophomores, and juniors will be campaigning five days in April. Ms. Grimm noted that Student Council discussed graduation attire, specifically caps and gowns. Initially, almost every student either did not care about the attire or was for the traditional attire. Because of that conversation, every student changed their mind and subsequently spoke with other students about the subject. Ms. Grimm spoke of her experience of a female student giving her personal testimony as to the amount of pressure she felt to wear a dress, and she started crying. It was a powerful moment that changed Ms. Grimm's mind. Ms. Grimm felt students should feel comfortable at their graduation.

It was the consensus of the Board of Education members to have the discussion of graduation attire after the Consent Agenda. The graduation attire decision is an administrative decision, not a Board of Education decision.

Faculty Senate Report

Ms. Hardin reported that Faculty Senate fully supported the administrative FTE recommendations and strongly encouraged the Board of Education to consider them as presented, including the division head recommendation of going from teaching two classes to one. Any change to that recommendation would have a ripple effect.

Superintendent

Dr. Isoye reported that English teacher Jessica Stovall was one of 30 finalists for the 2016 Golden Apple Awards for Excellence in Teaching. More than 400 area high school teachers were nominated, with ten award recipients to be announced later this spring.

Seniors Anishka Bandara and Arjun Rawal tied for first place from OPRF in the American Mathematics Competition 10/12 and had scores high enough to qualify for the American Invitational Mathematics Examination, the next round of tests on the way to the U.S. Math Olympics.

At the IHSA Solo & Ensemble Contest, students brought home five Division II Excellent Ratings and 39 Division I Superior Ratings.

Two of the Huskie Robotics Club teams made it to the state championship, with one team ranking third in the state. Congratulations to George Dickerson, Tyler Yokoo, Adam Potter, David Snyder, and Miles Kosik.

Both the Boys' and the Girls' track teams won the indoor conference. This is the first time that the boys have been back-to-back champions and the first time that both freshman/sophomore and varsity have won conference the same year. Norma Abdur-Rafia broke a record in the 300, and the OPRF girls 400 relay team broke the conference record.

Consent

Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the following consent items:

- Check Disbursements and Financial Resolutions dated March 24, 2016
- Monthly Treasurer's Report
- Personnel Recommendations
- Textbook Adoption Purchases
- Life Safety Survey Contract
- Securatex Building Security Services Contract
- PTAB Resolution
- Renewal of IHSA Membership
- Policies for First Reading:
 - Policy 2:160, Board Attorney
 - Policy 2:250, Access to District Public Records
 - Policy 6:140, Education of Homeless Children
 - Policy 7:100, Health and Eye Examinations; Immunizations; and Exclusion of Students
 - Policy 7:130, Student Rights and Responsibilities
 - Policy 7:140, Search and Seizure
 - Policy 7:290, Suicide and Depression Awareness and Prevention
 - Policy 7:340, Student Records
- Policies for Second Reading
 - 1. Policy 5:330, Sick Days, Vacation, Holidays, and Leaves
 - 2. Policy 6:20, School Year Calendar and Day
- Open and Closed Session Minutes of February 25 and March 15, 2016, and a declaration that the closed session audiotapes of August 2014 be destroyed.

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

Graduation Attire

Mr. Rouse explained that the majority of students on the first voted for caps and gowns, but because it was not the majority of the class, a runoff vote was held from Monday, March 21 to Wednesday, March 23. Senior students were sent an email to their OPRF student email account with a link to the ballot. The results were as follows:

389 Senior Students Voted

Option A Graduation Attire (Cap and Gown) received 150 votes (39%)

Option B Graduation Attire (White or Dark Options) received 239 (61%)

He met with many students and appreciated their passion. While he was torn about making the decision, to do other than what the majority of students wanted would not be well received. The result: students may wear white or dark graduation attire for this year's graduation, meaning dark dresses are allowable

with optional roses and boutonnières. This conversation will lead to other conversations regarding other equity-related events, i.e., Mr. OPRFHS, etc.

Discussion ensued. Board of Education member comments included:

- 1) One member felt that the annual vote should be open to all students, not just seniors.
- 2) Several members supported the wearing of caps and gowns at graduation, but they appreciated the conversation, respected the votes and appreciated Mr. Rouse's work.
- 3) Several Board of Education members complimented the students on their hard work and passionate speeches.
- 4) One member felt the traditional attire is a beautiful tradition for the eye, and he agreed that the decision should not be made by the majority.

