

**NEW TRIER TOWNSHIP HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT 203
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION
December 1, 2020
New Trier Township High School
7 Happ Road
Room C234
Northfield, IL 60093**

A **Special Meeting** of the Board of Education of New Trier Township High School District 203, Cook County, Illinois was held on Tuesday, December 1, 2020 at 5:30 p.m.

Members Present

Ms. Cathy Albrecht, President
Mr. Keith Dronen
Ms. Carol Ducommun
Dr. Marc Glucksman, Vice President
Ms. Jean Hahn
Mr. Brad McLane
Mr. Greg Robitaille

Administrators Present

Dr. Paul Sally, Superintendent
Mr. Christopher Johnson, Associate Superintendent for Finance & Operations
Mrs. Denise Dubravec, Winnetka Campus Principal
Dr. Tim Hayes, Assistant Superintendent for Student Services
Dr. Joanne Panopoulos, Assistant Superintendent for Special Education
Mr. Paul Waechtler, Northfield Campus Principal

Also Present

Ms. Christine Estberg, Science Department Faculty; Mr. Alfred Estberg, Mathematics Department Faculty; Ms. Jen McDonough, Applied Arts Department Faculty and New Trier High School Educational Association President; Mr. Mike Hill, Technology Department; Mr. Eric Johnson, Technology Department; Ms. Lindsey Ruston, Board of Education Secretary; other administrators, faculty and staff, members of the press and community.

BUSINESS MEETING

***I. CALL TO ORDER – 5:30 p.m. – Zoom**

Ms. Albrecht called the Special Meeting of December 1, 2020 of the Board of Education to order at 5:30 p.m. Ms. Albrecht then stated that a full in-person meeting is not practical or prudent due to the Governor’s declared disaster.

Roll call was taken, and all members were present.

Ms. Albrecht asked for a motion to move to Closed Session. Mr. Robitaille moved that the Board adjourn to closed session for the purpose of the appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of specific employees of the District or legal counsel for the District, including hearing testimony on a complaint lodged against an employee or against legal counsel for the District to determine its validity; collective negotiating matters between the District and its employees or their representatives, or deliberations concerning salary schedules for one or more classes of employees; and litigation, when an action against, affecting or on behalf of the particular District has been filed and is pending before a court or administrative tribunal, or when the District finds that an action is probable or imminent, in which case the basis for the finding shall be recorded and entered into the closed meeting minutes. Ms. Hahn seconded the motion. Upon a roll call vote being taken, the members voted as follows:

AYE: Ms. Ducommun, Dr. Glucksman, Ms. Hahn, Mr. McLane, Mr. Robitaille, Mr. Dronen, Ms. Albrecht

NAY: none

The motion passed.

II. CLOSED SESSION – 5:30 p.m. – Staff Dining Room

III. BUSINESS MEETING – Open Session – 6:00 p.m. – C234

Ms. Albrecht recalled the Special Meeting of December 1, 2020 of the Board of Education to order at 6:10 p.m. Dr. Glucksman and Mr. McLane participated via telephone. Roll call was taken, and all members were present.

IV. Communications

Ms. Albrecht invited anyone from the audience who wished to address the Board to come forward and fill out a yellow communications request form and give it to Ms. Niki Dizon, Director of Communications. There were 26 requests for public comment. All comments were to be made in accordance with Board Policy 2-230, including keeping to a three minute or less time limit. Thirty minutes are usually reserved for public comments, but since many would like to share their thoughts, the time was doubled to one hour. Ms. Albrecht urged anyone who is speaking to shorten their comments to less than three minutes, as it would allow for more people to speak.

