

September 24, 2015

The regular Board meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on Thursday, September 24, 2015, in the Staff Café and in the Board Room of the OPRFHS.

Call to Order

President Weissglass called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. A roll call indicated the following Board of Education members were present: Fred Arkin, Jennifer Cassell (attended telephonically), Thomas F. Cofsky, Dr. Steven Gevinson, Dr. Jackie Moore, Sara Spivy, and Jeff Weissglass. Also present were Dr. Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; Tod Altenburg, Chief School Business Official; David Ruhland, Director of Human Resources; 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, Interim Director of Pupil Personnel Services; Karin Sullivan, Director of Communications and Community Relations; Sheila Hardin, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair; Hattie Grimm, Student Council Representative; and Gail Kalmerton, Clerk of the Board and FOIA Officer.

Visitors

OPRFHS faculty Mike Maloney; Patrick Bronson and Robert Wobble of Legat Architects, Stan Jagielski and Al Steffeter of Henry Brothers, Elizabeth Hennessey, of William Blair; and Joe Connell and John Bokum, community members; and Michael Romain of the *Wednesday Journal*.

Public Hearing

Mr. Weissglass called a Public Hearing to order on Thursday, September 24, 2015 at 7:36 for the Oak Park and River Forest High School 2015-2016 Budget. This budget was placed on display for public inspection on August 19, 2015 for 30 days per state code. Notice of this Public Hearing appeared in the Wednesday, August 19, 2015 edition of the Wednesday Journal Newspaper. Mr. Weissglass called for any written or oral comments. Hearing and receiving none, at 7:37 p.m. Mr. Weissglass closed the public hearing.

**Public
Comments**

John Bokum, 629 S. Home, Oak Park, resident for 36 year, spoke about the experiences of his four children while attending the high school and his/her subsequent career paths. He had attended Board meetings since 2009, and he felt he represented the taxpayers of Oak Park and River Forest. He looked forward to continuing to attend the meetings.

Status of FOIA Resolved	Ms. Kalmerton reported that 3 FOIA requests were received and 3 were resolved.
Student Council	Ms. Grimm reported that the focus of Student Council was Homecoming and the halls were being decorated as such. Students are bringing in cans for donations to put on display at the Homecoming dance. Approximately 1,600 tickets were sold at the bookstore and Student Council anticipated more tickets will be sold at the door. Student Council has a Facebook page.
Faculty Senate Report	None
Superintendent Report	<p>Dr. Isoye reported on that Elizabeth Perkins, Jane Jozefowicz, and Maya Taylor, drum majors, received first place for a third year in a row at the Maple Leaf Classic marching band competition.</p> <p>Dr. Isoye reported that the Marching Huskies placed third. Other accolades at this competition included second place winds, second place color guard and second place percussion;</p> <p>Dr. Isoye reported that Hanna Blankemeier, Genna Curry, Samantha M. Neilson, and Natalie Ungaretti broke pool records in both the 200 medley and 200 free relay recently with Natalie Ungaretti breaking her own pool record in the 50 freestyle competition while leading off the 200 free relay.</p> <p>Dr. Isoye reported that homecoming court included: seniors DeJohne Carter, Hannah Sklar, and Jasmyn Vega.</p>
Alumni Association	The Alumni Association is having an event on Monday evening, October 26, 2015.
Consent	<p>Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the following consent items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Check Disbursements and Financial Resolutions dated September 24, 2015 ● Treasurer's Report ● FY 2016 Budget ● Personnel Recommendations, including Resignation ● Center for Psychological Services Contract ● West 40 Alternative Education HARBOR Academy ● Special Education Systems Transportation Contract ● OCR Resolution ● Policies for First Reading <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2:260, Uniform Grievance Procedure

- 5:50, Drug- and Alcohol-Free Workplace
- 5:270, Employment At-Will, Compensation, and Assignment
- 5:290, Employment Termination and Suspensions
- Policies for Amendment
 - 2:250 Access to District Public Records
 - 4:45 Insufficient Fund Checks and Debt Recovery
 - 5:180 Temporary Illness or Temporary Incapacity
 - 5:330 Sick Days, Vacation, Holidays, and Leaves
 - 6:15 School Accountability
 - 6:40 Curriculum Development
- Open and Closed Session Minutes of June 30, July 14, August 27, 2015, and a declaration that the closed session audiotapes of February 2014 be destroyed.

seconded by Mr. Arkin. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Resolutions for National Merit Commended Students

Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the Resolutions recognizing the 2016 Semifinalists in the National Merit Scholarship Competition, the 2016 National Merit Program Commended Students, and the National Hispanic Recognition Program students; seconded by Dr. Moore. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

2016 Semifinalists in the National Merit Scholarship Competition

Noah R. Banholzer	Julia M. Harris	Allison E. Miller
Lia I Bauer-Goulden	Noah D. Heilenbach	Sean S. Pawelko
Sebastian M. Beaghen	Grace J. Kavinsky	Elizabeth S. Perkins
Ryan J. Borgdorff	Erica L. Knox	Martin N. Pimentel
Sara E. Conroy	Dallas Koelling	Lauren K. Pritz
Amelia C. Cornman	Sarah M. Kreider	Arjun Rawal
Jake T. Grant	Mary F. Martin	Matthew Testore
	Ethan J. Mertz	

2016 National Merit Program Commended Students

Audrey N. Angelos	Gabriel S. Harris	Oskar A. Muller
Conrad M. Brenneman	Sophia D. Hayes	Rachel Nitzsche
Finnian P. Cavanaugh	Logan G. Heffernan	Uzochi P. Nwoko
Luke A. Cimarusti	Henry P. Hitterman	Jeremy T. Pesigan
Sara S. Dimuzio	Evan T. Kindler	Michaela A. Roskopf
Ella L. Dixon	Philippe C. Labruyere	Peyton A. Schafer
Emmett K. Donnelley-Power	Grace A. Liao	Issac Stopek
Hannah S. Entner	Valerie G. Lundeen	Nora D. Sullivan
Aidan J. Flanigan	Nicholas R. Martire	Sharadram Sundaresan
	Christopher Meister	Richard G. Townsell

Chena C. Underhill
Aidan Wade

Matthew T. Wallace
Mark Weissglass

Olivia M. Zapater-Charrette
Joshua C. Zucker

National Hispanic Recognition Program

Carly Johnson

Martin Pimentel

Olivia Zapater-Charrette

**Annual
Recognition
Application on
District
Compliance**

Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the Annual Recognition Application on District Compliance, as presented; seconded by Dr. Moore. A voice vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

MENTA Contract

Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the MENTA Contract, as presented; seconded by Dr. Gevinson. Discussion ensued.

Because the Finance Committee voted 2 to 1 to bring this forward to the full Board of Education for approval, it was placed on the action portion of the agenda so that it could be vetted by the full Board of Education. Mr. Cofsky noted special education and non-special education (those students for which an alternative location might be helpful) components were in the MENTA contract. HARBOR and Ombudsman did not have the ability to provide special education services. While the contract is for \$200,000 more than last year, services and additional costs could extend beyond this initial contract. He asked for a comprehensive approach as to how programs were being added. Recently, staff expansion, contracts, instruction curriculum modifications and others items relative to the Strategic Plan have been added. The Board of Education supported additional resources inside the building for things such as a fifth PSS Team, in-house counseling, Special Education resources, and additional FTE to keep up with increasing enrollment. While additional resources have been designated to support students inside the building, this plan pushes resources outside of the building. Another member concurred because the Board of Education had intended that additional resources would result fewer behavior problems, i.e., truancy, not following the rules, etc. and that students would be more engaged. Another notion was that fact that it looked like the school was going down two paths one being outside resources (the number of slots at MENTA) and the other being restorative justice, looking at the Code of Conduct, the discipline philosophy and getting information from students and families about their experiences in the building. More information was requested about the success rate of MENTA and what these students do after graduation.

MENTA will provide students who have received OSS consequences with a full-day experience, rather than just one-hour per day of tutoring at the library. They will be transported to and from MENTA. MENTA's curriculum will mirror that of OPRFHS. While only 1% of OPRFHS student population may be referred to MENTA because their needs cannot be met on campus, every strategy at

OPRFHS will continue to be available for these students and the District continues to reexamine its strategies.

Through the surveying of SIDs, counselors, case managers, teachers and program managers, it was thought that 18 students would utilize the program. MENTA services have been researched and site visits were conducted at its other schools. Previously, the District had 10 slots with HARBOR and 10 slots with Ombudsman. MENTA has suspension reduction programs in conjunction with other schools with which it is associated. MENTA personnel will attempt to find the causes for the students' actions. Because attendance is an issue for these students, the District will be looking for an attendance rate of 90% or higher.

A roll call vote resulted in 5 ayes and 2 nays. Mr. Cofsky and Dr. Moore voted nay. Motion carried.

