A Committee of the Whole Committee meeting was held on February 13, 2018. Dr. Moore called the meeting to order at 6:38 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members present were Fred Arkin, Matt Baron, Jennifer Cassell, Thomas F. Cofsky, Craig Iseli, Dr. Jackie Moore, and Sara Dixon Spivy, as well as Greg Johnson, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction, and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board of Education and FOIA Officer (telephonically).

Also present were Tod Altenburg, Chief School Business Officer; Michael Carioscio, Chief Information Officer; Nathaniel Rouse, Principal; Karin Sullivan, Director of Communications and Community Relations; Amy Hill, Director of Research and Assessment; and Dr. Gwen Walker-Qualls, Director of Pupil Support Services.

Visitors: OPRFHS Faculty and Staff Jason Dennis, Chris Thieme, John Stelzer, Carolyn Gust, Micheline Piekarski, John Hoerster, and Melinda Novotny; Elizabeth Vietzen, Grace Dorian, Matt Vietzen, Majesty Gunn, and Andrew Inksetter, students and community members.

**Public Comments**

Ms. Elizabeth Vietzen supported the continuation of the Leadership and Launch program and noted that all students should be enrolled in this program as the ones who are in it are flourishing. She spoke of the positive effect this program had on her children. She suggested survey all 8th graders as to their interest.

Majesty Gunn, senior leader, also spoke in support of the Leadership and Launch Program and how it had helped her build confidence. She was appreciative of what the class had brought her.

Andre Inksetter, student, also supported continuing the Leadership and Launch Program.

Grace Dorian reported that the Leadership and Launch Program had been a great role model and it had inspired her. She too felt the program should be expanded so that all freshmen could participate.

Matt Vietzen reported that the Leadership and Launch Program had been great for him. It had helped him develop social skills, problem-solving, confidence building and he had developed a relationship with freshmen. The purpose was to make their lives easier.

**Leadership & Launch Pilot Evaluation**

The Leadership & Launch Pilot is a peer mentoring program designed to provide consistent social, emotional, and academic support for freshmen from selected upper-class leaders enrolled in a leadership development course. John Hoerster and Melinda Novotny are the teachers. The program originated with the 2014 Strategic Plan and is now in its third year as a pilot program. Currently, 96 leaders are enrolled in four sections of Leadership and Launch with Lindy Novotny or Mr. Hoerster, working with 360 freshmen in study halls, Extended Algebra, and Pre-Algebra classes. It is hoped that this will increase college success rates.

The program’s Mission and Objectives are to:

1. Increase school connectedness and feelings of belonging
2. Increase social, emotional, and academic connections and supports
3. Provide space for students to be safe, heard, valued, and respected
4. Develop student leadership
5. Create a space to implement SEL initiatives
6. Provide near-peer mentoring and tutoring
7. Transform school culture into one of shared responsibility, care, and respect.

The written report included positive statements about the program from Freshman Launch Teachers, Parents and Students were included, as well as positive statements from Junior/Senior Mentors’ Teachers, Parents, and Students.

An outline of the curriculum and the process of selecting leaders was included. The demographics of the program match the student population. A video was shown.

The Program Evaluation Overview
1) Near-peer mentoring is empirically supported
2) Begin with doing no harm
3) Qualitative measures
   ○ Student
   ○ Teacher
   ○ Family surveys
4) Quantitative measures
   ○ Attendance
   ○ Grades
   ○ Discipline
   ○ School connectedness measures
   ○ Activity participation rates.

Mr. Hoerster testified to the impact that this program had made on students. The student leaders take accountability and the program is a service to families. The graduates feel more connected to the school and the girls feel more confident in taking college leadership roles. This past summer 40 graduates returned to attend a summer party. Mr. Hoerster felt this program had made him a better teacher.

The number of Students Recommended for the Program was 479
The number of Students Who Applied was 248
The number of Students Who Were Interviewed was 174
The number of Students Accepted was 125

Sixty-six freshmen had applied to be leaders and 17 were accepted. Freshmen in the program were randomly selected from students who had a supported math class and available periods 2, 4, 6 or 7. Next year, the number of students will grow. Costs are borne by the District. Note this program is not built for the mentors to be tutors. This program can be a springboard for a discussion about curriculum. It is positive training. It could even work to grow OPRFHS’s own to be teachers.

One member supported this program but wanted its evaluation to continue as to its long-term effectiveness. This program does align with the Strategic Plan. Questions arose as to how to grow this program. While the information on the leader side has been very positive, a demonstration of freshman data on the long-term effectiveness of this program is needed. How are students who have study halls doing versus those who are in the supported math program? How are the teachers different? Is connectedness germane to academic excellence?
Follow-up on Data Retreat

This report summarizes work the administration has done to advance the goals identified at the November 2017 data retreat. The guiding principle then and now is that the work ought to focus on District priorities, and reports to the Board of Education should strategically align with those priorities.

The administration identified central questions common to both documents and grouped them into key focus areas (e.g. student learning, climate, finance). Central questions were distinguished that readily could be addressed with data analysis from those that could not. The first group of central questions were aligned to the Strategic Plan; this report will refer to them as the data priorities. The latter items were moved to a separate annotated list; they are not identified as priorities for report development. A comparison of this list was made to the existing Calendar of Reports. They were categorized the existing reports in one of three ways:

A. those with direct alignment to data retreat priorities (i.e. reports currently produced that directly answer one or more central questions);
B. Those that are not directly aligned with data retreat priorities but are required by law, policy, or other provision;
C. Those that are neither directly aligned with data retreat priorities nor required.