1. Mr. Eric Hungness, parent, urged the Board to select the two-track option beginning next week.
2. Mr. Dan Lawler, English Department Faculty, shared comments about accommodations, particularly those with childcare needs and the remote teaching option.
3. Mr. Mark Anderson, parent, urged the Board to select the two-track model and bring more students into the building.
4. Ms. Heather Oliver, parent, spoke on behalf of Ms. Emily Axelrod, resident and Ms. Oliver's mother. She shared comments on supporting bringing students back into the classroom, especially with the saliva screening.
5. Mr. Alfred Estberg, Mathematics Department Faculty, urged consistency for students and shared his thoughts on morale amongst the teachers.
6. Ms. Dylan Levin, student, shared her experience as a Trevian and urged for an increase to 50%.
7. Mr. Scott Sibert, parent, shared comments about further opening the school.
8. Ms. Jessica Reimer, New Trier Learning Center faculty, spoke on behalf of those who could not attend this evening. These comments were from Ms. Lisa Dublin, Social Work Department Faculty, and Mr. Matt Stuczynski, Library Department Faculty. Ms. Dublin's comments centered on not supporting a return to in-person and encouraging an adaptive pause. Mr. Stuczynski's comments focused on the morale of teachers.
9. Ms. Aileen Geary, Social Studies Department Faculty, shared comments compiled by Ms. Judy Weiss, Modern and Classical Languages Department Faculty, Mr. Brett Rubin, English Department Faculty, Mr. Tom Lau, Art Department Faculty and Ms. Lindsay Arado, Social Studies Department Faculty. Their comments directly addressed a few points made by the group Open New Trier. Ms. Geary concluded that now is the time to care for the most vulnerable students and staff and not forge ahead.
10. Dr. Carrie Mendoza, parent, shared comments about supporting the full reopening of New Trier High School.
11. Ms. Nancy Fehrenbach, parent, shared her concerns for her son's peers, particularly their mental health. She urged leveraging the saliva screening as much as possible and returning students to in-person learning to the greatest extent possible.
12. Ms. Kathleen Tallmadge, Social Studies Department Faculty, spoke on behalf of Ms. Felissa Onixt, Art Department Faculty. She shared Ms. Onixt's thoughts about the administration when she was notified, via the saliva screening, that she was presumed positive.
13. Mr. Kerry Hall, Social Studies Department Faculty, shared that last week he spoke for himself, but this evening his comments were on behalf of others. He noted that he did not have time to speak about a cancer survivor colleague who has accommodations. Instead he went on to share comments from Ms. Katherine Linsenmeier, Mathematics Department Faculty, noting that she likes the saliva screening, but does not think the community metrics should be ignored. She would like to focus on expanding the E track with students who are most in need. He also shared comments from Ms. Gina Fyock, Science Department Faculty, about morale and encouraged standing up for a safer situation and waiting out the peak at home.
14. Mr. Pat Quinn, parent, shared comments about wanting in-person learning and shared his thoughts around the numbers.
15. Ms. Susie Halpin, parent, questioned why this issue is not being resolved.
16. Ms. Beth Feeley, parent, stressed the importance of teachers being in the classroom with their students. She also spoke to sick days. She urged the Board to implement 50% immediately.
17. Ms. Eva Roytburg, student, shared her thoughts about giving teachers a choice to remain remote. She is also a part of the group Students for Safety and shared anonymous comments from teachers who attended that virtual event.

Ms. Albrecht noted that there was only about six minutes remaining and urged anyone who had yet to speak to state a point they agree with, if possible, that was previously mentioned in order to allow time for more comments.

18. Ms. Jen McDonough, Applied Arts Department Faculty and New Trier High School Educational Association

President, spoke on behalf of Mr. Kyle Ogrodnik, Mathematics Department Faculty, who shared data about the transmission of Covid in schools and his thoughts around this. Ms. McDonough shared that the New Trier Educational Association maintains that the school should prioritize its most vulnerable students and expand the E track to allow struggling students to be able to access their education on a two to four-day basis.

Again, Ms. Albrecht reminded everyone of the limited time remaining for public comments.

19. Mr. Joe Kearney, parent, shared comments about his children's experiences at New Trier and Loyola Academy. He urged half day, every day with teachers in their classrooms in a safe and responsible manner.
20. Mr. Chris Tritsis, parent, shared comments about getting students back in school.

Mr. Dronen inquired how many comments were left, to which Ms. Albrecht stated there were six. He asked if there was anyone in the grouping that the Board has not heard from at prior Board meetings. Ms. Albrecht noted there would be time for one more.

21. Ms. Stacy Dale, parent, shared comments on mental health as well as the low rate of transmission in schools as she is a public health researcher. Parents who want their children back in school want New Trier to weigh the mental health concerns that parents have against the low likelihood of an outbreak under the very good protocols the District has designed.

Ms. Albrecht thanked them for their comments.

***V. Special Orders of Business**

***A. Discussion on New Trier Reopening and Operational Plan for 2020-2021**

Dr. Sally presented on the New Trier Reopening and Operational Plan for 2020-2021. First, he thanked those who spoke as well as those who sent in correspondence that the Board and Administrators have received as all the different perspectives are appreciated.

Dr. Sally shared the agenda for the evening, which included revised metrics, pathways for additional students on campus, an update on the saliva screener, compliance with guidelines as well as Board discussion. He shared an updated chart regarding the status of area high schools.

He went on to share the metrics and the ladder for in-person instruction that was developed over the summer. The original principle tied the prevalence in the community directly to the risk in the building. It was the principle under which the school created the metrics that it did such as the Township Zip Codes and Staff Zip Codes. The new principles have changed as the science and experience has changed. Schools, including New Trier, have been successful at mitigating risk even when community prevalence is high. It is also now known about the cost to students of all remote learning or limited in-person learning. On top of the mitigation efforts that the District has employed, the addition of the saliva screening program has excluded many asymptomatic students and staff from the building. Dr. Sally went on to share the revised metrics and current status chart noting there were three columns of concern – significant, moderate and minimal along with associated actions. The purpose of the metrics is to provide information to the Board that they can use to make decisions about in-person learning. The emphasis of the new metrics has shifted to in-building measures from external measures. The District has learned that when the external metrics are high, the school needs to assess the impact on the internal metrics and practices and ensure that they remain strong. If the District sees weaknesses, it will have to make decisions about the relationships between the internal and external metrics. The dashboard would inform the types of conversations to have and the information the Board might need around the internal metrics, which they receive on an on-going basis.