Mr. Weissglass thought the issue of gender was about fast learning. For him when the students presented this at an earlier Board of Education meeting, it was a further shift from the traditional dress. He thought that moving towards anyone wearing black and white attire was a strong step towards more respect for the individual gender identity. Traditions and social change are important and sometimes conflict, and he felt change sometimes needs to be dramatic and sometimes needs to be incremental. He felt that the preference in the survey was a good outcome. He had learned from the students' comments that the wearing of black and white still feels gender related and is not yet enough of a break. Mr. Weissglass felt that caps and gowns were a traditional dress code which he did not favor it because it asked people to hide their individuality under a gown. Black and white dress got the majority of the survey votes; the most important piece is that this gives yet another learning moment about the respecting of gender and individual identity, and he encouraged the administration to take that and move forward with educating the community about gender identity.

Dr. Isoye reaffirmed that students would have the ability to wear black or white attire at this year's graduation. The first vote was a message of change. Mr. Rouse had been thoughtful in working with the multiple perspectives, and he had heard the majority of conversations. Dr. Isoye believed there was now a different level of awareness regarding gender. He hoped that these students realized that they had made progress in what they wanted, albeit it was not caps and gowns. Changing the graduation attire is a big change for a school steeped in tradition. Dr. Isoye thanked Mr. Rouse for synthesizing the information and allowing the students to have a voice.

Mr. Rouse thanked the students for their courage and the way they handled this situation. He will never forget the class of 2016.

Policy 6:280,

Mr. Weissglass moved to amend Policy 6:280, Grading and Promotion, seconded

Grading and Promotion

by Ms. Dixon Spivy. Discussion ensued.

Dr. Gevinson noted that the Policy Evaluation and Goals Committee raised the question as to why PARCC should be included in the policy, as it sounds as if a student's performance on PARCC will determine if the student is promoted. Mr. Weissglass pulled the motion for more discovery as the administration will check with the attorney.

Reduction in Force for Reduction of Teaching Hours

Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the Resolution of Reduction in Force for in Force for Reduction of Teaching Hours, as presented; seconded by Mr. Arkin. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Consideration of Bookstore Policy

Mr. Weissglass moved to eliminate Policy 4:142, Bookstore Policy, note the month and year the policy was eliminated and keep the policy in the Policy Manual as a historical reference; seconded by Ms. Spivy. Discussion ensued.

To be more conservative and continue to be self-sustaining, Dr. Gevinson moved to amend the policy as follows:

Add "Except for the absorption in the Education Fund of fees of the students who qualified for full or partial waiver" before "The bookstore is expected"

Replace "personal" with "personnel".

Discussion ensued. Because Dr. Gevinson favored fees that included salary and benefits, his motion would make the bookstore self-sustaining except for families qualifying for some level of fees, which he felt should be spread district-wide and not borne by families in the school. Ms. Cassell and Ms. Dixon Spivy had disagreed with him at the Policy Committee about this, and he wanted the full Board of Education to discuss this. He continued that the theme was of continuity and rationale. The reason for paying fees went beyond the cost of the books. A policy that establishes that, with this exception, is better than having no policy. It is needed because the cost would have to come out of the fund balance.

Several members did not feel a policy was needed and could be eliminated so that changes could be made to the District Fees for the 2016-17 school year. If changes were desired later, the Board of Education could craft a better-written policy. How would this policy affect change? One member believed that whenever a fee is proposed, it is determined based on a five-year trend for waivers and the cost of the materials; it is formulaic. Historically the Board of Education has asked questions about how a fee was derived, and an explanation has been given.

Ms. Charette-BassiriRad reported that five years ago before the IMF fee was implemented, the book fee did not cover waived students. The Bookstore acts as a bursar's office, an arm of the business office, dealing with things other than books.

Because fees can be published as late as May, the discussion about the Bookstore policy will continue at the regular April meeting. Parents need to pay their fees by July 1.

A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

**Recommendation of
IMF District Fees
For 2016-17**

Mr. Weissglass moved to maintain the Instructional Materials Fee at \$320 for the 2016-17 school year, as recommended by the administration; seconded by Mr. Cofsky. Discussion ensued.

