

# Edison Regional Gifted Center Local School Council Regular Meeting

16 AUG 2016

## High Level Summary

The following lists key actions/decisions of the meeting. Details can be found in a subsequent section.

- I. **Call to order / Roll call**
  - A. B Whitford called the meeting to order at 7:01PM
  - B. In attendance (quorum present)
    - i. David Barber
    - ii. Daneal Silvers
    - iii. Carolyn Gourash
    - iv. Brad Katz
    - v. Ben Whitford
    - vi. Ernesto Perez (arrived at 7:06)
    - vii. Jim Magas
    - viii. Jill Martensen
    - ix. S Quirke
    - x. Karen Valentine
  - C. Unable to attend
    - i. Michelle Sevig
  - D. Also in attendance were 20 stakeholders and Luis Garcia-Juarez from CPS LSC Relations
  - E. There was a partial audio recording made of the meeting. The meeting was also recorded (video) by one of the stakeholders
- II. **Approval of agenda [7:02PM]**
  - A. Unanimously approved
- III. **Approval of Minutes**
  - A. Postponed until arrival of Secretary
- IV. **Welcome New Staff [7:03PM]**
  - A. Principal Karen Valentine introduced the three new staff members noting their background and contact information will also be provided in the upcoming newsletter.
    - i. Kevin Connelly - new Physical Education teacher
    - ii. Denise Passolt - new School Counselor
    - iii. Nora Dandurand - new Middle School ELA teacher
- V. **Principal's Report [7:06PM]**
  - A. K Valentine gave a brief explanation of how she structured the Principal's Report, with a more extensive version of the Report made available to the LSC, and later to anyone else who would be interested in reading it.
  - B. K Valentine gave an overview of the process employed to hire the new staff.
  - C. She discussed the new schedule which would allow for more prep time for teachers, increase class time to 60 minutes (previously 45 minutes), increased opportunities for MTSS support and mentorship for non-tenured faculty
  - D. She explained the MTSS Coordinator Role (Mrs. Nicholson) that included detailed job description, professional development and mentorship.
  - E. Communication systems would include Constant Contact for weekly newsletter and Educational Networks for a new school web site. The PTO has offered to fund both items. K Valentine had also met with 25+ families since July 1 and there will be two back-to-school events in August.
  - F. She explained different PD opportunities for Principals including MTSS implementation
  - G. K Valentine asked for feedback on the report. There were questions regarding the MTSS position and what it entailed (K Valentine said Mrs Nicholson would speak to that in a future meeting), what was lost due to switching to 60 minute classes (there would be 15 minutes of French class lost during the week compared to the previous year), the teacher prep time (teachers would now have five 60 minute periods, an extra prep and collaboration time), and Computer Science (there will not be more time).
  - H. K Valentine explained that CUIP would be providing weekly tech support to the school at a cost of \$11K. PTO has offered to pay for this.

- I. Clarification on communication systems was requested. Constant Contact would cost \$300/year while Educational Networks would cost \$3600/year. K Valentine explained the process of paying for both. Other less-expensive options which would be parent-driven were discussed.
- VI. **Chairman's Report [7:31PM]**
  - A. B Whitford gave an update on Mrs. Oberhardt's appeal as well as information provided by the lawyer representing the LSC and a lawyer from CPS Legal.
  - B. There was discussion regarding the recordings of the closed sessions, particularly a session where parents met with the LSC in private.
- VII. **Approve Funds Transfer [8:20PM]**
  - A. K Valentine explained the process by which the PTO could transfer funds to the school and when the LSC would need to vote to approve expenditures and transfers. Currently the LSC did not need to approve any fund transfers.
- VIII. **Spending Limits [8:22PM]**
  - A. There was discussion on increasing the spending limits for how much the principal could spend without requiring the LSC's approval. The current limit was set at \$1,000.
  - B. J Magas made a motion to increase the spending limit to \$2,000, E Perez seconded.
  - C. Unanimously approved.
- IX. **Principal Evaluation [8:26PM]**
  - A. The LSC discussed the process by which it would evaluate K Valentine's performance. Topics covered were timeline/deadlines, training, faculty feedback and additional criteria.
- X. **Communication [8:39PM]**
  - A. There was discussion about installing a bulletin board for the LSC to provide information.
  - B. There was further discussion regarding the web site's development, specifically about functionality, who would be responsible for maintenance and how long it would take to implement.
  - C. J Martensen made a motion to allow K Valentine to decide what solution to deploy, B Katz seconded.
  - D. Passed unanimously.
  - E. There was further discussion regarding when the LSC would need to vote on approving the expenditures related to the web site development. K Valentine said it would only need to vote once Educational Networks provided a Purchase Order.
  - F. S Quirke made a motion to table the survey, E Perez seconded.
  - G. Passed unanimously.
  - H. E Perez made a motion to purchase a bulletin board and place it in the hallway, J Magas seconded.
  - I. Passed unanimously.
- XI. **Vote to Approve Minutes [9:00PM]**
  - A. B Whitford made a motion to approve the minutes from the meetings on July 7<sup>th</sup> and July 21<sup>st</sup>, J Martensen seconded.
  - B. Passed unanimously.
- XII. **Committee Formation [9:05PM]**
  - A. There was discussion regarding if and how committees would be formed and the possibility to appoint point persons rather than full committees. Committees that were discussed were the CIWP and Budget committees and who should be on them.
  - B. There was also discussion on reviewing the LSC bylaws.
  - C. The topic would be revisited at the next meeting.
- XIII. **Open Forum [9:10PM]**
  - A. There was a request to display the agenda on the projector during the meeting.
  - B. There was discussion regarding the inventory of computers at the school. K Valentine said she would provide more information.
  - C. K Valentine explained CPS' policy on returning school fees stating that unused school fees could only be returned in exceptional circumstances. As a result the unused fees from last year should not be returned.
  - D. There was further discussion on the budget, specifically, in terms of technology.
- XIV. **Agenda Discussion [9:20PM]**
  - A. B Whitford listed the topics that were outstanding including the bylaws, committees and web site.

B. K Valentine said there could potentially be an expenditure that the LSC would need to vote on for the CUIP program.

XV. Adjournment [8:59PM]

A. B Whitford made a motion to adjourn the meeting, B Katz seconded.

B. Unanimously approved.

XVI. Action items

<b>Date Raised</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Assigned</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Status</b>
16 AUG 2016	Ask Mara Georges how the LSC would go about asking her questions as a group.	B Whitford	20 SEP 2016	
16 AUG 2016	Finish training on Principal Evaluation.	All LSC members	20 SEP 2016	
16 AUG 2016	Add item regarding Principal Evaluation to October meeting.	B Whitford	20 SEP 2016	
16 AUG 2016	Provide K Valentine with contact information of alternate web developer.	J Martensen	20 SEP 2016	
16 AUG 2016	Obtain and share technology inventory with LSC	K Valentine	20 SEP 2016	
16 AUG 2016	Mrs. Nicholson to come to speak to LSC about the MTSS Coordinator Role	C Nicholson	20 SEP 2016	
16 AUG 2016	Provide details of schedules	K Valentine	20 SEP 2016	
16 AUG 2016	Transfer of executive session recordings	T Hower	20 SEP 2016	Completed
16 AUG 2016	Sign Confidentiality Agreements	All LSC members	20 SEP 2016	
16 AUG 2016	Update Bylaws	J Martensen	20 SEP 2016	

## Meeting Detail

The following provides more comprehensive detail of the meeting however it is not a transcript. Please listen to the audio of the meeting for exact proceedings.