Before Mr. Waechtler, Northfield Campus Principal and Mrs. Dubravec, Winnetka Campus Principal spoke of the work that has been done on Track E, Mr. Robitaille asked if the Board should talk about the metrics and resolve those before pivoting to another topic. It was agreed to proceed this way and Mr. Robitaille asked Dr. Sally to say more about what is meant by the saliva testing at capacity on the chart, to which Dr. Sally noted it was a cut and paste error on the slides. Conversation continued between the two. Next, Mr. Robitaille noted that the external metrics were the best the school had at the time and now, to him, they have been absorbed by more precise, analytical measurements, some of which are subjective and others that objective and data based. He pondered if external metrics are relevant anymore because what really matters is what is going on within the buildings. He shared further thoughts around this topic, questioning if the external metrics are false metrics that give the District a sense of concern that it otherwise should not have because the metrics that really matter are just fine. Dr. Sally responded that the District needs to stay in touch about what is

happening in the community and staff zip codes. He noted that it is part of the decision-making process along with the internal metrics. If it is not part of the discussion, Dr. Sally is concerned that something may be missed. These metrics are not an on/off switch where, at a certain point, the school needs to go remote. Ms. Hahn added about the impact on operational metrics such as staffing and contact tracing when community levels rise it will take longer to get test results, among other things. It will impact the ability to operate but may not impact internal data about what is coming in the building or not, but still needs to be watched. She would like to focus on the decision-making metrics but does think that these external metrics play a role, but are not as big a priority as they were. Mr. Dronen agreed with Ms. Hahn's comments, also sharing that it is something the public wants to see. It also provides a chance to see the evolution of the District's metrics and how they have become more precise. He would like to continue to see the external factors data. He shared observations from Dr. Sally's memo, to which Dr. Sally agreed, noting that the metrics are part of the story and stay a part of it, but there are other items that are more important at this time that have been developed and are better understood.

Ms. Ducommun inquired if the Board is going to help define in-person capacity and under capacity regarding the chart that Dr. Sally created. He noted that the District knows it is under capacity and wants to make sure the Board understands when the Administration or the Reopening Advisory Board (RAB) thinks it is at capacity and makes these various decisions and things change all the way.

Ms. Ducommun thanked Dr. Sally for his well-done and thorough memo on these metrics. She shared language from that memo and inquired under what circumstances he would not involve the Board is a decision to take an adaptive pause. Dr. Sally shared when this may be needed and described it as a need to make a call at that moment, for that day. He would want the ability to say that everyone needs to stay home that day, but there would be a conversation between him and Board, and next steps would be determined.

Mr. McLane thanked Dr. Sally and the administration for their time in developing a more comprehensive and thorough set of metrics. Mr. McLane made a formal request for Dr. Sally to quantify the overall District metrics chart. He went on to explain that each metric has a good, bad or neutral assigned value to them, each one would have a different weight and from there a score could be determined that would fall within a range. That range would then dictate potential actions. This would eliminate the guess work from the current metrics system as it would distill the information into something that is more actionable, more objective and more transparent. Ms. Hahn responded that what she heard from medical professionals on the RAB, as much as it would be nice to have an objective measure, by definition these situations are subjective, and each metric is a potentially unique situation. The action items are not mathematical, but rather times when the school would investigate and consider them. The metrics cannot be quantified in an objective way. She believes the model captures what is being shared by the health professionals as to how to approach these situations. Ms. Albrecht reiterated that the District is moving away from the on/off trigger concept, to one where the trigger causes the school to take a certain action. Certain situations inform the District and the Board decides about next steps. This is consistent with the RAB concepts that the metrics inform in certain ways, but do not cause a specific action except one deemed by the Board. Dr. Sally shared that the action of these variables matters and is not sure that the District could capture everything. The score may hide important information within each individual metric. Ms. Ducommun shared thoughts on this, noting that the guidance from the RAB, along with the Board, who were elected by the community to think about complicated decisions, and working with Dr. Sally and his administrative team is the ideal. It may be easier to abdicate that responsibility but that is not why people elected these Board members.

Dr. Glucksman thanked everyone at New Trier for their herculean efforts to educate in the time of Covid. He also personally acknowledged the students and staff who have contracted Covid sending thoughts to them and their families and wishing for a successful recovery. Every decision is based on the best data available and the District has a lot of local data that has been accumulated over the past several months. The new metrics are prioritized to reflect the microcosm of what is happening on campus. These new or modified metrics reflect the situation at New Trier. They can then be used as the District takes a multi-barrier approach, which is beyond New Trier's peer schools. The school has many mitigation factors in place, however, as a first barrier, and not a substitute for any mitigation measures, is the scientifically proven and vetted screening tool of the saliva screening. There is accumulated data of almost 6,000 tests at the school and a total of over 30,000 tests done by the lab. This adds to the data that can be used for the newer metrics. Ms. Albrecht noted that these metrics can be fluid. Dr. Sally also stressed the need for continued iterative dialogue and went on to share additional comments. Dr. Glucksman noted that the metrics are evolutionary and will change based on the data that is accumulated. At this point in time, this is what is being reviewed, but it does not mean that it cannot change.