The Policy Evaluation and Goals (PEG) Committee had asked that the Board of Education makes a determination on the IMF, as it could not agree. The current fee of \$320 covers everything to make the bookstore self-sustaining, i.e. credit card fees, free and reduced waivers, salaries and benefits, etc. If salaries were covered by the District, it would result in a loss of revenue of \$276,103. The revenue for paid fees would be \$777,000. On the other end of the spectrum, if no IMF Fee is charged, the loss of revenue would be \$1 million. A PMA chart reflected the different options if this loss of revenue were to be taken out of the fund balance.

Ms. Spivy suggested having personnel costs absorbed by the District and charging the students just the cost of the materials. She was concerned about paying students covering those students who qualify for free or waived programs and personnel costs. Price points that qualified someone to be on the reduced plan and the documentation for Food Service is different from the bookstore, and she wanted to make it less burdensome.

Dr. Gevinson noted that philosophically it did not make sense for other families with students in the school to pick up the burden of the waived IMF; however, the concept of a free education is something that he cannot draw a clear line on because many things contribute to an individual's education. Why not just have the students buy their books? Nutrition is just as important and why would the District not supply breakfast backpacks? Decisions are made pragmatically. He felt a change in the IMF would hasten a referendum by a year and to do so would have an educational consequence. He did not want to take that risk. If personnel costs and waivers were removed from the fee, the District would be losing \$400,000 per year which equates to four teachers and much education. Children are expensive and a burden, and this is a great education at little cost. The District is not violating the concept of a free education by charging relatively

modest fees. He suggested reducing the credit card fees and continuing the tradition of making the Bookstore a self-sustaining operation, with one exception the free and reduced fees.

Ms. Cassell was conflicted as she felt a fee was needed for students and instructional materials. She questioned why a self-sustaining bookstore would cover salaries and benefits, and because she did not know the rationale, it was hard for her to continue to support it. At the same time, this is a significant amount of revenue, and she was concerned about depleting the fund balance and going to a referendum earlier than anticipated. Her interest was in free and waived and salaries and benefits. Having all students receive materials and having the taxpayers bear the burden is fairer than having the user of the bookstore carrying the burden. She remained uncertain.

Mr. Arkin, too, struggled with this as he believed the rationale for having a self-sustained bookstore was to take that financial burden off the District. While some of the reduced students could be included in the number of free and waived if they had applied for the book waiver, it is not an automatic process. Food Service has to follow federal guidelines. He concurred with Dr. Gevinson in that free and waived student fees should not be a burden on the balance of the student families, but an annual expense of the community in general. The budget must adjust, and this will reduce the fund balance faster. He supported salaries and benefits being included in the fee.

Mr. Cofsky reiterated that fees are not an insignificant amount of money and have been included in the PMA model, historically. He leaned towards moving free and reduced fees from the burden of students and keeping personnel costs included in the fee. He also suggested that the families pay the credit card fee, not the District.

While not in attendance, Dr. Moore had asked Mr. Weissglass to read the following statement: “If eliminating the bookstore policy is the mechanism for restructuring our IMF process then I support the PEG recommendation, which functions of the bookstore will still be covered by revenue generated by IMF?”

Mr. Weissglass commented that overhead fees are the cost of delivering services. If families went somewhere else, they would be paying overhead costs, so he did not understand the argument for taking salaries and benefits out of charging a fee. He felt it would be helpful to revisit policies and procedures regarding waivers. What would the cost be to give reduced waiver or percentage? Are people getting waivers not on free and reduced? What are the criteria? How much is that? Dr. Isoye responded that the administration would give clarity about the process of the federal guidelines for Food Service in the future. It is a declaration, an application. Food Services receives monies from the state, but the

Bookstore does not. Dr. Gevinson considered reducing the IMF by those students getting waivers, and that would reduce the fee to \$262. A recommendation will also be made to add \$50 for a technology fee.

Mr. Cofsky moved to amend the motion to exclude the free and waived costs from the IMF Fee to have the free and waived costs not be covered by the other students (\$268); seconded by Mr. Arkin.

Ms. Dixon Spivy moved to amend and take out salaries and benefits from the IMF; no second.

