

MINUTES
BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING
COMMUNITY UNIT SCHOOL DISTRICT 200
March 8, 2023

The first regular meeting of the month of March of the Board of Education of Community Unit School District 200, DuPage County, Illinois, was called to order at the Wheaton North High School, 701 W. Thomas Rd., Wheaton, IL by Board President Chris Crabtree, on Wednesday, March 8, 2023, at 7:00 PM.

ROLL CALL

Upon the roll being called, the following were present:

Board Members: Mrs. Chris Crabtree
 Mr. Rob Hanlon
 Mr. Dave Long
 Mrs. Angela Blatner
 Mrs. Susan Booton
 Mrs. Julie Kulovits
 Mr. Brad Paulsen

Also in Attendance: Dr. Jeff Schuler, Superintendent
 Dr. Charlie Kyle
 Mrs. Erica Loiacono
 Mrs. Melissa Murphy
 Dr. Brian O’Keeffe
 Dr. Chris Silagi
 Mr. Jason Spencer

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Board Member Kulovits led the Board in the Pledge of Allegiance.

COMMUNICATION WITH THE HOST SCHOOL

Mr. Matt Biscan, Principal of Wheaton North High School, welcomed all to the school and noted the multiple pathways offered to students to find who they are as learners and the opportunities provided for students. The Introduction to Teaching Class (part of the Education pathway) was featured, noting students have the opportunity to learn inside and outside of the classroom working with both D200 teachers and students at different levels. Two teachers from the Intro to Teaching class were introduced, and four current students taking the class shared their experiences with the Board.

MODIFICATIONS TO THE AGENDA

None

RECOGNITIONS & ACHIEVEMENTS

The Board recognized the following individuals:

High School National Merit Finalists

- WNHS – Ashley Huang, Molly Robben, Dixon Stapleton, Aaditi Wadia, Luke Wells, Micah Yoder
- WWSHS – Elijah Berry, Maya Bose, Sangeetha Santhanu

High School All-State Musicians

- WNHS – Bryce Abend, Matthew Hufford, Zachary Larakers, Archer Matthias, Cole Morgan, Charlie Strutzel, Gerrit Vanderschoot, Joshua Villanoy
- WWSHS –Dalia Volkart, Caleb Watson, Richard Lu, Chloe West, Addison Brejla

IHSA State Champions – WWSHS Speech Team; Dramatic Duet; Prose Reading; Informative Speaking

- Sam Rizzo, David Allgood, Jacob Purdue, Tori Barson, Olivia Bouchard, Santiago Mosca, Colin O’Malley, Emily Sklenicka

IHSA State Champion – Gymnastics – Floor Exercise

- Wheaton Warrenville Gymnastics Co-op Member & WWSHS Student – Haylie Hinckley

BOARD PRESIDENT REPORT

President Crabtree reported on the following:

- Thanked the students and staff at the meeting for being there and for the great way to start a Board meeting, which is a reminder of the importance of seeing our students engaged and the connections made.
- The opportunity to be at Whitter for the fifth-grade wax museum, to visit the SAIL program for students with autism (and see an art lesson as part of this), and to see the fifth-grade leadership club presentation on the new LLC to the first-grade students.
- Will be attending the IASB quarterly LUDA president meeting. Board members were advised to send any questions they have to Mrs. Crabtree before March 17th.

PUBLIC COMMENTS – Agenda Items & Non-Agenda Items

In accordance with Board Policy 2.230, members of the public wishing to offer public comment had the opportunity to do so. A public comment sign-up sheet was made available until 7:00 p.m. at the meeting site. The Board Meeting was available for viewing via live stream on the District’s YouTube channel at www.youtube.com/communityunitschooldistrict200.

Per Board Policy, the Board may shorten the time allocation for each person to less than three minutes to allow the maximum number of people the opportunity to speak. The Board did not shorten the time allocation for each person to speak due to the number of speakers.