Mr. Dronen noted there is a moderate concern for health staffing levels and inquired where that stands and the plan for it. Dr. Hayes, Assistant Superintendent for Student Services, stated that the school has three retired nurses who are interested in assisting with contact tracing, and shortly, a position will be posted for a nurse who is retiring at the end of December. The school would work with its contact tracing support service agency for additional assistance if needed. He shared that the addition of the three nurses for contact tracing is a positive step forward as that process can be time consuming. Those nurses will begin contacting families regarding presumptive positives from the saliva screening.

Ms. Hahn had a question on the screening participation level and the thresholds in place. She inquired if those numbers represent the total population in the building or if they are broken down. Dr. Sally responded that they are in-building people. The participation rates that the school posts, according to Dr. Sally, are those that match of who ended up in the building and those who took the saliva screening test. Mr. Johnson added that there are several populations of people such as those employed in food service or are frequent subs that the school is working to enroll and who will be included in the calculations as well. Ms. Albrecht stated it has only been two weeks with Ms. Ducommun adding that for those students who are not in the E track or engaged in activities for which they test weekly, they have only gone through the testing protocol once and are likely to get better at this. Mr. Johnson echoed what Ms. Ducommun said about building routines and working through logistical start up issues.

Ms. Albrecht shared an additional comment about the adaptive pause and went back to Ms. Ducommun's concept. If Dr. Sally had to call an adaptive pause, she noted, that the next step would be to get the Board together for a special meeting. Dr. Sally responded to Ms. Albrecht that the Board would meet if a decision was not obvious as to how to resume school. Mr. Johnson added an example where a school may have to pause but would not need a special board meeting to resume classes.

Mr. Robitaille asked if the Board was going to vote on this and Dr. Sally explained that one vote would be on the reopening plan, which this is a part of, as well as the process of an adaptive pause and coming back to the Board as established in the memo. Dr. Sally thought the Board does have a vote on it as part of the operational plan, while Ms. Albrecht noted Dr. Glucksman's comments that it is evolutionary, and the Board does not want to have to constantly vote on it. Ms. Ducommun shared thoughts that for the Board to say that they agree where this has been and is headed and this iteration of it is useful. She would also prefer not to stack decisions and be clear about each step so that there will not be complications. Discussion continued and Mr. Dronen then asked for background on the 80% participation level, specifically how that number was determined and not a higher one. Dr. Sally shared that in discussions with the RAB, that the research on this type of metric, in this type of environment, is very limited. He noted that everyone wants as high of a level as possible, however, the discomfort amongst the epidemiologists as numbers below 80% were discussed grew significantly. This was Ms. Hahn's impression as well. Dr. Sally noted that the target is much higher than that. Ms. Albrecht inquired how often the RAB will look at this, to which Dr. Sally responded it would be weekly and allows him to get as much information to the Board as possible. Ms. Ducommun confirmed that there would be weekly updates, which Dr. Sally corroborated. Final comments were shared between Ms. Albrecht and Ms. Hahn about the RAB. Dr. Sally summarized that there would be three votes and outlined them.

The meeting then moved on to the next topic of pathway for additional students, which Mr. Waechtler presented on. He explained the current one track where students attend school for two days every other week, noting that classrooms had anywhere from one to ten students in them. At Northfield, in-person attendance was around 22%, with 15% remote and at Winnetka, around 17% of students are in with 28% remote. Mr. Waechtler then walked through the proposal to have more students on campus each day. He thanked advisers, adviser chairs, social workers, and MTSS teams who have identified struggling students who are already attending school in-person two or four days per week. The school knows that there are additional students who are struggling who have not been offered this intervention. At Winnetka, 250 students per track could be brought into school, the average daily attendance is 500 students, this would lead to 750 students on campus per day. This would be per track, so a substantial number of additional students could be on campus at Winnetka. At Northfield, there would be an additional 50 students per track, their current daily attendance average is about 200 students a day, so it would increase attendance to 250 per day. Mr. Waechtler went through next steps, noting that the student support team would continue their work to identify struggling students and add them to the in-person option. There would also be a parent input form in PowerSchool that parents would complete if they believe their child needs immediate intervention that would last through the end of first semester. There are four weeks remaining in first semester and students would attend two days a week. Staff would review the requests and gather input from staff who know these students and work to bring in more students. Mrs. Dubravec noted that the challenge will be how these decisions are made for some students. The good news is that there is space and the form will be available tomorrow, with a group forming shortly after to review requests.