Ms. Dixon Spivy moved to have students pay the same percentage for materials as they do on the reduced plan; seconded by Ms. Cassell. Discussion ensued. Ms. Spivy wanted to take the Free and Reduced guidelines and automatically apply it to the bookstore, as families are signing affidavits, they are the District's students, and it should not be a separate application process. Dr. Gevinson wanted to wait for the administration to answer the questions about costs and process before a decision is made. Mr. Cofsky agreed that application process needed to be revisited and that IGOV had talked about multiple ways for the information could be shared across governmental entities. Mr. Arkin agreed with Mr. Cofsky, as philosophically he believed that there should be a reduced fee for those in need, but the process has to be determined. Ms. Cassell was concerned with not having the information but felt she wanted to bring families relief sooner rather than later. Mr. Weissglass asked who is on what list? Another category could be added later after analysis. He did not support Ms. Spivy's amendment. He wanted more information on the cost, what qualifies for free, and what qualifies for reduced. An analysis of costs and fees is needed.

Ms. Spivy moved to add a third price point of 10% which would correspondent with the federal guidelines for Food Service; seconded by Ms. Cassell. Discussion ensued. Students would pay \$26.80 instead of \$268. The balance would be paid for by OPRFHS.

Ms. Spivy withdrew her motion as it was the consensus of the majority of Board of Education members to consider this at the April Board of Education meeting. The District will present the cost of every free and reduced student also having an automatic waiver or a reduced amount.

A roll call vote on the amendment resulted in motion carried.

A roll call vote on the amended motion resulted in 5 ayes and 1 nay. Motion carried. Ms. Spivy voted nay.

The Board of Education recessed 10:31 pm. and resumed at 10:41 p.m.

2016-17 FTE and Stipends

Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the proposed Instructional and Instructional Support FTE, as well as Stipends, pursuant to the recommendations of the administration; seconded by Ms. Dixon Spivy.

Dr. Isoye noted that student participation and the rationale for increasing the stipends was included in the stipends recommendation memo. PMA charts had been updated; charts 1-4 are the more detailed, and 5 is an overlay of all of the charts. The FTE recommendations were made as a result of student interest in a broad scope of course offerings, which are well rounded from core area to electives.

Mr. Arkin thanked the administration for providing the information requested. It was helpful to see the participation numbers and the incremental costs. Mr. Cofsky appreciated the presentation as it allowed the Board of Education to look at all the pieces together. He appreciated the administration's adjustments to the PMA model as the Ehler's enrollment projections now indicated 250 students less than its previous report, which equated to 16 fewer teachers at a saving of \$1.5 million. The health care numbers were adjusted downwards by \$200,000. The macro picture is less by \$1.5 to \$2 million in annual costs because of the student growth and has been replaced by support staff. Financially and from substitution, the Board of Education is changing a model that had 16 or more teachers and replacing it with support staff (non-instructional support) going from 24 to 42 in the areas of IT, counseling, support, etc. He stated that it was a strategic shift; it is not tactile. When asked if anything else would come before the Board of Education. The response was that the technology had not been extrapolated relative to the 1:1 program. The District also does not know future staffing concerns. As an example, DLT started to look at that the stated average caseload for counselors and social workers, noting that to reach that number will take longer than expected because of the change in enrollment projections. It is not being changed in the model. The 504 coordinator is a benefit that satisfies the law and the service piece, as the 504 Plan benefits the students. More and more students are requesting these services so the position could expand in the next few years. The Special Education TAs work one-on-one or help in special classes to ensure students get the instruction they deserve by law. Those needs are unknown. It is a linear trend and based on what is happening with the students coming in. Decisions were based on last year's enrollment and not something that needs to be put in the model immediately. This model is the best estimate, not knowing other factors. Mr. Cofsky stated that \$1.5 or \$2 million over a six-year period meant \$10 to \$15 million in incremental funds. The strategic question is what can be expected and what will look different. The District is spending everything it would have spent on enrollment. He noted the technology fee, will the yet un-approved 1:1 cost the taxpayers more money? Mr. Carioscio explained that the .5 FTE position was a "catch-up." If the

technology FTE were not approved for the 1:1, he recommended freezing everything. The Board of Education will be asked to vote on the 1:1 program next month.