<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Topic</u>
David Eaton	WWEA – Wheaton North
Ethan Spaid	April 4th Election
Harold Lonks	Ethics

President Crabtree read a statement regarding a complaint she received regarding an alleged violation of Board policy 2:105 against a Board member. The Board’s legal counsel has been directed to review and investigate the complaint and apprise the Board of its findings. The Board will not comment any further until that legal process is complete.

SUPERINTENDENT REPORT

Dr. Schuler provided the following updates:

- Thank you to the students recognized this evening for their accomplishments, to the staff that has committed and provided the experiences, and to the committed and supportive parents of the students.
- Dr. Schuler also had the opportunity to attend a few of the elementary wax museums and thanked the staff for providing rich and robust experiences for students in the classroom.
- The importance of building out pathway opportunities for our students is critical and essential, and the hope is that all D200 high school students can note at the end of their time here an experience inside one of the schools that got them connected to a future pathway or education experience.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. Approval of American Government and Civics Textbook – Recommend approval of American Government and Civics Textbook as presented.
2. Approval of Advanced Placement (AP) Calculus AB/BC Textbook – Recommend approval of AP Calculus AB/BC textbook as presented.
3. Approval of Advanced Placement (AP) Psychology Textbook – Recommend approval of AP Psychology textbook as presented.
4. Approval of Professional Learning Expenditure Request for Board Members – Recommend approval of professional learning expenditure request for board members as presented.
5. Approval of the Resolution to Authorize Transfer (Repayable Inter-fund Loan) from Working Cash Fund to Education Fund – Recommend approval of the resolution to authorize transfer (repayable inter-fund loan) from working cash fund to education fund as presented.
6. Approval of the Resolution to Authorize Transfer (Repayable Inter-fund Loan) from Working Cash Fund to IMRF Fund – Recommend approval of the resolution to authorize transfer (repayable inter-fund loan) from working cash fund to IMRF fund as presented.
7. Approval of the Resolution to Authorize Transfer (Repayable Inter-fund Loan) from Working Cash Fund to Transportation Fund – Recommend approval of the resolution to authorize transfer (repayable inter-fund loan) from working cash fund to transportation fund as presented.
8. Approval of Bills Payable and Payroll – Recommend approval of the bills payable and payroll as presented.
9. Approval of Minutes – February 8, 2023, Open and Closed, February 22, 2023 Committee of the Whole, Open and Closed, and Approval to Destroy Recordings of Closed Sessions Prior to October 2021 As Allowable by Law – Recommend approval of the minutes as presented and approve the destruction of recordings of closed sessions prior to October 2021 as allowable by law.
10. Approval of Personnel Report to Include Employment, Resignation, Retirement, and Leave of Absence of Administrative, Certified, Classified, and Non-Union Staff – Recommend approval of the personnel report as presented.

There were comments and/or questions on the following:

- #5-7: Resolutions to make repayable inter-fund transfers – this is an annual process; noted the point in the year as we get further away from tax disbursements and covering cash shortfalls so expenses may be paid.

MOTION

Member Booton moved, Member Hanlon seconded to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Upon a roll call vote being taken, the vote was: AYE 7, NAY 0. **The motion carried 7-0.**

ACTION ITEMS

Approval of Resolution to Authorize Partial Settlement Agreement of Vaping Litigation

In November of 2020, the Board of Education authorized a resolution to participate in a litigation effort against a number of companies that drove the rise in the vaping epidemic. This was a joint effort by a number of school districts around the country in an effort to recover some of the resources schools districts have invested in the prevention of or response to this unfortunate trend.

Frantz Law Group led the litigation effort, in partnership with a number of other school district attorneys. A partial resolution has been reached with one of the companies. The details were included in the resolution document. It is expected that a second resolution will follow at some point in the future.

There was no cost to the District to participate in this litigation. District 200 will receive \$287,000 through the settlement agreement.