### In Attendance

(21 non-LSC) including A Bernotas, J Doyle, K Corbett, S McNabb, ? Vernola, T Hower, J Hower, H Chang, W Scanlan, N Colella, S Colella, J Schott, W Hong, K Connelly, D Passolt, N Dandurand, L Garcia-Juarez (Compliance Officer)

- I. **Call to order [7:01PM]**
  - A. B Whitford called the meeting
  - B. In attendance (quorum present)
    - i. David Barber
    - ii. Daneal Silvers
    - iii. Carolyn Gourash
    - iv. Brad Katz
    - v. Ben Whitford
    - vi. Ernesto Perez (arrived at 7:06)
    - vii. Jim Magas
    - viii. Jill Martensen
    - ix. S Quirke
    - x. Karen Valentine
  - C. Unable to attend
    - i. Michelle Sevig
  - D. There was a partial audio recording made of the meeting. The meeting was also recorded (video) by one of the stakeholders
- II. **Approval of agenda [7:02PM]**
  - A. B whitford moved to approve the agenda, S Quirke seconded
  - B. Passed unanimously
- III. **Approval of Minutes**
  - A. B Whitford suggested postponing until arrival of secretary
- IV. **Welcome New Staff [7:03PM]**
  - A. K Valentine explained the hiring of the three vacant positions during the last 6 weeks (PE Teacher, Counselor/Case Manager, 7<sup>th</sup> Grade). While the 7<sup>th</sup> Grade teaching position was both Math and ELA, the candidate pool did not allow for that and so moving forward the position will only be a Middle School ELA teacher. K Valentine asked that the new faculty introduce themselves
    - i. Kevin Connelly - new Physical Education teacher
      - a. Worked 3 years at North River School then 2 years at Ogden.
    - ii. Denise Passolt - new School Counselor
      - a. Was at Ogden for the last 5 years. Before that taught at an alternative high school in California and a little in Chicago. Had already met some parents and children.
    - iii. Nora Dandurand - new Middle School ELA teacher
      - a. Came from Beaubien Elementary's Gifted Program where she taught ELA for grades 6-8. She said she is passionate about gifted education, having been hired at Beaubien right after college.
  - B. K Valentine said that two of the new faculty had young children at home so they could leave after their introductions. She added that she would give more detail on the hiring process in the Principal's Report.
- V. **Principal's Report [7:06PM]**
  - A. K Valentine gave an abbreviated version of the report the LSC received. The way she structured the report was based on the Principal's Competencies which is how principal's are evaluated by the LSC and the Chiefs. She explained that her presentation would only have highlights of the more detailed report given to the LSC. There would be time for feedback after the report so as to tailor the report to meet the community's needs.
  - B. She explained the purpose of the report as being a way to ensure that the LSC and the community are informed on leadership decisions that improve the learning experiences at the school. While not exhaustive it would give an overview of what was happening at the school by giving key examples of daily work.

### C. Staffing

- i. K Valentine stated that as part of the Strategic Planning for Continuous School Improvement the three faculty she introduced earlier in the meeting were hired onto the school staff. She explained that the six-week hiring process was robust and extensive and involved screening and various stakeholders. LSC members were invited to participate in an interview, parents of diverse learners, parents of 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> graders and students were included in the interviews. APMA staff sat in on the PE teacher interviews due to the close partnership with ERGC. The goal was to create a as strong of a candidate pool as possible, present it to the stakeholders and then have the stakeholders make a selection. The final decision was up to K Valentine to make but the candidates she was going to hire were the ones the stakeholders chose. K Valentine stated that D Barber and Ms. Shanahan were closely involved in the hiring process, especially in the hiring of the 7<sup>th</sup> grade position and she asked D Barber to provide more information if anyone was interested.
- ii. Two of the new hires have experience with gifted children. K Connelly has 6 years experience with different populations of students. They would be announced in the following e-mail newsletter. D Passolt had been introduced in a previous newsletter but K Valentine had forgotten to include her contact information so she would be including her in the the newsletter again. Their photos and contact information would be included and K Valentine said that all three were good at returning any queries.
- iii. N Dandurand will be contact each 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup> and 8th grade family personally. Part of this is is an effort to reduce any anxieties that are usual for 7<sup>th</sup> grade families to have at the beginning of the year. D Passolt had already started to do that with the families of diverse learners as well as people downtown to make sure the school has the best Special Education program possible.

### D. Scheduling

- i. K Valentine explained that the new schedule was still in the works and had been sent to faculty for feedback. She went on to explain that some faculty had already worked with her on the new schedule doing the “heavy lifting” with issues that kept arising. These included:
  - a. Compliance with District Guidelines and Mandates
    1. K Valentine stated that this schedule helped the school meet those requirements and in a better way
  - b. Developing a strong candidate pool for the 7<sup>th</sup> grade position
    1. The new schedule allowed for hiring for someone specialized in just ELA, Math or Science. From her experience as a middle school teacher being able to specialize was very helpful.
  - c. IEP requirements
    1. The new schedule meets those requirements. As she mentioned in previous meetings, these have been made a priority this year.
  - d. Providing additional prep time for teachers
    1. Every teacher will have an additional prep [time] to do whatever they need to to do what’s best for the needs of the kids.
  - e. Ensuring weekly common planning time for all grade bands
    1. K-2, 3-5, 6-8 will have weekly time to co-plan. K Valentine said that this was amazing as it is not common in schedules.
  - f. Build mentorship opportunities for all non-tenured teaching staff
    1. K Valentine met with the 3 PATs (Probationary Assigned Teachers) at the school to talk to them about how to design an individualized action plan for their specific mentoring. Along with their additional prep time they can use this time for things such as classroom observation in an exemplary teacher’s classroom, engaging in professional learning communities here at the school or cross-school. This also includes co-planning

and co-teaching. K Valentine did not of any other school that had this.

- g. Increasing opportunities for Tier 2 and Tier 3 MTSS support
  - 1. In creating the schedule for diverse learners time was set aside for Spec Ed teachers and MTSS Coordinator to meet with students in a targeted way. K Valentine said this part of the schedule was still being fleshed out but overall this was pretty close final. It would be sent out that week for a round of teacher feedback. Anything that dramatically impacts the kids would be shared out via the newsletter.
- ii. MTSS Coordinator Role (CIWP goal: Building A Culture of College \_\_\_\_ Readiness)
  - a. K Valentine said that as part of the CIWP goal one of the things worked on during that week was fleshing out the MTSS Coordinator Role. As was mentioned in the previous meeting regarding the budget, the role would be kept on. K Valentine has been meeting with Mrs. Nicholson to make sure she has a very detailed job description. It is aligned with the CIWP as well as operational needs.
  - b. K Valentine said she has worked with District staff to schedule professional development for Mrs. Nicholson, D Passolt, the Spec Ed teachers and herself. This was to be on the same page in terms of expectations for data collection then work with larger staff to establish how to support the staff in providing Tier 1 MTSS Interventions which is really just Differentiated Teaching. There will be a communication stream there in the future, but for now it is about making sure the current team is in sync.
  - c. K Valentine has identified an experienced Mentor MTSS Coordinator who is in another school to help support Mrs. Nicholson due to limitations on how much support she can give her.
  - d. Mrs Nicholson was asked to attend a mandatory MTSS Professional Development session. With staff returning Aug 29, during that week the school is required to present CPS-Designed Professional Development on MTSS which is the District focus for this year and is also a focus for ERGC's CIWP.
  - e. K Valentine said there would be updates in the coming newsletters.
- iii. Communication (CIWP goal: Parent and Community Collaboration)
  - a. K Valentine said there were two main work streams over the last couple of weeks.
    - 1. Communication systems
      - a. As discussed in Budget Meeting, PTO agreed to fund Constant Contact. This is the e-mail system she had been using to send out the newsletters. The first one had been sent the week before, with the second one being sent out the next day. This system can be used by the LSC, PTO and other parent groups as it shares a database of e-mail addresses. K Valentine thanked those who had helped her update the database.
      - b. K Valentine said a new web site would be coming soon and added that this would be discussed by the LSC. PTO had offered to fund this as well. The web site would be created through Educational Networks, who is responsible for 50-60 CPS websites. The site can be tailored to meet the needs of the community and to the LSC. Regardless of how it comes about, a new website would be coming shortly, possibly before school starts.
    - 2. Family Engagement

- a. K Valentine said that in the past 5 weeks she had met with over 25 families. She felt this was one of the most rewarding pieces for her and it solidified her idea that ERGC parents were amazing, committed, generous and loving. She conveyed her excitement at working with the parents at ERGC in the coming years.
      - b. She had also met with some students and said it was the most rewarding experience. She gave an example of meeting with a student, read her writing and give her feedback. She also said that it was incredible to hear the insights that some of the students had given during the interviews of the incoming faculty candidates and that in many cases informed her decisions. She explained that it was important to her that the faculty being selected could connect with the students.
    - 3. Two Back-to-school events
      - a. K Valentine announced a CPS-sponsored event on the August 22<sup>nd</sup> in collaboration with APMA and Hibbard.
      - b. The PTO was sponsoring an ice cream social/picnick on September 24. The new teachers would be there as well.
  - iv. Professional Development (CIWP goal: Disciplined and Reflective Leadership)
    - a. Professional Development
      - 1. K Valentine said that it was difficult for principals to go to Professional Development during the school year, so she took advantage of some sessions that occurred during the Summer.
      - 2. She said she attended 3 sessions this month
        - a. Courageous Principals PD
          - 1. Focused on Communication and Strength-based Problem-Solving
        - b. CPS New Principals PD
        - c. CPS MTSS PD
          - 1. Centered on structuring a meaningful MTSS program and how you can support teachers by rolling it out.
  - v. K Valentine asked for feedback.
    - a. S Quirke asked about the MTSS position, specifically, how the role would be specific to ERGC.
    - b. K Valentine hoped that Mrs Nicholson would be at the next meeting to further explain her role.
    - c. J Martensen praised K Valentine's presentation as each section was tied to specific competencies related to the Principal Evaluation.
    - d. B Whitford asked if anything had to give in respect to the schedule.
    - e. K Valentine answered that she was hesitant to answer since the schedule was still in draft form and could change. She gave one example of something that had to give by stating that in the primary grades instead of having French three times a week, this year it would only be twice. Due to moving to 60-minute periods (from 45-minutes, last year) this would mean there would be 15 minutes less of French per week.
    - f. J Martensen asked how many prep times the teachers would have.
    - g. K Valentine asked J Doyle to respond. J Doyle stated that during the previous year teachers either had 60-minutes five times a week or seven 45-minute periods. This year teachers have five 60-minute prep times, an extra prep plus common collaboration time and it does not interfere with lunch. K Valentine added that attendance could be

entered as well, which aligned with the first goal of the CIWP regarding attendance.