Dr. Gevinson noted that the Ehler's report had ramifications. The strategic shift must be intentional, rather than accidental. The problem is that more funds are being shifted in the direction of non-classroom. Dr. Isoye stated that the administration did not make the recommendation to add as much non-instructional support. Mr. Weissglass affirmed that the Board of Education approved more than was recommended. Dr. Gevinson stated that based on different numbers, he would argue for putting more into the classroom. Class sizes are too high, and he asked, given these numbers, if the District were overstaffed with the 5th PSS team.

Dr. Isoye remembered the Board of Education's discussion about looking at the level of support for students, talking about the level of support from social workers and the comparing of contractual services. Based on the reports, expectations are being met. The administration looked at the strategy one way and the Board of Education another way. Mr. Weissglass understood Mr. Cofsky's observation of investments being similar amounts of money, but he did not agree with the characterization of a substitution of one strategy for another on the investment last year. If the same growth had occurred, the District would be spending more. To say this \$1.5 million is an exchange did not ring true to him. The question of whether the District's investment in non-instructional personnel is necessary and appropriate is a good question. However, it was disappointing to characterize this is a strategic shift-aligned to the Strategic Plan, and the reduction in expected growth is happenstance. Ms. Hardin, having sat through 2 FAC committees, stated that the PMA model did not have a mechanism to increase support staff and investment or adjustment would have to be made. It is completely unfair to categorize this as a substitution as they were always two entities and everyone agreed that adjustments had to be made. Ms. Hardin heard the Board of Education refers to the 5th PSS Team as a mistake, and she stated that there has been much return on investment. Mr. Weissglass asked for a report be made to the full Board of Education. Mr. Carioscio added that the administration has been talking about the 1:1 plan for three years and the timeline has been presented. Mr. Weissglass supported the recommendation in full, as presented.

Dr. Gevinson heard the comments from the division heads that they supported reducing the teaching responsibilities of Division Heads who were teaching two classes to one. He personally believed that PERA's requirement to evaluate teachers on student outcomes was a terrible idea educationally, and had nothing to do with what teachers have done, and that the District should take a minimalist approach in how it handles things. If that is the rationale for reducing the

teaching load for division heads, he asked why the other three divisions who have more people were not being reduced from 1 class to zero. Mr. Rouse reported that division heads want to teach and to support teachers and students. PERA is a state requirement. Mr. Rouse had planned to bring this FTE request last year but did not because of prioritization. There is more work yet to be done on the student growth outcomes. If this request is not approved, the domino effect will be staffing implications. Dr. Gevinson reiterated his confusion about not reducing all of the division heads teaching assignments, as it did not make sense and it did not distinguish between workloads. Every CADCA school has a distinction depending on how many teachers the division head is supervising.

Mr. Weissglass noted Dr. Moore's questions: The increase in administrative duties as dictated by PERA is extensive. Does any of the evaluation work fall to our Principal and Assistant Principal of Instruction? Would coverage of these evaluative measures by division heads, principal and vice principal result in a reduced FTE at the division head level? Mr. Rouse noted that Ms. Hoffmann evaluates counselors. SIDs participate in the evaluation of non-tenured teachers so that their abilities to evaluate will be expanded. Mr. Rouse evaluates the administrators. Additional support has been provided in Special Education because of the number teachers.

Mr. Weissglass spoke on PERA issue. There is a distinction between student growth and student growth models to evaluate teachers. He believes this was about the importance of how students move forward, so he applauded moving to student growth models without any awareness of best practices. He agreed from the evaluation standpoint; student outcomes were problematic.

Ms. Cassell commended the administration and thought it was reasonable to make an investment in students per the recommendations. The School Refusal Program is good for students as it will lead to a decrease in off-campus tuition. The technology request is reasonable if a commitment is made to go to 1:1. She heard Dr. Gevinson's concern about the division heads, but the question was answered. The PSS Team members spoke about their success at the Parents 4 Success meeting. The Leadership and Launch and the stipends the people who presented on this provided data how the District's investment in the students have led to better outcomes, less discipline and higher GPAs. The administration has done a great job of presenting data. Ms. Spivy concurred.

Dr. Moore requested that Mr. Weissglass read this statement: "In future budgets, I feel the extra-curricular stipend recommendation should come from the administration separate from the FTE recommendations."