There was additional information and or comments on the following:

- This was a nationwide lawsuit filed by over a thousand districts against the major companies that had a hand in the rise of the vaping trend.
- Noted this is a partial settlement, as it is a settlement with one of the two companies involved. It is anticipated that a second settlement will follow and will be about the same amount of money to the District.
- Those funds are intended to help continue to support the efforts around drug and alcohol education in the Districts that participated in the lawsuit.
- Dr. Silagi was instrumental in gathering the pieces of information needed for the District to enter into this lawsuit.
- Excited to have the opportunity to do some education on this.

It was recommended that the Board of Education approve the Settlement Agreement as presented.

MOTION

Member Paulsen moved, Member Booton seconded to approve the settlement agreement as presented. Upon a roll call vote being taken, the vote was AYE 7, NAY 0.

The motion carried 7-0.

ORAL REPORTS

FY22 Audit Oral Report

Annually, District 200 auditors prepare an independent audit of the financial statements of CUSD 200. They also express an opinion based on the combined financial statements of the District. The Board is asked on an annual basis to accept the independent audit as presented by Baker Tilly US, LLP.

Nick Cavaliere from Baker Tilly addressed the Board of Education to discuss the DRAFT findings of the FY22 Financial Audit. The final reports will be completed in mid-March 2023.

There was additional information/comments on the following:

- The final audit is expected to be brought to the Board for approval in April.
- The annual financial report (AFR) is a regulatory report.
- A high-level summary of the financial results is included as part of this report and includes a collective summary of the revenues received as well as expenditures, a summary of the transfers, and financing activity for the year.

- There was a slight surplus in the Education fund, primarily attributable to an increase in the CPPRT (corporate personal property replacement taxes) that were received by the District. This has been seen statewide.
- The transportation fund has a slight reduction in fund reserves. This was expected as the state funding for those costs is generally a year in the rear.
- Did not see anything regarding the District's financial position that was concerning or indicative of ongoing operational deficits or matters of concern to bring to the Board's attention.

There were questions/comments/discussion on the following:

- The final audit report will include information and opinions from auditors regarding the controls in place in the District.
- The internal financial results each month and how the audit report differs structurally from this – the external financial statements are presented in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, while our monthly internal reports to monitor ongoing operations are on a cash basis (only represent revenues when received or expenditures when paid).
- Noted the amount of property taxes that are distributed from the county to the school district at the end of the fiscal year and the relationship to the percentage of the levy used to fund operations, and the potential for deferred inflow or unearned revenue. This all gets adjusted in the end.
- The auditor's questionnaire – there are no changes expected from the draft to the final.
- Financial profile summary score (expected) of 3.9 – this is out of 4.0; noted this is tentative until the state board accepts the AFR and finalizes the calculation.
- The state recognition score is not calculated by Baker Tilly.
- The funds utilized in the financial profile score are Education, Operations & Maintenance (O&M), Transportation, and Working Cash Funds as it relates to cash on hand and state recognition score.

High School Grading

Several years ago CUSD 200 began Professional Learning Communities (PLC). The core principles of a PLC include: 1) Ensuring that students learn, 2) A culture of collaboration, and 3) A focus on results. The PLC process has allowed our staff to develop shared learning goals, grading, and assessment practices. As our staff has engaged in continuous improvement of the PLC process, we have refined our practices and identified areas for improvement. With this, our staff has reviewed grading procedures to specifically define what a grade means and represents. This work has centered on the belief that the purpose of grades is to accurately communicate student learning progress through purposeful and timely feedback, as students develop enduring understandings and work toward mastery. Our goal is to provide students with transferable skills, equitable learning opportunities, and experiences that will inspire lifelong learning.

