

**NEW TRIER TOWNSHIP HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT 203
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION
November 24, 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, November 24, 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. Joanne Panopoulos, Assistant Superintendent for Special Education
Mr. Paul Waechtler, Northfield Campus Principal

Also Present

Ms. Christine Estberg, Science Department Faculty; Ms. Sheri Donovan, Science Department Faculty; Mr. John Miller, Science Department Faculty; Ms. Jen McDonough, Applied Arts Department Faculty and New Trier High School Educational Association President; Mr. Mike Hill, 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 November 24, 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, except for Dr. Glucksman.

Ms. Albrecht asked for a motion to move to Closed Session. Mr. Dronen moved that the Board adjourns 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, Ms. Hahn, Mr. McLane, Mr. Robitaille, Mr. Dronen, Ms. Albrecht

NAY: none

ABSENT: Dr. Glucksman

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 called the Special Meeting of November 24, 2020 of the Board of Education to order at 6:09 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 22 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. Dr. Sally encouraged everyone to engage in civil dialogue and model it for students and the community.

1. Ms. Susie Halpin, parent, shared two questions she had for the Board, the first was if the number of students who would return to a 50% or greater model of reopening is known. The second is to understand the implication in the Memorandum of Understanding between the teachers and the school board. She shared thoughts on the saliva screening as well.

Ms. Albrecht reminded everyone that questions from the public comments would not be answered directly during this time, but some questions may be answered throughout the agenda.

2. Ms. Heather Oliver, parent, spoke to the saliva screening and the benefits of in-person learning. She urged the school to continue with their plan to go from 25% to 50% of students in school.
3. Mr. Billy Rivi, New Trier grad, Instructional Assistant in the English Department and co-president of the New Trier Educational Support Professionals Association, shared a comment on behalf of himself and Ms. McKenzie Morrell, Administrative Assistant to the Director of Curriculum and Instruction and the Director of Special Education and co-president of the New Trier Educational Support Professionals Association. He noted that they stand with the teachers. First, he thanked the support staff for their work. He went on to share concerns from a support staff perspective on the potential move to 50%, particularly about the nurses and instructional assistants and asking for solutions prior to this move.
4. Mr. Eric Hungness, parent, shared that the decision to move to 50% should be based only on facts and data. He shared some of this data urging the Board to offer an increase to 50% in-person learning.
5. Ms. Sheri Donovan, Science Department Faculty, shared her thoughts that now is not the time to increase to 50%. She also spoke to concerns about the saliva screening.
6. Ms. Beth Feeley, parent, shared her thoughts and encouraged a choice for families to attend in-person.
7. Ms. Stacy Dale, parent and public health researcher, responded about a previous commenter's thoughts. She also shared her thoughts about the saliva screening and the benefits of it. She encouraged the school to open.
8. Ms. Maureen Tatosian, parent, echoed what others have said, particularly the mental health of students and safety of teachers. She urged the school to try bringing in more students.
9. Mr. Kerry Hall, Social Studies Department Faculty, shared points including speaking for those who could not attend, to pause on a potential increase to 50%, the saliva screening and urged listening to the medical experts on the Reopening Advisory Board (RAB).
10. Ms. Claire Cohen, student, represented a small group of students called Students for Safety. They are urging the Board to reassess the current reopening plan before moving to 50%. She shared thoughts around this.
11. Ms. Heather Hester, parent, spoke to advocate for the teachers, staff and students. She shared thoughts on mental health and to err on the side of caution. She went on to share concerns about the treatment of teachers.

Ms. Albrecht noted that there were 30 minutes remaining for public comments and urged anyone who might be able to summarize their points as perhaps they may have been already made by a previous commenter to do so. She noted that it was possible that not everyone who wished to speak would have the chance.

12. Ms. Victoria Chan, student, spoke on behalf of Students for Safety and shared about a live streamed virtual event that took place earlier in the day and is available for viewing on their YouTube channel. The group does not think now is the time to move to 50%. She also highlighted several teachers who were asked to share their thoughts during the event regarding hybrid learning. They shared thoughts about opening to 50%, their mental health, and the trust that has been broken between the faculty and the administration and the inequality that is perpetuated by New Trier's reopening. She shared thoughts from Ms. Lindsay Arado, Social Studies Department Faculty; Mr. Todd Maxman, Social Studies Department Faculty; Mr. Tom Lau, Art Department Faculty as well as a couple of anonymous teachers.
13. Ms. Izzy Hester, student, also spoke on behalf of Students for Safety and encouraged the Board to watch it on YouTube. She spoke about mental health and addressed concerns about how mental health is being handled.

Ms. Albrecht noted there were 20 minutes left in public comments and reiterated that if a speaker would like to summarize their thoughts if others have already shared similar ones it would allow time for others.