Dr. Gevinson moved to remove the Division Head recommendation; no second. Mr. Cofsky thought it was the responsibility of the administration to say here is

everything, and if it does not meet the expectations, then the administration needs to decide what it needed to change. He had supported the PSS Team and still does, but he wanted an updated. He believed in the 1:1 effort, but it becomes a question of doing all of the priorities and staying within the parameters.

Dr. Gevinson noted his support despite his disagreement because it did not make sense to vote it down. He was supportive of the concept, but he thought it was wrongheaded on division heads.

A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Student Discipline

None

EOS Schools Partnership

Dr. Isoye earlier this month signed a letter of intent to participate in a multi-year grant through the ISBE to partner with Equal Opportunity Schools, an organization focused on closing the AP access gap for students not equitably represented in the AP courses. The schools selected for the AP Equity and Excellence Project will receive technical assistance toward reaching an annual goal of growing all AP programs to reflect fully the school's diversity while raising performance in those courses. The District received confirmation that OPRFHS had the opportunity to participate in the cohort of districts. The cost of this program will be about \$50,000, and the grant could be as much as \$25,000. The Instruction Committee discussed this, and Dr. Gevinson felt it was an exciting opportunity to identify students in a way that OPRFHS struggles.

Compensation Philosophy

Mr. Cofsky noted that the development of the Compensation Philosophy had a long-standing process. At the February Board of Education meeting, this was an informational item. It is now a discussion for the whole Board of Education.

Discussion ensued about moving this to an action item. Mr. Weissglass appreciated the tremendously beneficial work of the HAY Group in identifying markets, digging into the high school's structure and getting people in the right ranges, as it has helped the Board of Education understand its compensation and internal equity around compensation, and he fully applaud that. That was one goal. The other goal was to explore a pay for performance and merit pay of which he was deeply skeptical of that within the school system. He worried about the impact on trying to create a strong collaborative environment. He worried about getting into the kind of gamesmanship that happens with merit pay, i.e., a financial payment when one cannot make a difference. He supported the compensation statement in #14.

Mr. Arkin was disappointed with Mr. Weissglass' comments because when this was first introduced, the whole premise of the HAY group premise was performance. He voted for it at that time because he was told performance was

the next step. Mr. Weissglass explained that his comments were that he was open to hearing why a performance-based model would make sense, but that he had not assumed that, especially Numbers 7 and 8. He did not understand how No. 7 would work, and he was skeptical about both of them. He had not seen a mechanism. He strongly leaned against this philosophically.

Mr. Cofsky remembered looking at external equity for nonaffiliated groups and having the concept of looking at practices that are used to make sure employees are competitive within those groups. Mr. Weissglass asked how that would be measured, as it was hard to do a bonus when there is no profit. While the HAY Group assumes the District is going in this direction, Mr. Weissglass has not heard the negatives about doing so.

Several Board of Education members agreed that the Board of Education must have a philosophical conversation about a performance-based compensation before it can move forward with a compensation philosophy. One member asked if this document were to be used for attracting talent and if so, then it is about what the District believes in compensation, and it should be made visible and attract those in agreement with those concepts. If it is a tool to attract, professional development, life insurance, long-term, flexible spending should be spelled out to attract talent, etc.

The next step will be to discuss performance pay and Board of Education members were encouraged to send questions in advance to shape the dialogue.

Update on Plans for 1:1 Mr. Carioscio asked for Board of Education support with the next phase of 1:1. He introduced Lisa Vincent, Earliana McLaurin, and Chris Thieme. They reviewed a PowerPoint embedded in the agenda.

Mr. Prale reviewed the agenda for the presentation and showed a video with a student who talked about the pros and cons of 1:1.

Lisa Vincent spent 11 years training students on how to use technology to impact learning and had seen how technology has changed their student lives and learning. Tools that were once used by the neediest students are now mainstreamed. Read and Write for Google is a tool offered to every student from the Honors level to those in self-contained classes to enhance their classroom experience. Using technology can be a game-changer in supporting executive functioning skills. Teachers have testified as to how Chromebooks have helped student learning. Technology is improving their ability as students. Lastly, from an equity standpoint, these tools need to be provided to students to affect the achievement gap. She has been surprised and disheartened that so many students do not have technology outside of the classroom.