Members of the D200 high school team, including HS Principals Matt Biscan and Scott McDermott, and HS Asst. Principals Alexia Ellett and Dan Korntheuer provided a presentation on Grading & Assessment in D200 High Schools, which included information on the following:

- Our Journey
 - 2008-09 Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) started
 - 2008-19: Grading & Assessment Conferences (Guskey, DuFour, Wormeli, etc)
 - Yearly: Coordination between high schools on common essential standards
 - Ongoing: Work on PLC cycle, dept. level conversation on grading, assessment, and instruction
 - Institute Day topics on grading and assessment
 - Fall 2021: shared common vision and piloted grading practices at both HS

- Spring 2022-Present: shared common vision with standardized grading practices
- The Meaning & Purpose of Grades
 - Purpose: accurately communicate student learning progress through purposeful and timely feedback, as students develop enduring understandings and work toward mastery.
 - Goal: provide students with transferable skills, learning opportunities that lift all students; and experiences that will inspire lifelong learning.
- Common Misconceptions (our current grading system does NOT...)
 - Give students something for doing nothing
 - Offer endless retakes of the same assessment
 - Mean that we are no longer giving zeros
 - Compromise the rigor of our courses and academic standards
- High Standards with High Levels of Support (our current grading system...)
 - Reflects research-based practices
 - Emphasizes student learning, skill development, and knowledge over behaviors
 - Reinforces a growth mindset for students
 - Improves feedback and communication regarding student progress
 - Maintains high expectations for student growth
 - Creates a learning environment focused on raising all students
- Grading as a Form of Communication
 - Colleges depend on high schools to report accurate grades of what students know and are able to do
 - Our grading practices changes reflect that
 - Increase communication of growth and expectations with students and parents
- Common Grading Weights & Grading Codes
 - 90% Summative Assessment (e.g. unit exams, research papers, major projects) – what students know and are able to do
 - 10% Formative Assessment (e.g. daily homework, practice) – less emphasis on practice/homework
 - Allowing for more opportunities to practice without penalty & with increased individualized feedback
- Grading Logistics
 - Formative Assessments (Homework)
 - 10% grade weight – students may receive a zero for work not submitted
 - Summative Assessments (Test, Papers, Projects)
 - 90% grade weight
 - Traditional scale (100 pt.) vs. New scale (50% floor for summative assessments submitted / 40% floor for summatives not attempted)
 - Students receiving an F can improve/recover at the same proportionality as a student receiving a D, C, or any other grade
 - Glenbard 87 / Naperville CUSD 203 / Maine Township 207 have grading components similar to D200
- Retakes & Redos
 - Summative Assessments include a process to demonstrate further learning (retake/redo):
 - Student has to earn the opportunity by showing new learning prior to being offered retake
 - Variation of the original assessment
 - Holds students accountable for their learning and helps students learn how they learn best

- Retakes/redos have a limit
- Thank You!
 - Proud of the work
 - Always learning and adjusting, as needed
 - High expectations with high levels of support
 - Adapting to all students' learning styles and needs
 - Student-centered with a focus on learning

There was additional information/comments on the following:

- Board policy 6:280 – Grading and Promotion, delegates the responsibility for developing a system of grading to the Superintendent or designee. Members of the HS admin team have worked on some adjustments to the HS grading expectations.
- District Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) allow teachers to meet every week and engage in conversation about student achievement, growth, and feedback.
- Teachers and leaders across the District have also engaged in workshop and conference opportunities across the state attending grading assessment and PLC conferences for ten years (beginning in 2008). Information learned from here would be brought back to the District and teams on Institute days, summer workshops, lunch and learns, and weekly PLCs.
- From this, it was noted that extreme disparities existed in grading practices from the different teachers, rooms, and HS building; what is being presented does exist within our buildings; and a commitment to consistent practices must be made to better serve the students, and the practices must be clearly communicated and understood.
- The high standards we have as a District and we can't do what we have always done to grow our students forward.
- When you evolve in a system and the system changes sometimes there are misunderstandings about what is happening.
- Some things that have been done in the past were more about compliance than they were about actual learning.
- Over the past few years, colleges have depended a lot more on the whole process and are looking at grades over standardized test scores. Therefore, our grades must represent what our kids know and are able to do. The changes in the grading practices reflect this.
- Formative assessment – the planning and preparation students are going through to be ready for the summative assessment.
- Summative assessment – happens after instruction, after learning.
- Putting in floors for summative assessments (50% for a summative submitted; 40% floor for a summative not attempted) is to make an “F” recoverable.
- Retakes/redos of summative assessments will look different than the original assessment.
- PLCs have installed good processes for students to show and demonstrate they are retake-ready.
- Emphasizing to students that what they are learning in class is important by allowing retakes and continuing to work with them, and on the learning process so they master it and build from there.
- Noted grading is a process and something continuously being looked at, as we want to continue to grow and learn (example of looking at student success criteria and student reflection this year at WWS).