14. Ms. Hannah Sussman, student, shared comments that reopening to 50% is not worth the risk and urged the Board to listen to the students and respect the teachers.
15. Ms. Morgan Deger and Mr. Blake Deger, students, would like the school to continue to try and reopen. They would also like the option to go in-person.
16. Ms. Jen McDonough, Applied Arts Department Faculty and New Trier High School Educational Association President, stated that the Teachers' Association also stands with the support staff professionals and physical plant services staff. Ms. McDonough noted that an Association meeting was held earlier today. She asked that the Board keep the building at 25% until second semester, prioritizing students who need in-person the most. Ms. McDonough then thanked the Board for the resources that have been given to the teachers who have asked to work remotely. She also asked the Board to increase the number of accommodations that are allowed as many schools that faculty members' children attend have gone on an adaptive pause until Martin Luther King Jr. Day.
17. Mr. Henry Blossingame, New Trier alum, shared comments urging the Board to not open past 25% until the number of cases significantly decrease and to give all staff and faculty the accommodations they need.
18. Ms. Claire Sullivan, resident, parent and Special Education Department Assistant – Northfield Campus, shared comments on not increasing to 50% in-person.

Ms. Albrecht asked yet again for anyone to shorten their comments or say they agree with a previous comment as not all public comments may occur with the current timing.

19. Ms. Kimberly Finch, parent, shared several points focusing on giving students the option to have daily in-person instruction.
20. Mr. Ted Dabrowski, parent, shared comments encouraging the Board to move to 50% in-person instruction.
21. Ms. Kathy Hulbert, parent, shared comments on social-emotional learning as well as increasing to 50% in-person instruction.
22. Mr. Rusty Magner, parent, shared comments on further opening the school.

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. He thanked those who spoke publicly as well as those who have written to him, the Board and other administrators. Dr. Sally shared the agenda which included the pathway for safely increasing the number of students on campus, classroom and common space capacity analysis, an update on the screening program, metrics, and then discussion and question from the Board.

Dr. Sally began with the pathway to safely increasing in-person instruction, noting that the District has successfully welcomed students on campus for in-person instruction based on letter group tracks and for extracurriculars, however, the school needs a plan to safely increase students on campus each day over the coming weeks. There are needs out there that the school is trying to meet and there is capacity in the building to accommodate some of those needs. He acknowledged that there will be different opinions regarding his recommendation. His recommendation to the Board is to continue and enhance the current one track or 25% model and provide additional in-person opportunities for struggling students. He would also like to establish a date for implementing the two-track model or 50% model starting on January 26th which is the start of second semester and is during a time of natural change. The 25% model has been successful, and it is an inopportune time to ramp up given the anticipation of a post-holiday spike in infections. An increase to two tracks would also result in more density in the building. Many peer and sender schools are ramping down or going to an adaptive pause. New Trier knows it can conduct school safely under the current conditions while adding struggling students and continuing this model through first semester which provides time to continue to monitor internal metrics. Dr. Sally then displayed a possible November/December calendar, noting that this week parent-teacher conferences took place and shared his appreciation for teachers and parents engaging in good conversations. The week of November 30th, the school would continue at 25%, with the following week assessed for an increase to 50%. Dr. Sally recommended that the school stay at the 25% model through this time and increase the capacity within Track E.

Dr. Sally shared current and proposed classroom capacity information. There are anywhere from one to five students in a classroom and in some cases up to ten. On campus attendance at Northfield has been about 22% and at Winnetka, it has been about 17%. Based on this information, the District believes it can add more struggling students within the 25% limit. He reviewed the two-track option, where two tracks would be in for a two-day pair, so students would be in for two days every week. This would mean that there would be six to twelve students per classroom with an anticipation of 41% of students on the Northfield campus and 32% on the Winnetka campus. The school is planning to expand into

other spaces needed for lunch and free periods. Social distancing is maintained throughout any of the District's plans and it will not back down on other mitigation factors that are in place even with the saliva screening program. Dr. Sally walked through the numbers of students on the tracks and about enhancing the single track. With the two tracks, he shared the possible attendance range for the Northfield campus of 38% to 46% and at Winnetka of 30% to 38%. These numbers are pending no addition of students into Track E, so these are the numbers as they are now as opposed to the further identification of Track E students.

Mr. Johnson, Associate Superintendent for Finance and Operations, provided an update on the Covid-19 Saliva Screening. He shared his thanks with those participating. The participation rates for the week of November 16th was 88% for students and 72% for staff. There were nine presumptive positives with a positivity rate of 0.41%. The District is working to establish an inconclusive category and those in this category are encouraged to have a PCR diagnostic test and will remain in this category until they get an official test so that they are excluded from the environment. Mr. Johnson noted that the school has been reviewing its testing protocols and have been pleased so far. The lab is running three screens on presumptive positives. One item that the District is reviewing is how it schedules screening days and staggering within those days. Mr. Johnson also noted that the District needs to think about how it keeps the participation level up through winter. He noted that a question for the Board to begin to discuss is if the saliva screening should be mandatory for in-person instruction. Currently, it is optional for in-person instruction, but is mandatory for extracurricular participation. Mr. Johnson then displayed the dashboard from last week and detailed the best way to read it, along with other information about when data is added, noting the focus is receiving the results and notifying those who are presumed positive.

