

Community Unit School District 200

Administration and School Service Center

130 West Park Avenue

Phone: (630) 682-2002

Wheaton, Illinois 60189-6400

Fax: (630) 682-2227

NOTICE

CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) MEETING

BOARD OF EDUCATION
DISTRICT 200
DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

A Meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) of Community Unit School District 200, DuPage County, Illinois will be held on Wednesday, November 15, 2023, at 7:00 – 8:30 p.m. at the School Service Center, 130 W. Park Ave, Wheaton, IL. The agenda of the meeting is as follows:

1. Call to Order
2. Public Comment
3. Approval of Minutes – October 18, 2023
4. Question of the Month
5. Review and Discussion of Middle School Facilities Engagement
6. Review and Discussion of Student Learning Dashboard Update 2022
7. What is the Buzz?
8. Adjourn



Rob Hanlon
Board of Education, District 200



Superintendent of Schools, District 200

Community Unit School District 200 is subject to the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, as well as Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Individuals with disabilities who plan to attend this meeting and who require certain accommodations in order to allow them to attend and/or participate, or who have questions regarding the accessibility of the meeting or the facilities, are requested to promptly contact the School District's ADA/Section 504 Coordinator at (630) 682-2000. TT/TDD Service is available through the above number.

Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)
November 15, 2023 - Meeting at SSC

Call to Order

- The meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m. by CAC Chair G. Biziarek.
- This meeting was conducted in the BOE Room at the SSC.
- 23 CAC members were present for the meeting.
- Others present: Supt. Dr. Jeff Schuler, Asst. Supt. Melissa Murphy, Asst. Supt Dr. Brian O'Keeffe, Board Member Rob Hanlon.

Public Comment

- Mary Ann Vitone - Spending

Approval of Minutes from October 18, 2023

- Motion to approve the minutes: N. Mead; second: G. Aimonette. All in favor.
- The minutes of October 18, 2023, were approved.

Question of the Month

- Dr. Schuler asked the group to discuss in table groups the impact of social media platforms on students and whether this has been positive, negative, or other.
- Dr. Schuler clarified this includes true social media platforms - Instagram, TicToc, etc. (Does Include YouTube, but not Google Classroom).
- Feedback forms were collected from the table groups.
- The context was provided for the question:
 - Background - About a year ago the District was one of approximately eighteen school districts in a consolidated suit against JUUL and a number of the manufacturers responsible for vaping devices. D200 received about \$300K out of the litigation effort, but the primary purpose was to bring more responsibility to manufacturers in the way they were advertising their products to kids.
 - At the November Board meeting, an agenda item was included involving social media companies and bringing accountability to social media and how they are recklessly advertising their products and impacting kids.
 - Wanted to see the gut reaction from the group. The answer was "negative" from every table group.

Review and Discussion of Middle School Facilities Engagement

- Wanted to get some feedback around the engagement work the district is doing around facilities.
- Noted the three members of CAC who are members of the Community Engagement Leadership Team.
- History of the Middle School facilities engagement
 - Last year, CAC members spent time at the end of the year looking at some concept ideas on work the district needs to do at three of our middle schools.
 - The work evolved out of a master facility plan where we identified areas that needed to be done to improve our facilities.
 - There were some concept drawings on how to attack that work, with some initial budget numbers attached to the concepts.

- The Board asked the Administration to take this Fall and gather input and feedback from the community.
- Assembled a separate engagement team to help guide that process.
- The Board received an initial report at the October COW meeting on the first round of feedback that came in.
- This transitions into a second round of feedback - taking some of the feedback received initially and putting it together with numbers and project pieces.
- Brings us to today - will talk through how we got to where we are currently, and ask the group to take the survey that is part of this next round of feedback.
- A copy of the initial community engagement report that came to the Board was provided to each table group.
- Feedback came in from three separate forms with people having varying degrees of information. 1) community engagement leadership team; 2) conducted four different engagement opportunities, three in-person and one virtual; and 3) telephone survey - a scientific-based survey to represent the community. Phone survey intended to get gut-level feedback from those with limited information.
- How the phone survey worked - put in ten different project buckets (examples of some of the buckets - safety & security; infrastructure; general classrooms, etc). An estimated price tag was listed with each bucket. Caveat - if you add all ten buckets together, the aggregate dollar amount is bigger than any of the initial estimates; noted economies of scale if you address multiple areas. Wanted to look at those ten buckets in isolation. Asked individuals for their response to each of the individual buckets. Also asked some financial questions regarding potential funding levels and their opinion on that.
- The phone survey started with a general question - What is the individual's favorability of the district - 79% of respondents (approximately 535 individuals) that took the phone survey had a favorable opinion of the district; 14% held some type of negative opinion. The net favorability rating is +65%. This is categorized as very strong.
- Individual projects - none of the ten project buckets did not have a favorable response from individuals on all three surveys.
- Across the board (in all three surveys) - two sets of projects with the highest favorability - 1) Safety and Security; and 2) Infrastructure and Mechanical. The next three project buckets are Special Education and Accessibility; Classroom Improvements; and Science Lab Classrooms. The remaining five project buckets - Performing Arts & Music Spaces, Library Learning Centers; Indoor Athletic & PE Spaces; Student Services Spaces, and Building Layout & Collaborative Spaces were supported, although at the bottom.
- Funding - all three potential funding levels (low, medium, and high) had community support. When asked about the three separate funding elements in isolation, the highest level of funding got the highest level of response from all surveys/groups. Only 5% of respondents anywhere did not want to see any more money going into the projects.
- High funding was rated first, then the medium level, followed by the low level.
- Community Engagement Leadership Team - took the initial round of feedback, put together project buckets with money, and asked for a second round of feedback around three separate options in another survey.
 - Option 1 - addresses essential improvements (includes safety & security, and infrastructure & mechanicals), notes the estimated cost to taxpayers, and the approximate tax decrease.
 - Option 2 - new version of what was the medium option; built on the five buckets that tested higher than the other five - incuses safety & security infrastructure &