There were questions/comments/discussion on the following:

- Conversations students are having with teachers and with one another, being aware of what standard has not been met when going into a retake.

- Students seem to be more aware of their own learning, and aware of what they need to do to be successful.
- Struggle with the change of only 10% being that practice score as it relates to the practice of doing homework and that skill. Have we found there is a fall off of students doing homework?
- Confirming what percentage is given when homework is not turned in “0” vs 40%.
- Disconnect example noted of the previous practice where students did well on homework and did not do well on the assessment.
- Skills that students need to be successful; consistency has shown more representation of what that grade means.
- Students who struggle with testing anxiety/assessments and how to recover their grades without the homework or practice component. The strong effort by the teachers on doing things differently – if something does not work for a student the first time, what can we do differently, and how to prepare for a retake.
- 40% floor for summatives – struggle with giving this when the work has not been done.
- This is year one for this grading and assessment practice and it is new and different for everyone.
- What does recovery mean on the assessments and what makes a zero difficult to recover from?
- How teachers are finding this new grading practice during this first year. This is a philosophical change that teachers are working through; the importance of meeting students and learners where they are at and raising them. Discussions continue to happen and adjustments will continue to be made where needed.
- High school – is to learn how to keep learning; these practices are steered toward that.
- Feedback from students/student advisories – the most common theme is that things have slowed down and students feel like teachers have more conversations and explain their thought processes.
- The 90/10 weight is more in line with the collegiate experience.
- Any changes in research or trends from when the District began researching the grading practice in 2008 continue to solidify that evolving in both grading and assessment practices is important to prepare our students.
- See this step as preparing students for the next step in college and giving them their best shot at success.
- Taking into account SEL and the mental health of students related to this change.
- Reinforcing a growth mindset for students – achievement on a specific day vs. growth of a student.
- The opportunity to do P.E. class makeups at the HS – previously vs. now.
- Retakes and redos – the message to kids to keep working, keep moving forward and that learning is a process. Modeling what is happening in the real world.
- How do we know if this is working or not working and if there are adjustments to be made? Looking at data at the end of the semester to look at the impact of the grading system, conferring with dept. chairs and filtering into PLCs. This is an ongoing process, and the staff is committed to a regular review of data.
- Having retakes is a good opportunity for kids; the commitment of teachers to administer the retakes and all of the extra work involved.
- Student feedback on being allowed to slow down and learn; teachers taking the time to ensure they understand the concepts; depth is significantly important to accelerate our students forward.
- The increase in the number of “A” grades – what may be driving that?

- Grades data point reviewed from the first half of the year. Are we expecting the same for the second semester? It was noted we are very early on in the process.
- Elementary has been doing this type of grading since the 90s and early 2000s. Sometimes kids just cannot do the test, but know the material.
- How kids learn has changed so drastically in the last 25 years; the expectations have changed, so our grading has to follow.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Middle School Capital Project Discussion