- h. S Quirke asked how K Valentine was able to accomplish this.
- i. K Valentine answered that she couldn't take credit for it and asked J Doyle if she could speak to it. J Doyle answered that CPS requirements aligned better with 60 minute periods. Once core minute requirements (ELA, Math) were met then there was room to provide the prep times.
- j. S Quirke asked D Silvers if K-2 had been doing the Collaboration informally in the past. D Silvers responded that they had during their lunches. J Martensen clarified that 6-8 also did and that she believed that 3-5 had also done it.
- k. E Perez asked what classes other than French would be reduced. K Valentine answered that to her knowledge, at the top of her head, she did not know of any, but that it was still a draft and could change after feedback. She added that she could speak to it next month and why there where changes.
- l. J Martensen asked if there would be more Computer Science and J Doyle answered that there wouldn't be. Students would only take it once a week.
- m. K Valentine added that J Doyle had assisted in creating the Tech Plan. K Valentine added that she had met with CUIP from the University of Chicago and that they would be providing technology assistance on a weekly basis at a cost of \$11,000 per year. CUIP would be sending a purchase order and the PTO had agreed to pay for it. As the agreement with CUIP is on a semester-semester-basis, if the arrangement is not a fit, there is the option to terminate the agreement.
- n. S Quirke asked if that would be set up like office hours where faculty and staff could set up a time to meet with them. K Valentine said it would and that a running ticket system could be put in place so CUIP could address issues during their 4-hour visit.
- o. W Raphael asked about the fees related to Constant Contact and the website. K Valentine answered that Constant Contact would cost a little over \$300 per year and that the school receives a non-profit discount. For the website the fee would be \$3,600 annually. She said that the idea would be to go with this solution for this year and then see if it works long-term. She had also received quotes from other organizations that perform the same work and this was the least expensive and most widely used.
- p. E Perez asked what the process for moving forward with the e-mail and web site systems.
- q. K Valentine explained her understanding of how that would work. The PTO had agreed to donate those funds, which would be deposited into an internal account. Since the amount of money needed to pay for the web site would be more than the spending limit, the LSC would need to approve that expenditure.
- r. E Perez followed up that in reviewing the quote that Educational Networks had provided he had found numerous issues with sites that had already been created, specifically with some sites not functioning properly on Macs, and CSS not loading correctly. He added that other solutions such as WordPress, Squarespace and Wix would be much less expensive. WordPress is free but did not have the same level of functionality, especially when it came to security, and required more experience with the technical side of web development. Squarespace and Wix cost about \$25 per month but offered the same level of tech support and customer service as well as functionality such as calendaring, email and security as Educational Networks. Additionally, since there was a drive for more parental involvement and volunteering, he, along with other parents, could implement a web site and email

solution free of charge. In the end it would cost less than 1/12<sup>th</sup> of what Educational Networks is charging.

- s. K Valentine said that it could be something to consider. She had approached the PTO to ensure there would be funding for the Educational Networks solution but it was up to the LSC to approve the internal accounts expenditure. Her concern was the timeline as it related to when the web site could be up and running and that there was enough bandwidth and support within the parents who were interested in volunteering to create the web site.
- t. E Perez noted that during K Valentine's explanation of the hiring process she had stated that various stakeholders including LSC members and parents were involved. He asked who those stakeholders were and how they were notified to be part of the process.
- u. K Valentine answered that for the Counselor position she had asked parents of diverse learners to be involved since they work closely with them especially in regards to the case management aspect. Several parents had reached out to her expressing that they were interested in being involved. For the PE position she had asked parents who she knew were former teachers to be involved as several had reached out to her stating they wanted to be involved in that as well. For the 7<sup>th</sup> grade position she invited the entire LSC and B Katz responded and D Barber was involved.
- v. E Perez followed up by asking how the parents who were involved were notified about being involved as it seemed not all parents had been notified that the process was going on.
- w. K Valentine said that while she understood the concern, this was a case where she could not notify the entire community due to how large it is and issues with scheduling. She explained that the hiring process during the summer was much more aggressive in terms of timeline than one would expect. She apologized if anyone felt they were not included in the process but that the process was intended to be inclusive.
- x. W Raphael asked if there had been an e-mail or notice sent out letting the community know there was a hiring process in place.
- y. K Valentine answered that in retrospect she should have included that in one of the newsletters. She reiterated that she is in the process of learning. She added that she believed the community was aware that there were vacancies as she had mentioned it during the previous LSC meetings but that she was open to feedback and it was something she could work on.

**VI. Chairman's Report [7:31PM]**

- A. B Whitford gave an update on Mrs. Oberhardt's appeal. He had spoken with Mara Georges, the lawyer representing the LSC, on July 28<sup>th</sup>. She confirmed that the ERGC LSC as a body is represented in the appeal. The arbitration hearing has been delayed until mid-December due to CPS not paying the arbitrator. There is the possibility for further delays. The next deadline will be at the end of September when both lawyers will present Position Statements which outline how they plan to proceed and what evidence they will present. Mara Georges said that Mrs. Oberhardt's lawyer had previously requested a settlement which would have had D Oberhardt take a position elsewhere in CPS. That kind of settlement would have been arranged between CPS and Mrs. Oberhardt.
- B. B Whitford said he had talked to R Verna at CPS Legal where he shared his notes from his conversations with Mara Georges and then received feedback. R Verna responded that the ERGC LSC as a body is the represented party in the appeal but that individual former LSC members may be asked to present evidence in the appeal. The current LSC has access to all the executive session recordings and materials collected by the former LSC and there isn't any particular protocol in how those materials are transferred to the current LSC. The current LSC is bound by the same confidentiality requirements as stated in OMA and B Whitford said it would be advisable for the current LSC to sign the confidentiality forms so as to remind everyone of those requirements.