Committee Member Questions Procedure The majority of the Board of Education members reiterated their preference to continue with a previous agreement that the answers to any questions from Board of Education members are provided to all of the Board of Education members, even if the question stemmed from a committee member, in order to alleviate having to repeat conversations.

Pool Discussion In April 2015, the Board of Education approved a site for the erection of a pool building. Mr. Weissglass corrected his comments from the August meeting at which he stated that the cost of the pool was \$35 million. In fact, the cost was \$37.5 million. Ms. Hennessey had been invited to make a presentation about the District's bonding options and Mr. Miller to talk about how the decision to take different amounts from the fund balance for the pool would impact the District's long-term projections. It will be necessary that the Board of Education make decisions in October on the architect and construction manager contracts, funding, and whether to go for a bond or advisory referendum.

Elizabeth Hennessey shared a PowerPoint presentation that was included in the packet. The highlights were:

- Interest rates in the current market conditions are still low. Short term rates are the lowest.
- Outstanding Debt
- Outstanding Debt Service. The tax rate is \$.13. The debt service capacity for non-referendum bonds was provided from 2016 to 2033.
- Non-referendum Limited bonds can be used without a referendum to fund this plan, if the debt service payments fit within the District's Debt Service Extension Base (DSEB). This amount increases with CPI annually. The types of limited bonds the District can issue include Working Cash Fund bond, Life Safety Bonds, and Funding Bonds. The

District would have \$40.4 million is total capacity based on DSEB over 20-years.

Option I: \$15 million Limited Bonds; \$20 million Fund Balance would have a .06 tax rate increase. It would cost the homeowner of a \$400,000 market value home \$64. Every \$5 million of additional debt would be an increase of \$.02 or an additional \$21 on the same valued home.

Option II: \$15M Referendum Bonds; \$20M Fund Balance. The impact on the FY2016 Budget would be 96.06%. It would cost the homeowner of a \$400,000 market value home \$64. Every \$5 million of additional debt would be an increase of \$.02 or an additional \$21 on the same valued home.

Mr. Miller shared three individual charts and graphs showing how the fund balance would be affected if \$20 million, \$25 million or \$30 million were allocated to the building of a new pool. Each additional \$5 million over the initial placeholder of \$20 million shifted the time that the Board of Education would have to go out for a referendum six months earlier. The Board of Education requested that the graphs be overlaid. It was suggested that the long-term facility committee recommendations be added to the graph.

Portions of the Pool Program Verification Design Update was provided in the packet. It included a sitemap, a site analysis, diagrams for the lower level, ground level, and upper level, how the pool could be divided to accommodate use by the community, water polo practice and competition, adaptive PE, etc. It also included diagrams of the pool deck, pool profile, dryland, athlete seating, spectator seating, coaches/scorekeeper areas, PE locker rooms, athletic locker rooms, family changing, alumni room/concessions and critical project milestone dates. The OPRFHS staff who were part of the core design committee included John Stelzer, Clay Reagan, and Robert Zummallen. Mr. Zummallen helped to establish a schedule and provided feedback on how to engage stakeholders. Mr. Brosnan stated that the Program Verification confirmed that the pool size is achievable within the \$37.5 million, while there may be some adjustments. Each design will be broken down into phases. The objective is to balance the budget and the quality of materials at each stage.

Mr. Bronson noted that the pool built on the site of the existing parking garage will create a new front door for the campus and reflect what OPRFHS stands for today and in the future. By facing south, the pool will have an opportunity to gather light from both the south and north. Consideration was given to pedestrian access, views, construction access, materials moving off site, etc. This is a building addition, and the bridge element will connect the weight room and to the aquatics center, so that students do not have to walk outside.

The lowest level will house the mechanical elements with an elevator. The main level will house the water, services and support, i.e., locker facilities, entry, etc. The upper level will have spectator seating and flexible space and might be expanded for additional PE space, i.e., health classroom, green roof area, feature space overlooking Lake Street.

The pool deck and water is critical. The suggested layouts included what could be accomplished for the school's needs for the present and future needs, as well as the community's need. The deeper end would be toward the west and the shallow end would be toward the east and allow for adaptive PE, etc.

Competitive swimmers prefer to swim in deeper water. A bulkhead would allow the separation of the deeper water from the more shallow water. The community could run swim competitions if more than 9 lanes were needed, and practice could occur using the east side. A bulkhead could be moved to the east end for lap swim. Swim practices could run north and south and Adaptive PE would still have an area. In the lower right, pool competition use deeper water and on east end for warm up swimmers, etc. These were suggestions as to what could be accomplished for current, future and community needs.