mechanicals, special education & accessibility, science lab classrooms, classroom improvements, and some PE upgrades and student services spaces (because there are areas inside of those spaces that need addressing); most notably removes the fine arts piece; .notes the estimated cost to taxpayers, and the approximate tax decrease.

- Option 3 - (previously the high one) addresses all improvements, notes the estimated cost to taxpayers, and the approximate tax decrease.
- The next round of feedback - two distinct tracks to keep the data separate - another phone survey already launched and asks the same questions about the three options; a version of the survey will be available to anyone who wants to take it, but the feedback will be kept separate.

There were questions and/or comments on the following:

- Mid-option #2 - at this point, it is built off/modeled from community feedback based on the engagement. The intent is to bring the information to the Board to determine next steps.
- The Community Leadership Team had asked if the Board moved forward with option #2, what would it do to the capital plan the district already has (\$7.2M set aside annually for capital expenditures)? At this point in time, the Board has committed to the Sherman Dergis policy and continues to reinvest in elementary and HS buildings. However, option #2 would more than likely alter at some point (on the back end) some of the priorities that would have been taken care of in option 3 and would have to insert into the \$7.2M.
- When we look at the savings listed (approximate tax decrease on an average home), remember it is a tax decrease only on your tax bill line item for District 200.
- How much of our tax revenue comes on the backs of homeowners vs. business owners/industries?
- Some people may not understand where the tax decrease comes from noted on the options. The tax levy that supports D200 has two sides - the operating levy and the bond and interest portion of the levy that comes from a previously approved referendum. We are at the very tail end of the Hubble referendum and a \$10M bond issuance was done before 2014 (made some improvements at a few buildings). That is a separate chunk of tax bill. This year, the bond and interest portion of your tax bill is about \$19M; which drops to \$16.3M in the levy just approved; (may drop further to \$14M if the Board carries out the abatement); the savings shown comes when the debt goes away in 2025.
- Option 4 (no additional funding) - would yield a tax decrease of \$441/yr.
- Option #1 (\$42M) - just infrastructure and mechanical and safety and security. Request for a breakdown of what is included in all of that. Noted this came from a capital improvement plan the district has operated off of for the last ten years. Every asset in all 21 district sites has a projected end of life with a replacement cost associated with it; a lot of line items. Are there things we can do from the list, but not do others?
- Where are we hitting multiple categories - for example being something that may fall under infrastructure and mechanical, and possible athletic/P.E. spaces?
- Something to consider - what is the baseline when we say improve something? If we don't improve it, is it still okay? Every line item included in the \$42M is critical infrastructure and mechanical.
- Student Services Spaces for Special Education & Accessibility - where do sensory rooms and gross motor spaces fall? Noted one of the major improvement areas targeted across all three buildings is in health offices space. A chunk of that would fall into the bucket of accessibility piece.
- Middle schools - no playgrounds.