- C. The e-mail archives from the previous LSC are not necessarily part of the materials that are required to be handed over to the current LSC but B Katz had already handed those over to B Whitford.
- D. The LSC cannot vote to annul or roll back the decision by the previous LSC as it was done withing the relevant rules and laws. As parties of the appeal, the current LSC and D Oberhardt have the ability to negotiate a settlement of the appeal. Since CPS is not a party to the appeal, it would not be involved in any settlement of the appeal. D Oberhardt is free to pursue other opportunities in CPS but the LSC is not empowered to offer any of those as part of a settlement.
- E. The LSC cannot offer to let D Oberhardt return to ERGC as part of a settlement. K Valentine's contract has a contingency clause that would only be triggered if the appeal reached its natural conclusion and the arbitrator ruled in her favor. It is unclear if that would necessarily mean that D Oberhardt would return to ERGC but winning the appeal would be a precondition to doing so. There is no way for the LSC to revoke K Valentine's contract as part of a settlement, thus there is no way for the LSC to re-instate D Oberhardt at ERGC.
- F. There are some things the current LSC could offer as part of a settlement, including writing a letter of support or rescinding of past negative evaluations. The details would be agreed upon between the LSC and D Oberhardt or their respective lawyers.
- G. CPS later e-mailed B Whitford to state that none of what been discussed constituted legal advice. They further stated that all questions from the community be directed at the LSC and any questions by members of the LSC be directed at Mara Georges.
- H. B Whitford talked to Mara Georges that morning and was told that D Oberhardt was not interested in any settlement on any terms other than her return to ERGC as principal. Mara Georges stated that this was not something the LSC could offer.
- I. B Whitford stated that, based on what was read, there were three things that needed to be discussed.
  - i. Confidentiality related to the records.
  - ii. The logistics of how members of the LSC will access the records.
  - iii. Next steps the LSC wants to take.
- J. B Whitford explained that the current LSC has a right to review any and all materials related to the renewal vote and that the confidentiality attached to the materials when created is binding to the current LSC. He suggested that, for the sake of clarity, the current LSC sign the same confidentiality agreements that the previous LSC signed. If there were any questions or doubts regarding the confidentiality, B Whitford suggested talking to L Garcia-Juarez or refer to the LSC handbook before discussing any of the materials with anyone outside of the LSC.
- K. B Whitford continued with the issue of how LSC members would access the information. He reiterated that B Katz had handed over the previous LSC's e-mail archives and facebook page information. He also said that T Hower, the previous FOIA Officer had the recordings of the executive (closed) sessions. B Whitford suggested having all the recordings transferred to J Magas, the current FOIA Officer.
- L. B Whitford stated that the final item that needed to be discussed was what role, if any, the LSC played in the arbitration. He gave the opinion that the LSC's options were limited as D Oberhardt has the right to have her appeal heard and is not interested in any sort of settlement. He stated that this suggested that the LSC had to let the arbitration play out and see what he outcome is.
- M. B Whitford said some of the LSC members had enquired about speaking to Mara Georges directly to get a better understanding of the process. She said she would be happy to meet with the LSC in closed session but that she would not do that until CPS started paying her invoices.
- N. B Whitford asked in anyone had questions.
- O. J Martensen asked about "taking away" negative reviews and if that was possible. B Whitford answered that this was something CPS Legal had suggested and C Gourash had asked about but that that due to D Oberhardt not being interested in a settlement it was not an issue. J Martensen asked if this was part of the appeal and B Whitford clarified that it would only arise if D Oberhardt asked for a settlement. B Katz added that while an evaluation could be appended he had not heard of one being rescinded. B Whitford said the issue would need to be revisited if it came up.

- P. J Magas reiterated the point of CPS Legal stating that if any community members had questions regarding the appeal to direct them to the LSC who would, in turn, ask Mara Georges for clarification. B Whitford confirmed this, stating that CPS legal was probably no longer interested in fielding questions from parents. The LSC would not answer questions from the community, but in turn ask the lawyer and then respond if possible.
- Q. J Martensen asked B Katz and C Gourash how many times the previous LSC had met with Mara Georges before having invoices paid. B Katz answered that they, as a group, never met with the lawyer, but that K Pearlman, a member of the previous LSC, was the liaison. J Martensen asked if anything had been done to invoice and B Katz answered that there was an outstanding invoice but that he couldn't explain what that was. J Martensen asked how many hours the invoice was for and B Katz repeated that he could not explain.
- R. J Martensen spoke to the topic of confidentiality stating that she appreciated that the forms were available and that she would sign them, but that the LSC would never be able to talk to anyone outside of the LSC about anything in the closed session recordings. She referred to B Whitford's statement regarding discussing the materials with anyone outside of the LSC and stated that there could be no ambiguity. B Whitford referred to the confidentiality agreements that the LSC could sign but also stated that the LSC was already bound to the same confidentiality as the previous LSC. E Perez pointed out that L Garcia-Juarez had said the same during the previous meeting. J Martensen added that the LSC needed to sign a confidentiality agreement when taking part in Principal Evaluations and the closed sessions recordings were part of that process.
- S. E Perez asked if Mara Georges would file the Position Statement if her fees had not been paid by then. B Whitford said he did not know. He added that during this time she has still been having conversations with D Oberhardt's lawyer and he assumed she was expecting to get paid. E Perez asked if the LSC was allowed to ask her questions. B Whitford answered that she was, but that taking the time to meet with the LSC after work hours might not be more than just answering questions.
- T. J Martensen stated that she did not want the lawyer filing motions if she is not willing to meet with the current LSC. E Perez echoed the sentiment, stating that even if the LSC did nothing they were still a party to the appeal and that he had a problem with things moving forward without his questions being addressed.
- U. S Quirke asked if the unpaid fees could be taken up with CPS.
- V. E Perez pointed out that CPS Legal had given 8 responses but at the same time had stated that nothing they had said should be taken as legal advice. J Martensen said that this was standard. E Perez stated that he was concerned with that legal language as it cast doubt on the statements CPS Legal made.
- W. L Garcia-Juarez clarified that the statements made by CPS Legal, of which he was a part of, did not constitute legal advice but were simply responses to the questions that were posed. He went on to say that there was no advice given as CPS is not a party in the appeal and Richie (?) was not acting as the LSC's attorney.
- X. E Perez asked if in the event that any advice given by Mara Georges contradicted what was said by CPS Legal, then the LSC should defer to Mara Georges' advice. L Garcia-Juarez answered that since CPS Legal is not a party to the process and the LSC had legal representation, that the LSC should consult their legal representation (in this case Mara Georges) moving forward. B Katz asked B Whitford if he had shared CPS Legal's responses with Mara Georges and B Whitford said he had.
- Y. E Perez asked what would happen if the LSC voted to no longer be a part of the appeal. B Whitford responded that that would be something that would need to be taken up with the lawyer as he did not have a definitive answer. His understanding was that D Oberhardt had a right to her appeal moving forward. E Perez said he did not understand it in the same way and wondered if there was a way for the process to continue without the LSC being a party to it. B Katz explained that his understanding was that the previous LSC had made a decision, D Oberhardt was appealing that decision and the current LSC was now the defendant in that appeal. He went on to say that while the current LSC could discuss how to handle that defense he didn't know how the Council could just walk away from the appeal. E Perez asked what would happen if the current LSC did not agree with the defense of the appeal. B Katz explained that the LSC had assumed the defense of the appeal in the same way that the Council had assumed access to the executive session recordings but could not choose to no longer be defendants in the appeal. E Perez agreed

and said that as defendants the LSC could choose not to contest the appeal. B Katz said that would be something that would need to be discussed in front of the community. E Perez agreed and said he would prefer not to move forward without talking to the lawyer and getting input from the community. B Katz suggested asking the lawyer about the matter. B Whitford agreed, causing other LSC members to ask how the Council would go about doing that if she was unwilling to meet with them. B Whitford said he would talk to her and get back to the LSC. [ACTION]

- Z. S Quirke suggested contacting CPS to work with them to get the lawyer invoices paid so that Mara Georges could meet with the LSC. She said the lawyer's actions were understandable since she was not being paid.
- AA. J Martensen said she had heard somewhere that no arbitration money would be paid by CPS until there was a balanced budget, including money from the State of Illinois. As a result there was nothing the LSC could do. S Quirke asked if this meant the arbitration would be delayed and B Whitford confirmed it.
- BB. B Whitford asked if anyone else had questions.
- CC. H Chang pointed out one issue he felt was germane. Referring to the closed session that involved parents giving testimony he said specific commitments were made by the previous LSC regarding confidentiality that went beyond the general OMA rules. He stated that there was a statement reflected in the minutes that said the recordings would only be used if they were subpoenaed by the arbitrator in the case and that notes taken by the LSC during those sessions would be destroyed. He asked the LSC to look into that statement and consider it. E Perez responded that, having taken the FOIA/OMA training, his understanding was that the confidentiality agreement made with the previous LSC transferred to the current one and as such no one on the current LSC could discuss anything from those sessions with anyone outside of the LSC. H Chang said he understood it as a general matter but that there was another commitment made as to the specific closed session. J Martensen said that that commitment was not for the previous LSC to have made. H Chang asked again that the LSC look into the minutes. B Whitford said the LSC would and reiterated that whatever agreement was made by the previous LSC, the current LSC would be bound by it as well.
- DD. B Katz stated that he had made a request to B Whitford regarding the closed session recordings regarding keeping track of who listens to the recordings moving forward. He explained that quorum was present during the closed sessions and that while the current LSC was free to listen to the recordings there was no current application for those recordings. There was discussion about quorum as it pertained to listening to the recordings and B Katz said he thought that if the situation arose then there would be a record of who listened to what.
- EE. H Chang again brought up the topic of the agreement made by the previous LSC regarding additional confidentiality and stated that he thought the people who had spoken to the LSC during those closed sessions be given the opportunity to comment if something other than what the previous LSC committed to. He added that some people might be willing to waive their confidentiality rights but also said that if the LSC read the language, it was fairly clear as to the commitment made. E Perez asked if there was a document available and H Chang repeated that it was in the minutes. C Gourash said she did not remember the commitment exactly with H Chang stating again that he looked up the minutes. C Gourash continued to explain her understanding of the situation, stating that the LSC at the time had understood that the recordings would be available during the timeframe in which the appeal took place. Due to the appeal still being ongoing there has been a new LSC elected. H Chang said he understood that and then explained the commitment made by the previous LSC as needing to make a recording due to OMA requirements but that the recordings would not be listened to by anyone, including the previous LSC unless it was subpoenaed by the arbitrator during the appeal process. B Whitford responded that his understanding was that the previous LSC was not in a position to make such a commitment in a way that was binding to the current LSC. H Chang said he was not sure why. J Magas and E Perez explained that it would violate the OMA requirements. H Chang said the current LSC could commit to not listening to the recordings unless the members had a reason to.
- FF. J Schott stated that if the current LSC was taking on the responsibility of calling themselves the LSC body then they would need to take on the previous LSC's

commitments regardless of their legality. She then asked if the LSC was concerned that the parent comments swayed the previous LSC and made that much of a difference so as to need to read them as opposed to the other information from the principal evaluation. B Whitford said he had not read the language related to the confidentiality commitment.