The Critical Project Milestones were:

- | | |
|-----------------|--|
| October 2015: | Legat architects to proceed with design to meet with staff, balance needs and detail the design and allow demolition could start as early as July 2016. Zoning, construction permits would have to occur before demolition. IDHA would be involved after the demolition. |
| September 2016: | Begin foundations and site work |
| August 2018: | Grand opening of new aquatic center |

The timeline discussion should include what the cash flow is in concert with the decision-making guideline.

With regard to security, the pool would be used by the school during the day. After-school opportunities could be available for other groups. The Park District would target a Sunday/community swim with the connector to the main building being locked.

Many opportunities exist to go green, i.e., the green roof, preheating with solar tubes, etc. Natural light will reduce the burden for electrical lighting. The building is moving toward Leed certification.

The disruption in the weight room for building the connector would occur mostly during in the summer. Students would access the building via the second floor.

A ramp will be needed to access the elevator to access the bridge by those disabled. The public would enter through a secure entry on the main corridor. While 2 elevators are planned, effort is being made to minimize that need. The pool facility will sit 20 ft. away from the Field House and not impact it. When thinking about the second floor, this elevation would be opposite of the field house. Consideration is being given to the whole south side of the building and the connection points. Research is being conducted on how to allow for future cooling on the south side of the building. The freight elevator could serve existing areas.

In October, the Board of Education will talk in closed session about the acquisition of the garage. The approval of a parking plan must be completed by the end of the calendar year. Different elements need to be discussed with the Village with regard to ordinances, etc. If a variance is needed, the process could take 3 to 6 months. If that were delayed, the foundations could not be done and the project would be delayed 9 months or more. .

Additional questions from Board of education members should be sent to Mr. Weissglass and Mr. Altenburg.

**Parameters of
Long-Term
Facilities**

The Board of Education received a report on process for generating a long-term facilities plan. The process outlined by Legat begins with a core team who will then engage larger school and community groups. The administration would establish the core team to accomplish the Board of Education goals identified in the section facilities: 1) the design, financing, and community engagement/ education related to the prospective swimming pool project; and 2) other addresses the need for the development of a long-term capital improvement plan to upgrade facilities, enhance the learning environment, and accommodate anticipated increases in student enrollment. The larger school and community groups would be involved at strategic points in the process to suggest and review ideas. The next step is to finalize a working calendar, identify core leadership members representing stakeholder groups and settling on fees for the work hours directly involved by Legal Architects. The Board of Education was asked to provide input, recommend financial parameters, and other guiding principles so that the administration can begin its work.

A suggestion was made to think about long-term facilities plan in two five-year timeframes. The first phase would be building the pool and providing facilities that would accommodate the anticipated enrollment growth. An opportunity to expand usable square footage in the building would be to recapture the vacated pool space, and that will not be vacated until 2018 at a cost of \$10 million. In terms of funding, the Board of Education discussed looking at the fund balance and DSEB bonds to see if they could be used as the constraining factor for the next 5 years. An example would be to take \$20 to \$25 million came from the fund balance and 80% of the

DSEB or \$32 million for the pool plus facility renovation. Annually, the District budgets \$4 to \$4.5 for capital expenditures, work done in the summer, and some of those dollars might be redirected. It was determined that a target of approximately \$20 million for facility work over and above the pool would provide a workable constraint but not enough money to recapture the renovated space. Renovation of the Fieldhouse would occur in the second five-year phase. It was unknown what additional DSEB bonds might be available. Another possibility is that of raising private funds. By 2021, the District will have learned the economy, the community, and whether it should do an operating referendum and an additional education referendum. This could be talked about again in October at a special or regular board meeting.

Some Board members were unclear as to what would be considered most important during the first five year phase and if there would be a potential for the disruption of classes, a change in the graduation date, or teams having a change of venue other than the stadium.