This comparison lent a clear picture of the extent to which current practices match up with the data priorities identified at the November retreat and the extent to which both align with the Strategic Plan.

Several findings were noted.
1. While many of the data priorities are addressed by existing reports, there are opportunities to consolidate reports and use available data more intentionally in alignment with Strategic Plan goal areas.
2. A number of data priorities are not addressed by existing reports.
3. There is overlap but not complete alignment between the Strategic Plan goals and the data priorities/existing reports. For example, Strategic Plan Goal 5, Transformational Leadership, is not directly reflected in the data priorities, though data pertaining to leadership exists in the 5Essentials Report.
4. A number of the items currently reported to the Board of Education are not directly aligned to data retreat priorities or to the Strategic Plan. While many such items are required by law or policy, others are not. Of the items that are neither aligned nor required, some may still be important; being categorized as neither/nor does not necessarily mean that they will be discontinued, though they will be carefully assessed for value-added and time required.

It was also suggested that consideration is given to what is nice to know versus what is needed. The revised priorities will be brought back to the Board in the next two or three months.

NIIPC Bids

Oak Park & River Forest High School is the Administrative District for the Northern Illinois Independent Purchasing Cooperative (NIIPC). Per the NIIPC Intergovernmental Agreement: The administrative district, subject to the direction of the Board of Directors, shall perform those necessary functions to obtain bids and award to a preferred vendor the purchase of food and supply items by individual member districts of the Cooperative. This includes the rollover of all bids/RFP’s. Ms. Piekarski enjoys this work, and the responsibility is shared among 6 food service directors.

It was the consensus of the Committee of the Whole Members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approves the rollover of vending, milk and bread products and award the NIIPC Primary Distribution of Food Products & Miscellaneous Non-Food Supplies to Gordon Food Service, Inc., award Fresh Produce Products to Get Fresh Produce, Inc., as presented in the packet at its February 22, 2018 meeting.
AthletiCo
It was the consensus of the Committee of the Whole members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve the Agreement with AthletiCo to continue as the District’s provider of athletic training services at its February 22 meeting. AthletiCo has serviced as the District’s provider for athletic training services since 2006 at for all practices, home games, away football games, IHSA events, as well as injury assessment and rehabilitation services. Their certified athletic trainers are available after school Monday through Friday, as well as Saturdays per practice and game schedules. In addition, AthletiCo provides these services for our District’s summer camp program, which consists of 22 camps and over 2,000 camp participants each year.

Professional service awards do not have to go out for bid. The average per hour cost for this work is $24, and OPRFHS is paying $19.10 per hour.

Network
It was the consensus of the Committee of the Whole members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve the contract for purchasing to be awarded to CDW at its February 22, 2018, meeting. This contract is for switches and wireless access points.

Instructional Materials Fee and Technology Fees
The administration recommended that the District Registration, Instructional Material, and Technology Fees remain the same for the 2018-2019 school year as they are for the 2017-2018 school year and are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>District Registration Fee</th>
<th>Instructional Materials Fee (IMF)</th>
<th>Technology Fee</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$268</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>$268</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$268</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$268</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The administration recommended that the Pay-to-Play Fee for athletes also remains the same at $55 for the 2018-2019 school year.

Additionally, the administration recommends that the Instructional Materials Fee (IMF) reduction schedule remain the same as below:

- $268.00 Students who do not qualify for free or reduced lunch
- $26.80 Students who qualify for reduced lunch
- $0.00 Students who qualify for free lunch

The Committee members were informed of the following:
1) Publishers are not incentivized to have online textbooks only. While it could be called a trend to do so, this idea has not progressed much.
2) The technology fee is $50 per year. It has been found that Chromebooks are lasting more than 3 years.
For OPRFHS to take them back from seniors, it is not gaining much other than for recycling. Thus, OPRFHS is allowing students to keep their devices after their senior year.

3) Chromebooks cost approximately $350. OPRFHS charges $200 to students and that does not include support for these devices.

Committee members wanted to discuss philosophically of what a public education means and what the total fees are at a future COW meeting. The District collects approximately $1.1 million in fees. Mr. Altenburg was asked to prepare “next steps” as to what would need to happen in order to change the structure of the IMF for the 2019-20 school year for the presentation at the regular February meeting. A number of mechanical items that would need to be occur to consider any changes such as changing the bookstore policy, etc. One member remembered a lengthy discussion at a Policy Committee meeting previously. A history of fees was also requested. This item will come to the full Board of Education at its regular February meeting for consideration and approval.

Request to Waive Building Rental Fees – Social Emotional Learning Conference
It was the consensus of the Committee of the Whole to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve the Waiver of Building Rental Fees for the Social Emotional Learning conference at the special board following the Committee of the Whole meeting on February 13, 2018.

Oak Park and River Forest High School administrators were approached about hosting a Social Emotional Learning (SEL) Conference by the Illinois Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ILASCD) to be held on July 23 and 24, 2018. Because this is an outside entity, the District follows Board Policy 8:20 – Community Use of School Facilities and charges the appropriate rental fee. The total rental fee for this event is $14,520.

In lieu of the rental fees, ILASCD is giving access to a large number of OPRFHS faculty and staff to attend the conference free of charge. Board Policy 8:20 allows the Board of Education to waive rental fees at its discretion.

Therefore, the District Administration is requesting that the Board of Education waive the rental fees for this use of school facilities.

Future Agenda Items
1) IGOV

Adjournment
At 8:41 p.m., Dr. Moore moved to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Mr. Baron. A voice vote resulted in all ayes.

Submitted by Gail Kalmerton
Clerk of the Board