- GG. J Martensen stated the reason she wanted to listen to the recordings as wanting to understand the reason behind the decision taken by the previous LSC. J Schott clarified and asked specifically about the parent comments. J Martensen asked if those comments contained information about children or IEPs. N Colella stated there was information in the closed sessions that if the members of the LSC had been interested in they could have called and asked them about. J Martensen asked again if there was information about IEPs in the recording of the closed session with the parents and both N Colella and S Colella answered that there was.
- HH. B Katz explained that the issue with the sessions with parents and teachers was that there was an added layer of confidentiality that people were under the impression existed, whether it was beyond OMA or not, or, as C Gourash had explained, due to the LSC describing the situation as something exceptional and as such the current members of the LSC should be sensitive to. J Martensen asked if the sessions were labeled. T Hower responded that the LSC now had all the notes and agendas pointed out that H Chang was able to find those notes so the LSC should be able to find them. S Quirke asked if the parents spoke on one specific date. Some attendees responded that they were.
- II. W Raphael asked that if the LSC was bound by confidentiality and could not speak to anyone outside of the LSC about what was in the recordings what the issue with the current LSC listening to the recordings was. J Martensen answered that some parents did not trust the LSC to which N Colella responded that he did not trust the LSC. He added that he did not like the agenda that was on the table regarding pulling out of the appeal which he categorized as a joke.
- JJ. T Hower stated that the previous year had been eye-opening in that he had assumed parents could talk to each other as adults but then some parents FOIA'd other parents rather than just talking to them. N Colella said it was because everyone was a coward. T Hower said that if anything involved a child the LSC should err on the side of being compassionate and careful. J Martensen said she was not interested in listening to the sessions with the parents or teachers, but rather only the session where the previous LSC discussed their decision-making process after evaluating all the information to which T Hower responded that that was in now in the LSC's possession.
- KK. S Colella asked what the purpose of listening to the closed sessions was other than curiosity to which J Martensen said that was her reason. S Colella stated that that was not a very good reason adding that as a body representing the school community there should be more than personal curiosity. She said that if the LSC needed to continue to defend the appeal, then it made sense, but if the appeal was being delayed indefinitely there might not be a reason to listen to the recordings. She repeated that if the reason was to defend the appeal then it was necessary to perform due diligence and listen to everything so as to make an informed decision but added that if the appeal was delayed then there was no reason to. J Martensen explained that there was some legal action taking place at the end of September, to which B Whitford said it was only the lawyers presenting what they were planning to present during the arbitration. J Martensen responded that that included a list of witnesses. B Whitford said that that was not something the LSC would be involved with.
- LL. H Chang said he wanted to clarify his position and said that he didn't see how honoring the previous LSC's commitment to not allow anyone to hear the closed session recordings would violate their responsibilities. He reiterated that the previous LSC had made such a commitment. J Magas asked what the purpose of recording a meeting was if the recording would never be listened to again. H Chang answered that he was told that it was due to OMA rules. C Gourash said they were all there at the meetings. B Katz explained that the challenge was that other than C Gourash and himself, no one from the current LSC was at those meetings. The substance of their discussions regarding the principal review were the discussions, not the recordings with the parents. J Martensen repeated that she was interested in the recordings of their discussions, not the recordings with the parents.
- MM. B Whitford asked if anyone was interested in listening to the recordings of the closed sessions with parents, explaining that while he did not want to limit access due to what CPS Legal had explained to him regarding the LSC's right to access them he also felt the

issue was moot if no one was interested in listening to the sessions. He clarified that it was not a binding vote. J Magas asked if there was only one session with parents. E Perez said he was not personally interested but said he was concerned with the possibility that other sessions referenced information in the session with the parents.

- NN. S Quirke proposed having a Q&A session in closed session with B Katz and C Gourash as a way to gain information that would be pertinent to the appeal. This would address the concerns being brought up by parents while also answering any questions the current LSC might have. J Martensen said she still wanted to hear the recordings.
- OO. S McNabb stated that she believed the current LSC had a right to have access to the information but asked what the intention of the LSC was in listening. She said that if anyone had the intention of not defending the work of the previous LSC, which members of the LSC had a right to do if they voted publicly to do so, it would be unethical and arbitrary without the entire LSC listening to all the recordings. She believed that B Katz and C Gourash would do a good job of representing what happened the previous year but that it would not be enough, even if all the members of the previous LSC were to explain what happened, since it happened six months ago. She reiterated her request to the the LSC to think about their intentions and to have everyone listen to all the recordings rather than have only some people listen and report back to the rest of the LSC.
- PP. E Perez stated that his intention was to listen to the recordings so as to understand the legal proceeding that he was now a party to. He went on to say that after reviewing the information if he felt the decision was justified then he would back away from the proceedings and let the appeal run its course. S McNabb said that that intention was important as an individual but also as a body carrying on the work that was done previously and to be clear with the larger community.
- QQ. H Chang clarified his view once more by stating that he understood that the current LSC had a right to access the information, but that as a continuing body, it should honor the commitment made by the previous LSC.
- RR. J Martensen stated that the more people said she could not listen to something, the more she felt she needed to. N Colella asked J Martensen if she was twelve years old. She continued by saying that she was interested in finding something that would explain the previous LSC's decision. N Colella asked if it was to see if her friend didn't get her job anymore (referring to D Oberhardt). J Martensen said that if she didn't deserve to then she shouldn't to which N Colella responded that she didn't. J Martensen said she did not know that and asked to let her make that decision to which N Colella responded that the decision had already been made. He said that she should have shown up to the meeting but J Martensen clarified that the meeting was a closed session.
- SS. T Hower said that there was nothing in the recordings that would be surprising. He added that it was parents who, in good faith, gave feedback. H Chang explained again that some parents would be happy to waive their rights but that a commitment had been made.
- TT. B Whitford said the LSC would look into the commitment. B Katz said that there were numerous recordings made before the parent feedback session so if anyone wanted to listen to the recordings in chronological there would be a lot of time before they got to that recording.
- UU. J Martensen stated that people needed to understand that the current LSC was not given the reasons for D Oberhardt's non-renewal. N Colella told her she should ask D Oberhardt to which J Martensen responded that since July 1<sup>st</sup> that was not allowed as she was a defendant in the appeal. N Colella repeated that she should ask D Oberhardt.
- VV. B Katz asked L Garcia-Juarez if the previous LSC could share D Oberhardt's evaluations with the current LSC. L Garcia-Juarez responded that the current LSC should have access to all the material generated by the previous LSC. J Martensen repeated that that was the material she was most interested in. B Katz said that the evaluations consisted of the annual and culminative reviews which were voted on publicly. He added that these could also be starting points.
- WW. J Martensen asked if the Chief's reviews were included. C Gourash said that T Hower would have those, to which T Hower responded that they had been given to D Oberhardt. J Martensen asked if they had been considered in her renewal. S McNabb stated her concern that the discussion was getting into details that were not public.
- XX. L Garcia-Juarez stated that the LSC should not agree to things that were not within its scope of authority. His understanding was that the previous LSC decided that no one

would go back to the recordings unless they were subject to an arbitration hearing. Even if everyone on the LSC had intended to honor that commitment, the LSC could not bind itself to something it cannot honor because the LSC cannot prevent members from accessing information that is theirs in relation to the job that they do. He may have been in agreement to not go back but if the situation arose where it was needed to go back to re-assess the information that was said, as a Council member he would have a right to go back. He explained to H Chang that even if the LSC had acted in good faith and stated that the appeal would be over before the previous LSC's term ended, they did not have the authority to do that because it violates the Council's ability to work. Moving forward he advised the LSC not to make commitments that limit the work that it does. H Chang asked if L Garcia-Juarez was giving legal advice, to which he responded that he was not, but only giving advice to the LSC in terms of what they would do moving forward specifically since the Principal Evaluation was on the agenda. He further explained that he was not an attorney and not allowed to comment on the current arbitration. He asked if there was any doubts to what he had said to which S Quirke answered that the LSC should not make any promises it cannot keep. L Garcia-Juarez added that if it violated the work the LSC was tasked to do.