- How do we get to a point where we need this \$42M in critical improvements when we spend the \$7.2M annually (and say this is a good number)? Should the \$7M be a different number? Must go back to look at the 2017 Master Facility Plan - there was a clear need to do some catch-up work and get us to an annual number to address needs inside facilities and be palatable in the budget. Phased this in 2017 - the Sherman-Dergis policy was passed. The investment was \$1M at that point. Believe if you do catch up at the middle schools, the \$7.2M is a comfortable number.
- The \$7M - mostly used at elementary? It has been. Noted the economies of scale on taking on a volume of work vs. doing projects one at a time. Have not done a lot of middle school work intentionally - bigger MS projects were looming.
- \$370.4K is a medium property value home. 50% or more of taxpayers will experience that tax decrease or more. Home values are always shifting and changing, and individual home values are always adjusting. The aggregate amount is distributed among taxpayers.
- Clear feedback was obtained from the first survey. What else does the district want to know from the second survey? In the first round, the projects themselves were separated from the funding/money questions. The second survey has similar questions; retest information, but put the elements together.
- The Sherman Dergis policy/methodology mirrored off of what the City of Wheaton had used. The value (\$7.2M) is separate. In 2017, the district was looking for something to anchor the analysis of what needed to be allocated for capital improvements.
- A survey was distributed and CAC members were asked to take the survey. Take data set from CAC.
- Encouraged people to go to the site (together200.net).
- The final engagement report will come to the Board in December. Will use that feedback to begin the work to define plans.
- Will keep the online version of the survey up for a while.

Review and Discussion of Student Learning Dashboard Update 2022

- Melissa Murphy provided a presentation on the District Dashboard and Illinois School Report Card (a condensed version of what was presented to the Board in October).
- Context: there are two assessments given to K-8 students - FastBridge and IAR (3-8).
- Similarities between the two assessments - both are testing reading and math skills, and both are focused on the IL learning standards.
- Differences between the two assessments - FastBridge is an adaptive test (students enter in at their grade level, and then it adjusts to their skill level); FastBridge is given three times a year (IAR is given once a year); FastBridge gives immediate results, IAR results - must wait several months to receive the results.
- How the scores are reported - FastBridge (uses national norms and is all on percentiles); IAR (functions on a 5-point scale; if students score a 4 or 5, that is considered proficient. In some states, a "3" score is considered proficient, but not in Illinois.
- IAR Score report - a very small percentage of students score at the highest level ("5"). It is a really challenging assessment.
- Agenda topics covered with CAC:
 - High School: Areas of focus for 2022-23, results, and next steps
 - Middle School: Areas of focus for 2022-23, results, and next steps
 - Elementary: Areas of focus for 2022-23, results, and next steps
 - Highlights from the Illinois School Report Card

- Noted IAR results are given to the District mid-summer for the previous year's testing. The district is not allowed to report data to the public until October for the test given last year.
- High School - intentionally focused on increasing the percentage of students that are accessing advanced coursework.
 - Advanced coursework - graduating senior taking at least one advanced course, receiving at least a C in that course. D200 expanded this to include students who had received industry-recognized credentials (from TCD programs).
 - Had an increase last year, expanded the number of dual credit courses - have 15 dual credit courses (used to have one course).
 - When you offer more courses, are you expanding the number of kids that are taking the courses? D200 did see students who only access advanced coursework through dual credit. Also, because of the types of courses we are offering that are dual credit courses, we are not always attracting the same types of students at always take AP (advanced placement) courses.
- Freshman on track - students being on track to graduate on time is a key predictor of high school success.
 - Trend data - dip in 2021 (pandemic dip). We have rebounded; want to make sure we are supporting our students who were impacted by the pandemic. Noted credit recovery effort and academic interventionists at the high school level.
- Math and English Proficiency - state metric, sitting on report card; percentage of graduating senior students that meet proficiency through some criteria;
 - Criteria can be a course (percentage of students earned a C or higher in a course (AP, Dual Credit, Transitional or Algebra II) or an exam score (ACT, SAT, AP).
 - Currently have a Transitional Math course at our HS; safety guard before they move on to postsecondary education. Really important course; students do not need to waste time or money on a non-credit-bearing course.
 - Math - also have to be enrolled in a 4th year of math (if qualifying through a test score).
 - Two years ago - 69% were at proficiency level; this last year, 80% met the threshold for math.
 - English - need to put more attention on this.
 - English - not in the same situation as math in terms of courses.
 - This is the first year we have had a dual-credit English course (College Composition).
 - Transitional English course - the Board approved this for community review this month.
 - Results are a product of SAT scores. This group of students is a product of the pandemic and difficulties for those students. Our current seniors have higher SAT results.
- District 2022 and 2023 Dashboard - showed some of the results for HS, some of the historical data, and current results.
- Theory about the drop in English from last year to this year - believe it is around the SAT results, and we are on the uptick.
- Middle school - Middle School Writing
 - IAR assessment - half of the test is writing and the other half is reading. FastBridge is only reading.