The Board of Education began a long-term discussion regarding potential middle school capital projects at Edison, Franklin, and Monroe middle schools. This discussion comes on the heels of seeing middle school capital project concepts (presented by Perkins & Will) for the first time on February 8, 2023. After the February 8th meeting, Administration engaged the Citizens Advisory Committee (2/15/23), the Community Engagement Committee (2/24/23), and the Finance Committee (2/28/23) to gather feedback and work through support documentation for this discussion. A listing of potential funding options was developed by the administration, as was a District debt overview with financing scenarios from PMA Securities and a draft plan for community engagement developed by the administration. An updated budget for each concept was incorporated into the overall discussion. Dr. Schuler and Mr. Brian O’Keeffe provided an overview of the information, which included the following:

- Community Engagement Process – DRAFT
 - Assemble a Community Engagement Leadership Team
 - Leadership Team Goal
 - Leadership Team Activities
 - Leadership Team Timeline
- Funding Options for Middle School Capital Facilities Plan
 - These are not recommendations from the Administration to the Board
 - These are for discussion purposes only
 - These options may be used individually or could be used in combination
 - Tools that could be at your disposal for funding of any MS capital projects
 - Each option included a description, amount, and the pros and cons
 - Existing Fund Balance
 - Pledge O&M Dollars from Future Budgets
 - Utilize Debt Service Extension Base (DSEB) to Issue Bonds
 - Utilize Debt Certificates Payable from Operating Funds
 - Approve Referendum Question to Authorize Sale of Bonds

D200 Debt Overview and Financing Scenarios (provided by PMA Securities)

- New Money Scenarios
 - 5-Year Non-Referendum Bond (Oct 2024) @ CM Rates Plus 0.5%
Estimated Proceeds: \$18 million (Graph and Detail)
 - 10-Year Non-Referendum Bond (Oct 2024) @ CM Rates Plus 0.5%
Estimated Proceeds: \$35 million (Graph and Detail)
 - Debt Certificate Matrix
 - Referendum Matrix
- Market Update
 - Interest Rates* Since Jan 2003
 - Interest Rates* Since Jan 2020

- 10-yr MMD (Municipal Market Data) vs. 10-yr Treasury
- Disclosure
- Appendix A: Outstanding Debt Service
 - Overall Debt Service
 - Debt Service Extension Base

Middle School Master Plan Update

- Proposed Improvements
 - Concept Diagrams – Low Option
 - There is no ‘do nothing option’
 - Each campus has significant deferred maintenance needs
 - Address Health/Life Safety, Maintenance, and Physical Plant needs (finishes, maintenance improvements, etc.)
 - No reconfiguration or upgrade to educational environments
 - Monroe – Mid
 - Monroe – High
 - Monroe – Option Evaluation (Low, Mid, and High)
 - Improvement Categories include: Student Services, Itinerant Services, Classroom Environment, Library Learning Centers, Science Lab Classrooms, Small Group/Collaboration Space, Visual & Performing Arts, Building Look & Feel, and Building Systems
 - Edison – Mid – Level 1 & Level 2
 - Edison – High – Level 1 & Level 2
 - Edison – Option Evaluation (Low, Mid, and High)
 - Improvement Categories include: Student Services, Itinerant Services, Classroom Environment, Library Learning Centers, Science Lab Classrooms, Small Group/Collaboration Space, Visual & Performing Arts, Building Look & Feel, and Building Systems
 - Franklin – Mid – Level 1, Level 2 & Lower Level
 - Franklin – High – Level 1, Level 2 & Lower Level
 - Franklin – Option Evaluation (Low, Mid, and High)
 - Improvement Categories include: Student Services, Itinerant Services, Classroom Environment, Library Learning Centers, Science Lab Classrooms, Small Group/Collaboration Space, Visual & Performing Arts, Building Look & Feel, and Building Systems
- Budget Development
 - Budget Update – Middle School Master Plan
 - Low, Mid, and High-Cost Ranges for Monroe, Edison and Franklin
 - Low option includes capital project budgets taken from Legat 2023 updated assessment and include condition 1&2 projects for the entire school listed
 - Mid & High concepts include all work included in the low concept; any overlapping scope has been accounted for.
 - Budgets are inclusive of total project costs and escalated for construction from 2025-28 excluding FF&E, and hazardous material remediation.
 - Budget ranges are provided due to uncertainty in market conditions and specificity of scope.