YY. H Chang offered a response to L Garcia-Juarez, explaining again the agreement made by the LSC in that they did not want to make a recording but were obliged by OMA to do so. If the OMA did not exist the LSC would have listened, process the information and no evidence would have existed after the closed session it would only be reflected in the decision-making. They went on to say that they would not listen to the recordings unless subpoenaed by the arbitration. He understood L Garcia-Juarez' point and said that if a situation arose when the LSC needed to listen to the recordings then the LSC should let the parents who spoke know. Barring that, to him, a clear commitment was made.

ZZ. E Perez asked if one of the reasons not to make commitments that limit the LSC's ability to work was also to not limit the ability of the following LSC. L Garcia-Juarez responded that the LSC should not limit their ability to work even if it is in good faith. He gave an example where even if the LSC voted to not revisit certain material they could not enforce that later on as it limits the Council's ability to work.

AAA. B Whitford noted that there would be time for Open Forum if anyone else wanted to speak on the topic but that the LSC needed to move onto the next item on the agenda.

#### **VII. Approve Funds transfer [8:20PM]**

A. K Valentine began by stating that she had been waiting to hear information regarding the process of accepting PTO funds. She explained that if the PTO wanted to donate funds to the school the funds would go into the school's internal accounts assigned to lines corresponding to the intended purpose of the donations. The LSC would need to vote only if the administration needed to spend more than the limit set by the LSC. As there were no items that needed to be paid for, the LSC did not need to vote to transfer funds, only if they wanted to increase the spending limit. J Martensen asked if the agenda item was to approve funds being paid to the PTO. K Valentine said no funds had been removed from the internal accounts.

#### **VIII. Spending Limits [8:22PM]**

A. C Gourash stated that she thought the limit was currently set at \$1,000. In the past the LSC had been asked to raise it to \$2,000. She looked at the checks that were written in the past year and of the 167 checks that were written only one was over \$2,000, none between \$1,500 and \$2,000 and eleven between \$1,000 and \$1,500. She could not speak to the transfers made within the GLs as the LSC did not see those. She indicated that prior spending showed the limit didn't need to be over \$1500. K Valentine said she did not have a preference and would work with whatever the LSC decided.

B. J Martensen asked L Garcia-Juarez if the spending limit was \$2,500 for elementary schools and he answered that that amount was for high schools. When asked what the limit was for elementary schools he responded that it was \$1,000. J Martensen asked what the limit the LSC could raise the spending limit to and L Garcia-Juarez responded that it was unlimited. He added that there were other safeguards, citing \$10,000 as one.

C. S Quirke said that based on the evidence C Gourash provided that \$1,500 seemed logical and asked if she could make a motion to approve the limit. Other members noted that no further discussion had taken place. E Perez agreed with S Quirke. J Magas said he saw no reason to go higher to \$2,000 so as to not make K Valentine have to request a vote

form the LSC more often. J Martensen said that the raising the spending limit was a show of trust and suggested raising it to \$2,500.

- D. J Magas made a motion to raise the spending limit to \$2,000. E Perez seconded.
- E. Passed unanimously

**IX. Principal Evaluation [8:26PM]**

- A. B Whitford explained that the the LSC needed to start thinking about the timeline regarding the Principal Evaluation as it was a big part of what the LSC would be doing. He added that the LSC needed to make some decisions about how they would go about doing it. The next deadline in the Principal Evaluation process is November 4<sup>th</sup> by which the needs to decide if it wants to add any criteria to the evaluation. B Whitford suggested the LSC begin to think about what criteria, if any, to add.
- B. B Katz stated that it was best to start everything earlier and to get the dates and framework on a calendar. Last year's process was much easier but due to this being the first time for the current LSC it would be best to plan out preliminary meetings and discussion.
- C. B Whitford said there were various ways to split up the work and that it needed to be decided then how to proceed.
- D. C Gourash stated that the evaluation process was one of the most important responsibilities and that everyone should understand the competencies, the expectations are and that everyone is actively involved in collecting the information needed to make that decision. She did not feel comfortable dividing it up. J Magas agreed.
- E. B WHitford asked C Gourash if she felt it would be better to have everyone on the LSC involved in evidence gathering. She said she did and then explained the timeline for how the survey was rolled out to the various stakeholders during the previous two Principal Evaluations.
- F. B Whitford stated that he wanted to avoid waiting until the end of the year to put everything together, instead making sure to have enough time to course-correct if needed.
- G. J Martensen said that, in terms of evidence that would be gathered, what the LSC did in the meetings would be the evidence, so she did not believe there would be scrambling at the end.
- H. C Gourash added that there was an important component that some of the Council was not privy to that the teachers could bring. She recommended that there be a way to gather those insights.
- I. E Perez asked how the PPLC would factor into the evaluation. D Barber answered that there was an item on the agenda for the PPLC to give a report after meeting with the faculty.
- J. B Katz recommend the LSC review the steps of the evaluation together so as to familiarize themselves with the process. After completing it once it would become much easier. He added that the new version of the evaluation was much more transparent than previous versions. He suggested that the objective be understanding the evaluation rather than gathering evidence. S Quirke asked if that meant devoting time during meetings to go through the process to which B Katz answered in the affirmative.
- K. J Martensen asked if everyone had done their training. If not, the members who had not could receive credit hours from L Garcia-Juarez. S Quirke recommended doing the training in person. S Quirke suggested finalizing training before October and adding an item to the October Regular meeting to review the tool.
- L. B Whitford asked if it made sense to have a feedback meeting halfway through the year to assess where things were at. There was discussion regarding having a mid-year review ass well as a feedback session after the evaluation was complete. S Quirke stated that she preferred not to have any surprises in terms of K Valentine's expectations from the LSC.
- M. B Whitford asked if there was anything to discuss. S Quirke reiterated her recommendation to finish training and add an item to the October meeting's agenda.  
[ACTION]
- N. C Gourash suggested thinking about any additional criteria that the LSC would like to add. She gave the example of updating/reviewing curricula. She was unsure if such a task could be implemented in a year but at the very least there should be a document outlining the plan to do so. Another item she proposed was community-building. If others voiced their priorities then common themes could emerge.

- O. B Whitford asked K Valentine her thoughts on the process. She responded that her ideas were broad and that conversations be transparent throughout the school community and that they are done in the the spirit of generosity. She believed the community was made of learners, herself included, and hoped that idea could be communicated.
- P. E Perez asked if his understanding was correct in that if members of the LSC had criteria they wanted to add to the evaluation they should discuss them and then finalize any they agreed on before the November 4<sup>th</sup> deadline. B Whitford confirmed this. B Katz and J Martensen stated that any changes needed to be approved by CPS. B Katz added that other things such as surveys also needed to be approved by CPS Legal . B Whitford asked what the lead time for that was.
- Q. L Garcia-Juarez clarified that any additional criteria did not need to be approved by CPS Legal, but that if the Principal did not agree with the criteria the LSC could not bind her to it. Surveys did need to be sent to L Garcia-Juarez who would then send it onto CPS Legal. Once there was a response he would send it back to the LSC. The lead time was usually about ten days.