- Writing portion of IAR assessment - a strong focus because 27% in grades 608 met or exceeded on the writing portion in 2022. In 2023- 64% of MS students met or exceeded on the writing portion of the assessment.
- The robust plan to address that - proud of the work they did. D200 had a much more significant increase (64%) than the state scores (38%).
- Need to pay attention to the reading portion.
- Flat on the FastBridge for reading. Doing some curricular work now to make sure students have access to high-quality complex text to address that.
- FastBridge assessment supports growth. FastBridge Growth - aiming for 60%.
- What does growth mean in FastBridge? FastBridge analyzes student results and they have metrics that say the percentage of students that have made at least a year's worth of growth or more than a year's worth of growth in a year.
- Why we do not have 2022 FastBridge reading results for MS - were not giving the assessment to all of our students in 2022.
- Middle School math - engaged in a pilot last year of two resources and have adopted IM (Illustrative Math). Noted this was the first year of fully implementing IM at the MS level, and the first year math coaches are in place at the MS level.
- At the MS level - are we targeting the same way for lower-level, middle-level, and high-level learners? There are more course options at the HS level. Do not have the same options at the MS level. Students in MS, take 6th, 7th, and 8th grade math (unless they are in the PACE program). Supporting math achievement and the focus on subgroups that are underperforming (Multilingual Learners).
- Math coaches - are we going to lose any math coaches due to funding running out? If so, how will that impact the goals we have? Noted, hope we do not lose those resources. The 5-year projections from last year - included keeping those resources inside of the projections. Better sense when we get to January (when the 5-year projections are updated).
- If we have larger class sizes to accommodate the specialists and the effect on learning? Noted the impact on larger class sizes for younger grades vs. older grades.
- Elementary focus - Second grade stood out (after reviewing fall data) and needed focus.
 - These were kids who were in either preschool or Kindergarten during the pandemic.
 - 71% were in the Tier 1 range - ready to learn in the classroom.
 - Bookworms and teaching foundational skills in a differentiated manner.
 - Moved to 79% by the end of the year (looking for 80%).
- K-1 reading in general - at the end of last year 46% were at or above the 50th percentile,
 - Believe having a new resource, consistency in instruction, and differentiated phonics instruction is going to make a difference for our youngest learners.
- Math at elem level - last year was the first year of adoption for IM. Held steady with results.
 - First year of implementation can be challenging; expect results to increase.
 - Draw attention to the growth - what that growth looks like for all of the different subgroups - very similar at the same rate.
 - It is important that all of the subgroups were growing at the same pace.
- What the dashboard looks like for 2022 and 2023 in reading ELA and Math.
- IAR ELA Growth percentile - 63% is classified as excellent growth; math - 50% held steady, average growth.
- Annual Summative Designations on the IL Report Card. All D200 schools fall into the top two categories (Exemplary or Commendable).
- D200 had four schools fall into the Exemplary Status Category - the top 10% of the state.

- Question regarding a specific school in the commendable category that had higher scores than all of the other schools in the exemplary category. Noted the actual test results account for a small percentage (7.5%), and the growth is the biggest chunk of that.

What is the Buzz? (What are people talking about out in the community)

- High School Student Ambassadors - asked for the group to understand the new role. There are five ambassadors. The Board decided earlier in the year to incorporate student ambassadors; they will bring highlights and updates from the high school to the Board at meetings; the Board is going to be able to utilize their feedback and understand the student perspective on certain agenda items. Noted we had 30 HS students apply for the position. The two HS principals use students who applied and were not selected as part of an advisory group that will provide info to the student ambassadors. Intent - to bring student voice and perspective to different issues.
- Public Comment at CAC meetings - request for the Chair to look at how to limit time around public comment. Can we require a written proposal? Noted, CAC operates under the OMA; suggest affirming something in the bylaws. CAC is an advisory group to the Board, with no voting rights.
- PTA meeting at Franklin - staff was there. Conversation noted too few aides/teaching assistants (TA) in the schools. Concern that the rate they are being paid is not competitive. Are there enough aides/TAs for kids? This is a problem everywhere, not just in our schools.
- Lots of great comments about the Veterans Day flag display at the various schools, and a snippet of the Longfellow Veterans Day Assembly was on Fox32 news.
- Edison - bullying presentation was given to the entire school population; disconnect on what families are feeling vs school response.
- Thank You to the Board and District - the sexting and cyberbullying presentation was really good. The Detective does presentations for students as well. Could he do this for D200 high school students?
- Franklin has a policy that cell phones cannot be in the school and no computers in the lunchroom. True for the entire district?
- Time of year for the first band concerts - music teachers are phenomenal and do amazing things.

Adjourn

There was a motion to adjourn: S. Burke; second: M. Hengesbaugh. All in favor.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.