Earliana McLaurin reported that teachers will be the next biggest stakeholder group to have PD on instructional technology. While what is presented for PD seems similar to past PD, it is a big change in focus. It will introduce and reinforce essential skills needed in a device classroom. These are modeled after SAMR and International Society of Technology Educators. Some of it will be straight up tech training, but some will be the transition to more technology that fosters learning for all students. Students have said that collaboration is important, and that cannot happen if students are on different platforms. Educational Technology also wants to provide mentorship to the new teachers who want support. SAMR is a way to personalize learning, and it shifts the ways in which teachers work. The work of teachers and students are tracked and the administration can see how they align.

Mr. Thieme reviewed the timeline for the 1:1 plan and noted that the District is prepared to bring to the Board of Education the request to purchase the devices, and can distribute them to the students.

Discussion ensued about providing internet access to students who do not have it. Surveys have shown that few students do not have access to the internet at home. The District is working on fund the solution either by:

- 1) Vendors who supply Wi-Fi, extension of network, or
- 2) Vendors who work with families outside of the school on a one-to-one basis to bring the internet into their home at a reduced rate.

The administration is also working with the Chamber of Commerce and school districts on providing community WI-FI, student-friendly zones, longer hours in community buildings so that students can access them. The answer will probably be a combination of avenues.

Dr. Gevinson commended the administration for focusing on developing the idea, as it is about equity. He reflected that if it cost \$100 per year per student (600 students) to be supplied with access via an outside vendor, it could so that is \$60,000 per year. The other option was a monthly fee of \$30 to \$50 per month, per student. Knowing that students have good access is important before the Board of Education makes an informed decision. In the previous two years and next year, the total on this initiative is \$3.1 million and the steady state annually is \$867,000, every year to implement and sustain the 1:1 program, assuming no additional expenses occur. These costs are not totally incremental as the FTE were already included and the District will no longer support computer labs. This year is a catch-up year. The incoming class will receive new devices. A full complement of the devices will not be purchased next year. Discussion ensued about what was currently included in the financial model. The response was that this year's expenses were included, but nothing going forward has been

factored into the plan. The Board of Education wanted to know the financial impact before making a decision.

Pool Update When asked if the professional development was within the context of the professional development structure or was it supplemental, Mr. Carioscio stated that negotiations were occurring about time, the goal is to give 10 hours of foundational PD. Divisions using certain applications will have separate, short-term workshops. It will be as personalized for instructors as it is for the students. It was reported that the District was working with Legat on developing new Pool options to consider and it was planning meetings with the community on April 9, 11 and 12, which will be facilitated by an outside consultant. The working group consists of Mr. Arkin, Dr. Isoye, Dr. Isoye, Ms. Sullivan, Ms. Sutter, consultant, and Mr. Weissglass. The working group is shaping the plans and how to present them. They will not be public until the first community meeting. The Board of Education will receive the plans earlier if possible.

Policy 7:305, Student Athlete Concussions and Head Injuries Due to the lateness of the hour, this will be discussed at another time.

Audio Recordings The Policy Evaluation and Goals committee recommended that the report on audio recordings be moved to the full board, noting that both regular and special meetings would be recorded in the future.

Update on PTAC Dr. Isoye reported that the list of members to invite to Board of Education's Culture, Climate and Behavior Committee (CCB) and the timeline were being finalized. The Board of Education will be asked at a special meeting in April to approve the members. Note: first CCB meeting may occur before the special meeting.

Update on Civics Course Development The Instruction Committee recommended that the Update on Civics Course Development be moved forward to the full Board of Education. Discussion ensued. When asked if this would have a service project, the response was that while that was possible, the process will be for the District to connect with community resources, which has not been finalized. Dr. Gevinson added that discussion was about being a model student, including gender identification and expression, and a citizenship question about relationships on a dating level, etc. Mr. Weissglass noted that much of the language was very good, but much of it also sounds like fairly progressive learning. He does much work at the Convergence Center, which tries to find language that raises topics that do not assume an outcome or a political position. One topic is gun control, which seems to be an assumed answer to gun violence. He offered to talk with people about the language.

Adjournment

At 12:02 a.m., on Friday, March 25, 2016, Mr. Cofsky moved to adjourn the Regular Board of Education meeting; seconded by Mr. Arkin. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

Jeff Weissglass
President

Sara Dixon Spivy
Secretary

Submitted by Gail Kalmerton
Clerk of the Board