**X. Communication [8:39PM]**

- A. S Quirke summarized what had gone on before with the Communications Survey that was passed during the previous meeting and suggested moving forward with the Constant Contact solution. She felt it would be a good place to start as the current LSC web site was in need of updating. She acknowledged that there was still the topic of parent involvement in the development of a web site but felt that unifying with the PTO and administration would be in the LSC's best interest. She went on to say that the Communication Survey should be tabled but that a survey for the Principal Evaluation made sense.
- B. S Quirke recommended placing an LSC bulletin board in the lobby of the school building for posting agendas, minutes as well as information on the LSC members. She felt it was important, especially for Kindergarten parents, to have something like that and offered to purchase a board that could be installed. She asked if this required a vote. B Katz thought the bulletin board idea was fine.
- C. B Katz talked about the web site in terms of parent involvement. He explained that the LSC should consider turn-over and how much parents could be involved as well as other criteria including cross-platform compatibility and technical support and response if something breaks down. E Perez responded that the Wix.com solution provided 24/7 technical support so if anything did break it would not be parents who would be responsible for providing support. He reiterated that the solution provided other services such as e-mail and security and that of the solutions he had mentioned before, it was the least dependent on users being tech-savvy. He added that there could be multiple admins among the three sites (school, LSC and PTO) so it would not be a case of a single parent owning the web site. He repeated that the Educational Networks sites he visited were not aesthetically pleasing and felt that ERGC parents could provide something better. He added that some parents had already voiced interest in helping with updating the web site and that he felt that \$3,600 per year Educational Networks was a lot for the quality of work that they provided. B Katz explained that the previous LSC had looked into other solutions in terms including those E Perez had brought up.
- D. B Katz said that another criteria would be if there were components that were already built. J Martensen asked if those solutions provided templates to which E Perez answered that they did along with the ability to create unique designs. He added that Wix and Squarespace offered drag-and-drop plug-ins for calendaring, e-mail blasts and newsletters.
- E. J Doyle added other criteria to consider. She brought up the issue of depending on parents to maintain and update the site and the possible delay in posting content. She felt that even if parents were able to create an amazing, user-friendly web site that there would need to be someone in-house who would have to do all the updating. E Perez clarified that Educational Networks would also need someone in-house to update content. J Doyle said she thought that if there was a unique integration that was needed that there would be overhead in terms of time and that none of the faculty had experience in web site design and maintenance. She went on to say that what she liked about the Educational Insights [sic] solution was that the web site development and maintenance was their priority. ERGC would provide direction in terms of what the site would look like

but everything else would be their responsibility allowing parents and staff to make “kids first”. She asked the LSC to consider all that. S Quirke asked K Valentine if it would be possible to have that kind of arrangement with Educational Networks. K Valentine said she was not saying that Educational Networks was the way to go, but only an effort to contribute to the conversation. She was concerned that thinking about which solution to go with would delay moving forward with any solution. She admitted to not being a technology expert but that this was a way to contribute. K Valentine said that she had used Educational Networks before and that they had gone through various rounds of iterations before signing off on the web site implementation so she was confident they would provide ERGC with various options.

- F. B Whitford asked E Perez how long he thought it would take to implement an in-house solution. E Perez said he was unsure due to not having commitments from parents in terms of meeting to discuss the site development but he estimated it would be done within a month. He gave a high-level description of the steps needed including having the current site evaluated by a parent who had experience with User Experience, then developing wireframes.
- G. B Whitford asked K Valentine how long it would take Educational Networks to develop the site. K Valentine answered that due to an influx of requests that they would try to get it done before school started but that she believed it would be done one to two weeks after school started. She went on to explain that her experience was that Educational Networks would send out a professional photographer but that the schools would then upload their own photos so that what E Perez had seen were probably the latter.
- H. J Martensen asked if the University of Chicago solution (CUIP) could host the site if the parents developed it. E Perez also asked if CSS and HTML files could be sent to them for hosting. K Valentine said she did not know as she was not an expert in technology but that Russ, her contact at CUIP, was extraordinary. J Doyle said that after having a conversation with Russ she believed that it would be possible but that the true value of was the hands-on tech support including showing teachers how to use the site in the classroom and that in her opinion there would not be much value-add if they were only maintain the site.
- I. B Whitford summarized the choices as moving forward with the Educational Networks solution at \$3,600/year and then possibly swapping it out with something made by parents or going with the parent-developed site and if it doesn't work, swapping it out with the Educational Networks site.
- J. J Martensen asked K Valentine if the \$3,600/year quote was the only one or if she had received others. K Valentine answered that she had received another quote which was more expensive but since she had just received it she had not shared it out with anyone. J Martensen said they had used another vendor to create a similar site and thought they had only spent about \$1,800 for its development. She said she would look for it when she got home and send the info to K Valentine. [ACTION]
- K. E Perez asked if it would make sense to postpone the vote until J Martensen acquired a quote. C Gourash said that at that point work couldn't even start. B Katz said the priority was to replace the old site as soon as possible and then consider a long-term solution. S Quirke agreed, saying that if this was seen as a learning experience where the Educational Networks site could be deployed while the parent-developed version could be developed in the background.
- L. J Martensen asked if the LSC could vote to allow K Valentine to move forward with the Educational Networks solution while allowing E Perez to give feedback.
- M. W Raphael asked if the school would be forced to host the web site with Educational Networks or if it could be hosted elsewhere. K Valentine answered that she did not know. W Raphael followed up by asking of the school would own the content and, in the event that the decision was made to go with someone else later, if the school could then take the content elsewhere. K Valentine answered that the school would be able to take the content elsewhere. W Raphael asked if, in essence, the school was renting space from Educational Networks. Various members of the LSC confirmed this. E Perez said it was basically a subscription service.
- N. J Martensen stated that the PTO had already agreed to pay for it.
- O. E Perez commented that he felt that the LSC web site and all communication from the LSC be run by the LSC. His concern was that when LSC communication is bundled within

the newsletter it may get lost, especially when it was related to time-sensitive information (special meeting notices) or requesting feedback from the community (principal evaluation). He asked K Valentine if by using Constant Contact the LSC would have their own e-mail address and if that part of the email system would be separate from the rest of the email system. K Valentine explained that there was a generic login that she had shared with H Steiner and would share with the LSC. Any correspondence from the LSC would need to be titled as such in the subject line but the e-mail address listed would be the generic ERGC address. E Perez asked if the LSC, should the need arise, would be able to send out an e-mail at any time and K Valentine responded that the LSC would be able to do that. B Katz said that the decision to send out an email would be mitigated by a 48-hour time limit. E Perez said he understood that, but that his concern was the LSC being able to send out its own email instead of waiting for the next newsletter to be sent out. K Valentine further explained that she had set up the email lists according to grades so as to make more specifically targeted emails easier to send out.

- P. B Katz explained that in the past when surveys needed to be sent out that the LSC had mapped out a schedule so that it was agreed upon ahead of time when emails would be sent out. E Perez added that his concern was related to not getting enough responses and the need to remind parents of filling out the survey, if needed.
- Q. J Martensen stated that, as Secretary, E Perez should have access to Constant Contact. E Perez added that according to the LSC bylaws one of the Secretary's duties was correspondence. E Perez then stated that he would prefer to have the LSC site as its own stand-alone site under the purview of the LSC. J Martensen said that she agreed with K Valentine in that it should fall under the same site. She gave an example of another site that had tabs for the LSC and PTO. She believed it would be better to have a "one stop shop" instead of having individual web sites for each entity. A parent agreed to that idea. B Whitford asked if the LSC would have the capability to post items such as minutes and agendas. K Valentine confirmed that. B Katz explained that permissions could be granted to individuals within certain sections of the sites and that those permissions can be set up based on a criteria before the site is implemented.
- R. J Martensen made a motion to allow K Valentine to decide what solution to go with. B Katz seconded. Passed unanimously.
- S. B Whitford asked if the LSC needed to vote to approve any expenses. K Valentine explained that the next steps would be to receive a purchase order (PO) from Educational Networks and then vote to approve an expenditure of more than \$3,600. The money would be deposited into the internal accounts by the PTO and from there K Valentine would pay for the PO. B Katz added that the expenditure would need to be presented before a vote could take place, either at the next meeting or a special meeting. J Martensen pointed out that only quorum would be needed to vote on the expenditure so it could happen at the school provided there was 48 hour notice.
- T. B Whitford moved onto the item regarding the Communication Survey. S Quirke made a motion to table the survey since Constant Contact would be used to communicate with parents. B Katz suggested sending out a survey once the web site was in place to gauge how well things are after that. E Perez seconded the motion. Passed unanimously.
- U. B Whitford asked if the Council wanted to vote on the bulletin board. E Perez made a motion to purchase a bulletin board and place it in the hallway. J Magas seconded. Passed unanimously. C Gourash said she had a bulletin board that she would donate. Various members said they would not put their photos on it.

**XI. Vote to approve the minutes from the meeting on July [9PM]**

- A. B Whitford moved to approve the minutes from the meetings on July 7<sup>th</sup> and July 21<sup>st</sup>. J Martensen seconded.
- B. Passed unanimously

**XII. Committee Formation [9:05PM]**

- A. B Whitford stated that he thought it best in some cases to have a person who is coordinating a particular issue so that if any members of the LSC have ideas they could contact that person. This would allow the LSC members to think about issues between meetings then bring ideas to the meetings. He said he thought Communication could be one of those items that someone could take on if there were issues with the e-mail system, for example. In this way everyone would know who to contact regarding Communication. J Martensen said E Perez could be that person. J Martensen mentioned

the Budget as another issue and B Whitford also listed the CIWP as something that has had a committee in the past. He said he was unsure if there was a need for a committee or if it could just be someone who would deal with these issues.