There was additional information/comments on the following:

- There is no specific proposal or plan for MS projects out on the table from the Administration.

- Have introduced a few different ways potentially that some of the needs can be addressed.
- Want to bring back to the Board the collective feedback from the community on the potential project plans, decisions around how to pay for them, and other related factors.
- The makeup/composition of the Community Engagement Leadership Team.
- The task of the team is to lead a process to gather and solicit feedback from the community and bring the feedback to the Board. It is not tasked with bringing a recommendation to the Board.
- Types of feedback – can include open houses and different kinds of guided surveys.
- Critically important the feedback ultimately guides the decision that a future Board makes on this.
- For tonight, it is important the Board understands all of the information that is provided, and identifies any other missing or needed information that would assist in this process.
- The goal is to deliver the feedback report to the Board in October 2023.
- Do not suggest the Board members provide feedback on any plans tonight, should hear the feedback from the leadership team and the community.
- Focusing the discussion on whether anything is missing that is necessary for either the Board or the community to do their job.
- The FY22 fund balance was 32.2%; the amount available to use is based on the Board fund balance policy; analysis of cash flow should this option be pursued.
- Board policy 4:152 Sherman Dergis pledge of \$7.2 million annually for capital projects.
- DSEB: non-referendum bonds issued consistent with the District’s DSEB capacity (\$35 million)
- Debt certificates – the principal and interest of the certificates are paid from the District’s operating budget.
- The five funding options presented are beyond what was in the tool chest for consideration in the past.
- The potential capital facility work moving forward from 2023-2027 outside of the middle school capital projects that will need attention. This includes HVAC work, lights & ceilings, roofs, flooring, fire alarm, paving/concrete, field turf, and playgrounds.
- Reminder there is no “do nothing” option for the MS projects – there is \$41.6 million worth of capital work in front of us at the MS level. That is the absolute base need.
- The budget update includes refined information and dollars.
- “Low” includes what was identified as Section 1 & 2 needs at each of those MS that will have to be addressed within the next eight years. (Level 1, Priority 1 is a 1-3 year timeframe; Level 2, Priority 2 is a 3-8 year timeframe). The total low for all MS is \$41.6 million.
- The estimated project cost ranges provided in the mid and high levels include 2.5% on either side of the midpoint.
- Any estimates related to capital costs – there is a 10% contingency built into the numbers (this was not included in the numbers previously). All outside costs (surveys, site visits, and architect fees) are at a 12% rate, which is probably higher than where we would end up. There are also 4% escalators/increases built in by the construction manager.

There were questions/comments/discussion on the following:

- Consideration as to whether a Board member should or would sit on the Community Engagement Leadership Team; the pros and cons of doing this; assigning one member vs. rotation; OMA consideration; showing Board interest in the process and engagement; observer role vs. participant.
- The point of connection of this to CAC, but do not anticipate CAC running dual alignment with this. How will the CAC members be chosen to be a part of this team?