Discussion ensued about the Long-term Facilities Committee that began in 2012. Recently Dr. Isoye assigned Mr. Prale and Mr. Altenburg to work with Legat Architects. Dr. Isoye stated that in 2012, the committee had no parameters and, thus, it presented 2 scenarios with potential projects that could cost more than \$40 million. At that time, enrollment was forecasted to increase and there was a debate about room utilization, either 60% or 85%. Sixty percent meant 1 teacher, 1 room. Eighty-five percent meant teachers shared rooms. This is a philosophical decision. Because the District is experiencing larger enrollment, more FTE were added this year and the usage of shared rooms increased, causing the District to build new office space for teachers. Art, science, and math have been sharing rooms for some time. While enrollment continues to grow, walls have not changed. The present capacity for classrooms is not enough for the projected 3,900 students, not including the need for greater cafeteria space. Other spaces besides the current swimming pools will have to be repurposed. If the pools were repurposed now, it would cause off-site swimming for two years. Enrollment projections will be updated and another company may be used to triangulate the numbers.

Next steps would be to make a decision on whether to have a bond referendum in October either at a special meeting or the regular meeting of the Board of Education.

Two challenges could occur that could enjoin the District from doing some of this while the process is ongoing: 1) is the District on firm footing about this being addition to the existing building; and 2) opposition to the referendum could occur. Legal counsel will be sought again about these two issues.

Audio Recordings

It was the consensus of the Board of Education members to support the posting of audio recordings of Board of Education meetings as a pilot, tracking the number of hits. Note: When videotapes of the Pool Committee meetings were posted, there were few hits, even though that was a subject of great interest to the public. The intent is to make Board of Education meetings more available and transparent to the general public.

Student Discipline

The targets under the Board of Education's goal of school climate and culture were to 1) undertake board study of district's equity policies and practices; 2) develop Restorative Justice principles and practices, combined with a review of the code of conduct; and 3) continue efforts to create a welcoming culture and increase student voice and engagement. As such, the PEG committee has been discussing ways to acquire a deeper understanding of both the District's practices and their impact on the students, their families, and the school. PEG recommended that a next step would be to establish the Parent Teacher Advisory Committee (PTAC) and provide them with a charge that goes beyond just examining the Code of Conduct, talking about drafting a philosophy statement and reviewing models on student discipline for the board's discussion so that it does not have to craft it. A suggestion was to look for an outside facilitator. The Board of Education was asked to reach a consensus that no more than 2 Board of Education members would be required to vet the facilitator candidates along with other stakeholders and for the District to hire a facilitator so long as that cost was below the threshold of \$25,000. If someone were found, the Board of Education would be notified.

With regard to the Parent Teacher Advisory Committee, PEG will review the stakeholder groups and determine how many of each role will be included. PTAC is a committee that is formed by the Board of Education and technically the Board of Education president appoints the members. Dr. Isoye and Mr. Rouse will go through the process, and Mr. Weissglass will give input. The timeline to formulate a philosophy of the Board of Education could take a year. If the Board of Education wants to explore different models, it will take longer. PEG will determine the charge. Ms. Spivy's vision for PTAC is not just looking at the Code of Conduct but exploring other models, creating a hybrid of models, Restorative Justice, etc., and something that is unique to OPRFHS, taking into consideration its values and goals. It should be very in depth. One member felt that this would be a multiyear process and that PTAC be more of a conversation with the Board of Education. Another member felt that PTAC will adapt as school and society changes. It could be effective in addressing the issues relative to equity and Black Lives Matter, etc.

Dr. Isoye noted that he is trying to determine how to navigate Restorative Justice and discipline.

Dr. Isoye also reported that the Board of Education’s work involving student discipline, school climate and culture had begun. The students were putting together an event on October 10.

Student Travel Experiences

The Instruction Committee recommended bringing the Student Travel Experiences report to the full Board of Education. The links for the Global Summit will be included on the website.

Proposed Changes Academic Catalog

The Instruction Committee recommended bringing the Proposed Changes for the Academic Catalog for the 2016-17 school year to the full Board.

Administrative/Teacher Compensation Report

The Administrative/Teacher Compensation Report is required by law to be posted on the website. This is for information only.

Graduation Date May 29, 2016

The Board of Education is not asked to approve the graduation date but the discussion was brought to the Board of Education to make the date more public. Since the last conversation, the administration spoke with senior students who recommended holding graduation on Sunday, May 29, 2016. Families will be communicated to regarding tickets for graduation. The outreach and decision was appreciated by the Board of Education. No date will be perfect for all families.

District Reports

IGOV—The meeting were all of the taxing body boards meet will occur in January, rather than in October.

Adjournment

At 11:30 p.m., Mr. Weissglass moved to adjourn the regular Board of Education meeting; seconded by Ms. Spivy. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

Jeff Weissglass
President

Sara Spivy
Secretary

Submitted by Gail Kalmerton
Clerk of the Board