Ms. Ducommun asked Dr. Sally to provide context regarding the decision for the expanded one-track model instead of the two-track model. He replied that the District has a certain amount of time that is required for it to ramp up from one level to another, with Ms. Ducommun adding that this was part of the Memo of Understanding (MOU) that the Board signed with the association. The MOU was signed prior to the start of the school and includes many pieces, one of which was ensuring that teachers, the school and administration have time to ramp up to prepare for a particular level. Moving from one-track to two-tracks would be one of those times, however, expanding the E track, everyone understood that when it comes to struggling students, the school was going to work to find the space for them. Ms. Ducommun noted that this is being implemented next week because there are not the eight days that are needed in order to move to two-tracks, which Dr. Sally confirmed. She added that no matter how the Board conversation ends up, the intent is to have an option for parents to identify their students who need to be in-person. Ms. Ducommun asked if the Board will get to the point of understanding how the math works.

Dr. Sally then walked through the two-track option where students would be in school two days per week with six to 12 students in a classroom. Based on this, there would 41% of students on campus at Northfield and 32% at Winnetka. There would be a need to expand to other spaces for lunch and free periods and it would be implemented for the start of second semester.

Dr. Sally then went through an attendance comparison chart, that showed, based on maximum attendance for each campus currently, what the attendance would be if the E track model were to be expanded and the attendance with the two-track model. It does not include the school's all remote students. On the Northfield campus, currently 250 students are scheduled to attend daily, with the E track model it would be a maximum of 300 students and for the two-track model that number would be 420 students. Those families who may opt in or out at the beginning of second semester are not included in this analysis. At Northfield, the maximum attendance is expected to be 250-300 students or an increase of 20%. The attendance rate is expected to increase as students who want this model will attend and as the school brings in more students, more will attend who are supposed to be in. Dr. Sally predicts more than a 50 student per day increase on the Northfield campus. On the Winnetka campus, the average track has about 725 students, the expanded E track model would raise the maximum attendance to 975 students. In-person attendance is less at Winnetka, but Dr. Sally anticipates that will increase based on the aforementioned reasons.

Ms. Ducommun inquired where the 50 and 250 numbers came from, to which Mr. Waechtler responded about the analysis that Mr. Michael Marassa, Chief Technology Officer, did to help determine these numbers. Mr. Marassa provided further details about the process to determine attendance percentages. Ms. Ducommun asked about qualitative concerns that drove the determination of the maximum number of students, to which Mr. Marassa replied. Mr. Robitaille added that he was hearing something different and that what was done was a back solve for 25%. Mr. Marassa noted it started at that point, but there may be days where student attendance is slightly above 25% with Dr. Sally adding the range is 25-33% as the 25% model ranged from 17-22%. Ms. Ducommun summarized the numbers at each campus with the different models. Mr. Robitaille noted that the percentages translate into individual students and asked to know the difference between the three levels regarding the number of students that can be accommodated, in total, across both campuses. Ms. Ducommun worked on the calculations while Dr. Sally explained. Mr. Robitaille went to inquire about the difference between the E track expansion and the two-track model in terms of number of students the school can accommodate. Ms. Ducommun ran the numbers and responded to Mr. Robitaille. Conversation ensued between Mr. Robitaille, Ms. Ducommun and Dr. Sally.

Ms. Hahn inquired about the guidance the communication to parents contains regarding the criteria that will be used. If the decision is made to expand the E track, her concern is there may be parents unsure to what degree their students may be struggling while others may think that there are other students who need it more than their own. She questioned how the District was going to guide the community, so it ensures that the students who need to be in immediately and more regularly are in instead of straight numbers. Dr. Hayes answered that the students in the expanded E track and the two-track model are not the same students necessarily. He went on to share further thoughts, encouraging parents to be open and honest about their student's experience at home. With the two-track model, while students will be in the building more, there is not the intentional desire to try and have specific students in the building. Mrs. Dubravec noted that the form has explicit questions for parent feedback in terms of academic and/or social emotional struggles. She shared additional comments, noting that Special Education has done a wonderful job of identifying students as well.

Dr. Glucksman inquired if equity would be one of the criteria that is addressed if the enhanced E track model is selected. Dr. Hayes responded that it would and then spoke about those who selected Track F or all remote for reasons related to equity and gave an example. Dr. Glucksman replied that it is about trying to identify vulnerable students however that is defined, essentially making it that students who are most vulnerable are present in the enhanced E track.

Dr. Sally then provided his perspective on the E track, noting that his view of it changed after last week's meeting where the question was asked if the school has enough information from parents to really understand who is struggling. That question by the Board drove some of the thinking around this. The school could have simply filled seats to the capacity that it feels comfortable with, but the idea to gather input from parents was a good one. Though it is not without its issues, it does create a collaborative effort. He went on to share additional comments, noting that the unknowns are the capacity and how this will ultimately turn out.

Ms. Ducommun noted that the MOU is now on the website and it states the need to give the Teachers' Association eight days' notice therefore making the ability to move to the two-track model next week not possible. She suggested, that if there is interest among the Board, to think about an expanded track, that is the only option for next week. After additional comments, she noted her favor in trying the expanded E track.