- The importance of ensuring those without kids in the District are a part of the leadership team and we hear their perspective.
- The Board should receive regular feedback or updates on how things are progressing with the leadership team and feedback from the community. This should include making the Board aware of what they are doing and how they are going about collecting feedback, but don't want to bring information back to the Board in small pieces.
- Letting the governing structures work.
- Important to include elementary parents as part of the leadership team as they will be MS parents in the future.
- The two windows of time that are best times to collect feedback – April and when the students return to school in the fall.
- Engage 200 – two community members were co-chairs and they came to the Board meetings to give a recap.
- Engage 200, Master Facility Plan, Referendum in 2017 – how they relate to the feedback from the community and what was missed since the referendum did not pass. How can we avoid this from happening?
- How to find your “no” votes and get them to participate? Related to other ways to gather feedback and not just open houses.
- This Board has not talked about a referendum for the MS capital projects. This is not a plan currently in place.
- The estimated length of the project (3 years) as it relates to using Sherman Dergis allocation (\$7.2 annually x 3 years would be \$21.6 million).
- Existing fund balance – how the \$10 million estimate of what is available for use was calculated and the cash management impact of it; fund balance range per Board policy (25-40%).
- Playground assumption moving forward - \$500K per year outside of Sherman Dergis.
- If we do not allocate the \$7.2 million in Sherman Dergis annually, would we fall behind on the capital work? It was noted a fairly big portion of the capital projects for the MS would fall under Sherman Dergis. However, the more Sherman Dergis you allocate as part of this overall project, the less flexibility it gives you to address some of those needs elsewhere.
- Is the \$7.2 million for Sherman Dergis sufficient for the amount of capital work to be done? Noted we started in a place where we were behind and in a catch-up model. The gap has significantly closed in the last 4-5 years. The focus primarily has been on the elementary and HS, but do have catch-up work to do at the MS level.
- Debt certificates and DSEB – where they are payable from, how much we currently hold. All existing debt will be paid off in October 2025.
- DSEB – what do other districts and other taxing bodies do concerning using DSEB as a tool? When was the last time DSEB was used by D200?
- MS deferred maintenance – more efficient to do it all at one time vs. spreading it out.
- Existing fund balance – how do our parameters compare with other districts?
- What would the operational impact be for deferring other capital projects?
- Selling of bonds – who we sell them to depends on the marketability of the bonds.
- The difference in project cost from what was presented in February is due to the low costs (capital improvements that need to be addressed) being factored into the mid and high costs.
- Is there a Monroe mid-option that does not include an addition? No, the options include an auditorium, but different sizes. Can one be provided? There is a big jump from the low to mid option.
- Request for a document to be prepared to show what is included in the low option.

- What do we expect this investment to produce in educational performance? Should be able to tie back to achievement or outcome if asking the community for this. The experience is important too.
- Discussion around Monroe not currently having an auditorium (while the other three MS do) and whether we are saying we want all the schools to have the same facilities. The need for a Monroe auditorium was identified by staff and parents in the past and was revisited at the front end of the project. Identify what experience would be missing by not having an auditorium at Monroe.
- The goal – is it for all the students to have the exact same experience vs. all MS kids to have similar opportunities?
- The Board will ultimately decide/vote on the projects. The administration will bring a recommendation to the Board.
- The question of whether a Board member attends the leadership team meetings – Board members weighed in on this. There was a request for the Board to receive frequent updates. There will be no board member on the leadership team.

WRITTEN REPORTS

Monthly Financial Reports

FOIA Report

Board Communication Log

Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Report

REPORTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS

Board Committee Reports

The Board HR/Policy Committee, Community Engagement Committee, and Finance Committee met since the last business meeting. The meeting notes were attached to the agenda.

Other Reports from Board Members

None

TOPICS FOR FUTURE DISCUSSION

MS Facilities Plan

Acceptance of the FY22 Audit

2023-24 Fee Schedule

- Board Member request for an annual update on school safety.

NEXT REGULAR MEETING

April 12, 2023, 7:00 PM, Whittier Elementary School

ANNOUNCEMENTS

April 26, 2023, Committee of the Whole, 7:00 PM, School Service Center (SSC)

CLOSED SESSION

Pursuant to 5 ILCS 120/2 (c)(2) Collective Negotiating Matters Between the Public Body and its Employees or Their Representatives, or Deliberations Concerning Salary Schedules for One or More Classes of Employees.

MOTION

Member Crabtree moved, Member Long seconded to adjourn the meeting to closed session for the purpose of 5 ILCS 120/2 (c)(2). Upon a roll call being taken, the vote was AYE 7, NAY 0.

The motion carried 7-0.

There was no action expected following the Closed Session.

The meeting adjourned to Closed Session at 10:10 PM.

Dave Long, Secretary

Chris Crabtree, President