- B. B Katz asked if the LSC was establishing a point of contact instead of a committee. B Whitford said there were different ways of doing it. He explained that it could be a committee that holds meetings, a committee that is dormant but can call meetings when needed, or it could be someone designated to be the point person. He said the LSC should decide how to handle those.
- C. J Martensen stated that there were standing committees that all LSCs had, listing the CIWP, Budget and Principal Evaluation. L Garcia-Juarez corrected her and said that the only standing committee was the PPLC.
- D. S Quirke summarized discussions from previous meetings, pointing out that committees would be bound by OMA rules, needing 48 hour advance notice. As a result it had been suggested that informal committees be formed or that a point person be designated to collect information to move forward.
- E. B Katz added that it could be run as a principal task force with K Valentine organizing the groups and working with the LSC to identify members of the community, thus avoiding OMA guidelines.
- F. J Martensen clarified that she had been under the impression that there were standard committees that were established for LSCs and any additional committees needed to be voted on and added as an amendment to the bylaws. She stated that she was pretty sure the ERGC LSC bylaws had those committees established. B Whitford confirmed that the bylaws did have those committees as standing committees. Various members of the LSC said that needed to change.
- G. J Martensen said she would like to keep those same standing committees or appoint point persons for them. B Whitford asked for clarification and J Martensen responded that she wanted the Budget. E Perez stated that he believed some of the issues required full committees, especially the CIWP since there was also parental involvement. J Martensen agreed. E Perez said he thought Communication could have a point person while the Budget should also have a full committee. He added that things like Budget and CIWP required a lot of work.
- H. B Whitford explained that even if the LSC created a committee it would not need to meet regularly. The chairperson of the committee would be the point person and if they needed to have a meeting they could schedule one. B Katz added that the chairperson could report at the LSC meetings but if there was nothing that had been done in the interim there would be no report.
- I. J Martensen suggested the Budget committee consist of K Valentine, B Whitford and H Steiner with B Whitford as chairman. The committee would discuss any budget issues that arise during the time in between LSC meetings. B Whitford stated that K Valentine, H Steiner and himself had arranged a bi-weekly meeting in which budget issues could be discussed if needed. He said that that might be enough, but added that if someone wanted to be part of the committee that could also be an option.
- J. C Gourash explained that while currently the budget has been managed as how much money the school has and if it's being spent appropriately and if there are overages. What she felt was missing from the budget was understanding what the school would like to invest in if money were not an issue. For example, if the teachers could have everything they wanted, what would those things be? If there were bigger ticket items that were needed that could drive other groups related to the CIWP so as to look at fundraising. She added that she would prefer to change the name from "Budget" to "Funding/Strategy."
- K. J Martensen added that due to her 8 years of experience on other LSCs and familiarity with dealing with budget issues in terms of understanding the nuances of how funds can be used she felt she would be a good resource on the Budget Committee. She stated again that if there were to be a Budget Committee she wanted to be on it.
- L. B Whitford asked the LSC how they wanted to proceed.
- M. S Quirke asked J Martensen if she would be able to attend the bi-weekly meetings to which J Martensen answered that she could not but wanted to take part in bigger decisions.
- N. B Katz if anything would be done with the committees that were being established before the next meeting. He added that if not, then members should come to the next meeting

with ideas on how to refine the committees since there would be no need for the committees before then.

- O. L Garcia-Juarez recommended that if bylaws existed that established how the LSC should proceed with the committees that they be reviewed before the next meeting so as to decide to suspend, revise or keep them as is. J Martensen volunteered to take that on. B Whitford said he was going to suggest doing so as he considered them archaic. He added that there was a model in the LSC Reference Manual. L Garcia-Juarez also added that bylaws are not required.
- P. B Whitford said the topic would be revisited at the next meeting.

**XIII. Open Forum [9:10PM]**

- A. S McNabb asked if the agenda could be displayed on the projector during the meetings so attendees could see it. She gave C Gourash credit for the idea.
- B. T Hower enquired about the computer inventory asking if any progress had been made or about getting parents engaged. K Valentine said due to other needs related to getting the school ready there had not been anything done. She explained that at the end of each year the schools were required to complete and asset inventory. Due to not being at the school at that time she did not know what that looked like. She added that she can obtain it and share it with the LSC in time for the next meeting. [ACTION]
- C. C Gourash asked K Valentine if she was going to discuss the school fees. K Valentine said she had already updated the LSC and explained that part of the work she had done regarding the budget was concerned with the student fees. She had sought guidance from various people in CPS on how to proceed. As she understood it some families had been reimbursed in varied amounts after asking for refunds. She was unable to figure out the rationale or the amounts. She had forwarded the documentation that had been sent to parents regarding the breakdown of how the fees would be used to the Auditing Department at CPS. The issue was escalated and K Valentine was notified that the administration was not allowed to return student fees unless it was a situation where a student had paid for attending an event which they did not attend. That situation did not apply to ERGC so K Valentine was provided with clear language as well as contact information for anyone concerned with the issue. Because the fees were collected in a general way, despite giving a breakdown of where the money was intended to be spent, the administration is not required to get parent approval to spend the fees. The funds were distributed to the appropriate lines in the internal accounts (ie: In the internal accounts there is a line for Technology that has \$31,000 from the fees) so that when they are spent they are used for their intended purpose. K Valentine proposed a moratorium on school fees for the 2016-2017 school year barring any unforeseen circumstances. This would allow the LSC to come up with a plan for fees moving forward that would be efficient. It would also allow for researching what other schools do, best practices and getting parental input.
- D. J Martensen said that her understanding was that a lot of the money designated for technology was part of the technology plan that had been in place during the previous years. While looking on the web site she noted that year one was explained while year two and three were not. She asked if anyone could explain where things were at or if the tech plan was completed. B Katz stated that the tech plan was legacy from the administration previous to the last one and that there had not been a comprehensive evaluation of it. J Doyle added that the tech plan was not followed in its entirety, stating that a lot of hardware was purchased but that when it came to professional development and an allowance for extended day money not all of those things were fulfilled. As a result the plan came to a standstill and focused on hardware purchasing instead of being a holistic infrastructure around it. Year two and three were not fleshed out as the school was waiting for some of those things to be fleshed out.
- E. T Hower explained that if there was reticence to parent involvement when it came to long-term objectives the tech plan was a good example of why. While there was excitement for the three-year plan, after half a year parent involvement disappeared. He said it was great when it worked but to be aware that it may not.
- F. J Martensen asked if the needs addressed by the budget were met when it came to the textbooks and subscriptions adding that the Clerk would have access to that information. K Valentine said she had been talking to the Clerk about that and that the larger needs were met but that she could not speak to the more strategic moves, such as Scholastic,

and would need to ask her. J Martensen said she was asking so as to know why last year's fees were still sitting in the accounts. K Valentine said she wasn't sure it was appropriate to contact D Oberhardt to obtain that information but could ask others.

- G. E Perez said he believed he had heard that there was a an intended use for the fees. B Katz said that the topic of the fees was brought up at the beginning of the year but were tabled. He said there was something opaque to the LSC at the beginning of the year and so was not surprised that the reason was cryptic. J Martensen asked if the LSC saw the budget every month at the LSC meetings. B Katz confirmed this and said that the fees were asked about. C Gourash added that she had asked in February and March about the money in the Technology bucket and suggested using it for the 8<sup>th</sup> grade students since they would not be benefitting from any new technology that would be obtained for the school. She added that when the topic was brought up that devices were 1 to 1+ and that the LSC had said that items like professional development and software would be needed. She personally believed the Tech Coordinator would fit in that bucket and that other things needed to happen, such as teachers requesting software and professional development. She said the LSC could not make recommendations; this is not their area of expertise. She stated again that it had been brought up.

**XIV. Agenda discussion [9:20PM]**

- A. B Whitford listed the topics that were outstanding and would need to be covered in the next meeting, including the bylaws, committees and the web site.
- B. K Valentine said that there could potentially be a PO ready and the LSC would need to vote on the CUIP program. They would split funds but the expenditure would be over \$2,000.

**XV. Adjournment**

- A. B Whitford made a motion to adjourn the meeting, B Katz seconded
- B. Passed unanimously
- C. Meeting adjourned at 9:21PM