Ms. Albrecht inquired with the expanded E track if students will be in only two days a week or if some would be in four days. The school's system is put students into the four-day-a-week E track consistently, which will continue. This is about parents saying that their child needs to be in school two days a week for the next four weeks and the school responding to that request.

Mr. Robitaille commented that an expanded E track in the absence of a near-term path to get to two tracks, and talking about partnering with families, is potentially setting up an adversarial situation in an already emotional environment for teachers, advisers, administrators and families. There will be around 300 students, the difference between the expanded E track and the two-track model, who will not get into expanded E track and some parents may feel that they did not articulate their situation well enough. Mr. Robitaille would be in favor of the expanded E track if there was a clearer path to two tracks. If the expanded E track is even an intermediate solution, he thinks it is fraught with issues. Ms. Ducommun and Mr. Robitaille had a discussion around his thoughts. Ms. Albrecht then walked through what the next four weeks look like with finals week being remote. Ms. Albrecht commented that it would be helpful to know what a surge may look like after these breaks, but that is not possible. Ms. Ducommun shared her thoughts on the potential surge and what might happen, noting that students need the school now and that many of them are suffering.

Mr. Robitaille added that there is an internal inconsistency among Board members if they say they are concerned what a surge might do to the school but are highly confident and willing to spend a million dollars on a test that is extremely reliable. It is inconsistent to say the Board will spend the money and believe in the test yet will not trust it. Ms. Albrecht disagreed with Mr. Robitaille and spoke of the ramping up needed for everybody. To her, post-Thanksgiving and post-Winter Break are the most vulnerable times for the school with the possibility of not being able to sustain the plan. She believes the sustainability of the plan is important and the school is continuing to ramp up, but doubling attendance a week from now is a lot to adjust to. Discussion ensued between Mr. Robitaille and Ms. Albrecht with her noting she does not want an adaptive pause. While Ms. Albrecht would like to add more students, she likes the idea of steadily getting there, especially at a time when most health experts believe there will be a surge. The two then discussed their thoughts around an adaptive pause. Ms. Ducommun asked Ms. Albrecht to speak more about the adaptive pause and sustainability, which she did by discussing the pause taken in October. The two discussed this further. Dr. Glucksman agrees with Ms. Albrecht noting that the Board understands it needs to take steps forward, the question is how fast. Moderate steps forward are needed focusing on safety, stability and sustainability. He shared other comments and then responded to Ms. Ducommun's question regarding if what happens after Thanksgiving will inform what might happen after Winter Break. Dr. Glucksman noted that he is more concerned about Winter Break. Ms. Ducommun inquired if the District could ask people to commit to quarantine post-travel.

Ms. Hahn added her perspective which is less about prognosticating the health concerns and more about compromise. She believes the best outcomes represent compromises that are born from the tension between differing viewpoints on an issue. The approach of maintaining the single track with an expanded E option through first semester is that type of compromise. It is not a compromise based on health and safety concerns for the most part anymore, but rather faculty and staff are anxious and as a result, exhausted, about meeting the needs of students in this environment. No one is questioning if students are struggling, teachers and support staff see that daily and are dedicated, committed professionals who care deeply about meeting those needs. In order to do that, they need to feel comfortable and confident that they can support these needs in this new environment. This compromise is the approach that gives them that time to get used to an increase in students, recognizes their professional needs, while ensuring that this is done in a way that works for students. Mr. McLane built on Ms. Hahn's comments by noting there is a certain elegance to the expanded E track concept as a measured, rational, thoughtful, incremental approach to keep building towards adding students during a period that could be choppy. It should create predictability and stability for students and staff. He also responded to Mr. Robitaille's earlier comments.

Mr. Dronen commented that everyone agrees that they want to proceed with two tracks per day, but the question for him is when. He supports opening the school but making sure that is done in a safe and responsible manner for students, teachers and staff. His concern is if the school ramps up, without a full grasp on the metrics, it will lead to an adaptive pause, which may be unsettling to students, particularly those with significant needs. He stated that he needs more information such as if the nursing staff has the capacity to handle an increase in students. The school also needs to be cognizant of their health and safety because if they get sick or need to quarantine there is shortage of available substitute nurses. He did acknowledge that attempts are being to alleviate that. By waiting until after the new year, it allows more time to be prepared for the increase in students. Ms. Albrecht clarified that the expanded E track would take the school through finals, which Mr. Dronen agreed with.

Mr. Robitaille commented that despite the fact that the actual data demonstrates it is safe to be in the building, that federal, state and local authorities recommend being back in school to the extent possible, and the saliva screening which is highly reliable, the Board is going to make a decision on what might happen. Ms. Albrecht responded to his comments. Discussion then continued between the two.

Mr. McLane inquired if it was time to vote, which was agreed to.

Ms. Ducommun moved, and Mr. Robitaille seconded the motion, that the Board of Education accept revisions to the Reopening and Operational Plan as presented with an increase to two tracks of students on campus the week of December 14th, subject to further review by the Board of Education. Mr. McLane had difficulty hearing the motion read by Ms. Ducommun, and it was requested that the motion be read again, which Ms. Ducommun did. After that reading of the motion, Dr. Sally confirmed that those Board members, Mr. McLane and Dr. Glucksman, who were participating via phone heard the motion, which they did and Mr. McLane clarified that it was not the expanded E track approach, but the two track approach, which Dr. Sally confirmed was the motion on the table. Dr. Sally noted that it has been seconded and asked Ms. Ruston to restart the roll call. Upon a roll call vote being taken, the members voted as follows:

AYE: Mr. Robitaille, Ms. Ducommun

NAY: Ms. Hahn, Mr. McLane, Mr. Dronen, Dr. Glucksman, Ms. Albrecht

The motion failed.

Ms. Hahn moved, and Mr. Dronen seconded the motion, that the Board of Education accept revisions to the Reopening and Operational Plan as presented with an increase to two tracks of students on campus the week of January 25th with implementation of measures to increase the number of students on Track E during the remainder of first semester as presented, subject to further review by the Board of Education. Prior to the roll call vote, Ms. Ducommun and Mr. Robitaille asked to have a discussion around this motion, particularly regarding “as presented.” Given the numbers that Ms. Ducommun worked on earlier in the meeting around the expanded E track, it would add roughly 100 students to the Northfield campus and 400 to the Winnetka campus, for a total of 500 students. She inquired if the Board was committing to adding that many students with this motion. Subject to what is heard from parents and the work of adviser chairs, Dr. Sally replied yes. Ms. Ducommun would like to think, that inherent in the motion, is that kind of capacity increase from roughly 20% to a third of students being able to be on campus two days a week, which Dr. Sally confirmed. Mr. Robitaille remarked that January 25th is the beginning of second semester, which Dr. Sally also confirmed. Dr. Sally inquired if there was any further discussion and Mr. Robitaille asked if the Board was going to amend the motion. Ms. Albrecht noted that it was “as presented” and the discussion was clarifying “as presented.” Ms. Ducommun inquired if Mr. Robitaille wanted the amended motion to include the numbers, which Mr. Robitaille confirmed. Dr. Sally then asked Mr. Robitaille if “as presented” covered it, with Mr. McLane noting that this was what was presented, so it is included. Dr. Sally briefly went through the proposal again, with Ms. Ducommun asking for clarification on the numbers. Dr. Sally noted that 1,000 more students at Winnetka and 200 more students at Northfield will have more opportunities than they do now. Ms. Ducommun asked that it be put in the motion. Discussion on this continued between Ms. Ducommun, Dr. Sally and Ms. Albrecht. Mr. Johnson added his thoughts. Ms. Ducommun stated that with this proposal, in the short-term, the school is trying to accommodate with this proposal, 1,200 more students on campus. Dr. Sally clarified that it would be an additional 600 students per week. Mr. Dronen added that there will more information at the December Regular Board Meeting. Ms. Ducommun wanted to make sure it was clear what “as presented” meant. Mr. Waechtler answered that 50 students per track or 200 total students would have the opportunity to come two more days a week than usual. It would be 1,000 total students at Winnetka. Dr. Glucksman noted that the Board has to vote on the motion as they understand it and it has been clarified, but they must vote on the

motion that was seconded. Ms. Albrecht noted that it was “as presented” and the presentation has been clarified again, to which Ms. Ducommun agreed.

Upon a roll call vote being taken, the members voted as follows:

AYE: Mr. McLane, Mr. Robitaille, Mr. Dronen, Ms. Ducommun, Dr. Glucksman, Ms. Hahn, Ms. Albrecht

NAY: none

The motion passed.

Next, Mr. Johnson provided an update on the Covid Saliva Screening Program. Last week, the Board asked the administration to work to increase the participation numbers and the steps that could be taken to do so. In working with Ms. Dizon, there has been targeted communication to non-opt-in students and staff. There has also been targeted communication based on attendance, with the reminder that participation is required for extracurriculars. Updates have also been made to the website. The administration has also discussed how it will shift to weekly screening as it was another question from the Board. Currently, all extracurricular and students in-person on a given week participating in the screening. The request was how the school could start to normalize this process and have the group that is not testing every week start to do so. The District has worked with the lab and this will begin next week. Mr. Johnson noted that earlier Ms. Ducommun mentioned that people have only been through one cycle of the screening process. There are some items that the school has to work through logistically as well as families making this part of their routine. As this becomes a more regular process for families and the school refines its own processes, it will help make it a more routine part of the school’s environment while building additional support and compliance. Ms. Ducommun noted that she mentioned to Mr. Johnson that there be a phone number or monitored email for questions that parents may have. Mr. Johnson shared comments around this idea.

Mr. Johnson then walked through how the school reports data on its website which Dr. Hayes manages. He shared details about the summary of the student and staff exclusions chart. He then displayed the results from the saliva screening and then invited questions from the Board.

Mr. McLane asked what happened to the participation rate data, to which Mr. Johnson replied that it is still there, he just did not include it in the screenshot for his presentation. He went on to share additional details including the school is working on building up additional data with the goal of the information being as transparent and understandable as possible. Ms. Hahn commented that the positive Covid test or diagnosis number of students and staff does not match the screener test as it includes people who have received an alternative diagnosis. The difference does not mean that those are people who came into the building with Covid, which Mr. Johnson confirmed and shared additional details. Dr. Hayes also provided more details as to the types of quarantine.

Mr. Robitaille inquired how long it would take to implement mandatory testing. Mr. Johnson responded in terms of lab capacity, noting that they have been able to ramp up much more quickly than in the past. The logistical piece is not a concern, but it is working through the process on the student side. While 95% have opted in, the remaining 150 students and families who have not, will need to go through the rules and regulations process. If they decide to deny testing, they would access their education remotely. The District would potentially need to set up an appeal process as well. On the staff side, the District would have to have conversations with the various associations on implementation. Mr. Robitaille inquired specifically about students and how long it would take, to which Mr. Johnson responded that it is the matter of a couple of weeks. Mr. Robitaille shared his thoughts on those who are not complying. Mr. Johnson shared his experiences in having conversations with those who have questions or issues with the screener. Conversation continued between the two on this topic.

Ms. Hahn inquired if the Ruvna screening is required, to which Mr. Johnson replied that it is needed for entrance. She went on to state that to her the saliva screening is equivalent to Ruvna. If the District can require people to fill out Ruvna, the District should be able to require the screening. Dr. Sally responded that there are a few legal issues to work through about mandating the saliva screening. Ms. Hahn went on to share additional comments. Dr. Glucksman added that there is precedence in the District for this with at least one of the sender school districts, which Dr. Sally noted has not happened yet. Mr. Johnson added that other schools are looking into the screener, and since New Trier was on the front end of it, the school is already seeing the benefits. If New Trier chose to mandate the screener, the school would be one of the first and anticipates others would follow. In the time being, Ms. Albrecht noted that 95% of those who want to attend in-person have signed the consent waiver. Dr. Sally shared that by encouraging weekly testing, it allows for the logistical pieces to be ready when the Board decides they want to mandate the screening. Mr. Robitaille shared further

thoughts, with Ms. Ducommun sharing her understanding of the advice that the District’s lawyers have provided. Mr. McLane inquired if the Board should go for more specificity with a timeline. Dr. Sally shared thoughts including that the school needs to determine the standard for exclusion if a student has not tested and recommended that post-Winter Break the school would be ready. Mr. Robitaille asked for the sense of the Board regarding mandating staff. Ms. Ducommun does not want to go there now, but stated it is good to encourage it. Mr. Dronen agreed with Ms. Ducommun and noted that it would be subject to impact bargaining. Mr. Robitaille responded with his thoughts and Ms. Ducommun replied with hers. Ms. Albrecht would like to know why some people are not taking the screening and Mr. Johnson noted that more work would be done on that with staff and students. He went on to share additional thoughts. Dr. Sally suggested on the staff side, that since the next Board of Education meeting is not until December 14th, it would give the administration time to have conversations with the various associations. Mr. Johnson thanked the teachers’ association who has advocated for their members to sign up, noting that Ms. McDonough participated in the pilot. He shared that the District values its partnership with the association. Ms. Ducommun noted that adding 600 students a week will be a big part of the ramp up and may result in more regular weekly testing habits. Mr. Johnson agreed and noted the importance of building habits.

Mr. Robitaille inquired if it was reasonable to expect this to start on January 4th. Mr. Johnson noted that the District will move in this direction and bring a plan to implement to the December 14th Regular Board of Education meeting. Mr. Robitaille then inquired if a motion was needed, to which Ms. Albrecht responded that the Board is still in discussion on it.

Ms. Albrecht noted that the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) have been updated on the website and are a good resource. Ms. Albrecht thanked Ms. Dizon and Mr. McLane for their work on those.

Dr. Sally then emphasized the Trevians Caring for Trevians pledge. He shared that if families should choose to engage in large gatherings or non-essential travel, while the District wants them to avoid that, they can self-quarantine and their students can attend remotely. Everyone is encouraged to do the right things and comply with the guidelines set by the Cook County Department of Public Health and Illinois Department of Public Health so schools can remain open and expand their in-person learning.

***VI. ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Robitaille moved, and Ms. Hahn seconded the motion, to adjourn. Upon a roll call vote being taken, the members voted as follows:

AYE: Mr. Dronen, Ms. Ducommun, Dr. Glucksman, Ms. Hahn, Mr. McLane, Mr. Robitaille, Ms. Albrecht

NAY: none

The motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 9:36 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lindsey Ruston, Secretary

Cathleen Albrecht, President