Dr. Sally noted that much has been learned about Covid and he went on to share where the school has been and where it is currently. There are students who are struggling with remote learning in large numbers. Schools can operate safely in-person with strong mitigation efforts and the weekly saliva screening is an additional layer which has not been factored into other schools and how they have operated. Many asymptomatic students have been identified which benefits everyone, though the District does recognize that this is not an impenetrable barrier which is why the Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) and infection control procedures remain. Dr. Sally acknowledged that the lack of clarity of how metrics and thresholds would drive decisions created confusion and frustration among students, parents, and staff and spoke to how that confusion occurred. The concept of the "Adaptive Pause" was introduced after New Trier's original ladder was published and was the action taken in October. Many actions have been taken over the past several months to enhance mitigation, many of which are invisible, but those actions taken in response to what might be happening in the school or community are critical to communicate to students, staff and parents.

Dr. Sally then walked through a series of charts about metrics and mitigation and what the school initially thought would happen (minimal external metrics with mitigation factors would lead to minimal internal metrics and substantial external metrics would lead to substantial internal metrics), what instead has been learned is that even with substantial external metrics the school can keep internal metrics minimal. The Reopening Advisory Board (RAB) is processing this by looking at internal metrics and what the actions are associated with each level. All those actions should be in pursuit of moving that metric down or keeping people safe. Dr. Sally shared that a full table of metrics is starting to be developed with the District prioritizing the items that are most important. The RAB believes them to be the saliva screening metrics and the positivity rate and how transmission is being managed in school. Currently, the school is on step 4, hybrid learning with a single track at 25%. Movement up the ladder can be considered if in-person capacity allows and most metrics are green, while movement down the ladder will be considered based on the actions listed in each metric's red category. Dr. Sally went on to discuss the metrics in greater detail. The thought is to go from a set of internal metrics focused on what level the school is on and what action it should take. It is not an on/off switch but a series of actions that the District would take.

Finally, Dr. Sally shared a set of questions for discussion by the Board with one topic being if the saliva screening should be mandated for students and staff. Other topics included if the Board supports the new metrics and if the school should stay with one track per day or move to two tracks per day. Dr. Sally spoke to his final question of if the full day hybrid model be maintained or modified as some schools have gone to a half day model, so they do not have lunch. For New Trier, the school believes that the student experience is enhanced by being in-person two days in a row as opposed to half day every day.

The Board decided to take questions one by one so there is a coherent conversation. Mr. Dronen began with the topic of mandatory saliva screening, noting that he would like to see participation, ideally, at 100%. He inquired as to why 12% of the students are not participating, to which Dr. Sally responded that students have only cycled through this once, but that messaging reminders need to increase. Mr. Johnson explained that 95% of students opt-ed in with an 88%

participation, so there are two gaps that the school needs to address and provided examples of what some issues may be along with other comments. Mr. Dronen recommended that the administration find a way to encourage more participation. Ms. Ducommun stated that if the school can get quickly to the point of testing every student, it would have many benefits and referenced the community health comment from Ms. Donovan. It would be a way to stress the importance of testing and understand the rate of infection that is going through the community, particularly with the theory that cases will be spiking. Weekly testing of students and staff would help greatly in the District's understanding of what is going on in the school as well as the larger community. It would also help people get accustomed to the routine and that would help participation numbers, if not, then Ms. Ducommun would want the District to consider mandatory testing. For New Trier to say that it is a cost that the school is absorbing, but it is doing this to help students, families and the community, she would like to see what the response is to that. Dr. Sally clarified that Ms. Ducommun would like a ramp up to weekly testing as quickly as possible, to which she confirmed. She went on to note that even if the Board adopts Dr. Sally's recommendation of one track instead of two, even those students who are not in the tracks for that particular week should still submit a sample as it would give the school an opportunity to try out the staggered model. She would like to see the school be assertive in testing everybody during this time. Mr. Robitaille does not believe this is a messaging issue or encouragement issue, but rather if a student wants to attend school in-person they must test before they come in. If a teacher is going to be in the building to teach, they must test as well. He thinks it is unrealistic through messaging and encouragement to get 100% participation and should be required as a condition to get in the building.

Mr. Robitaille noted that there were some concerns about the accuracy of the RT-Lamp test expressed this evening. He continues to read that it is highly accurate, while hearing comments that maybe it is not. He asked for someone to comment on the reliability of the test. Dr. Glucksman gave details on the RT-Lamp test, noting that the lab goes beyond what was contracted with the running of the third screening of the Yale Saliva Direct Test as further corroboration of the lab's findings. When this is put together, it is accurate. The lab has run around 28,000 tests as New Trier is not the only organization they are working with and tests are run in duplicate. Dr. Glucksman often runs these RT-Lamp tests as well and feels very comfortable and assured about this. Mr. Johnson added that there is a growing body of research, those links will be provided on New Trier's website, about the effectiveness of RT-Lamp tests and is an internationally known technology. Mr. Johnson repeated that this does not replace any other mitigation efforts that are in the building. The screening is a supplemental method that enhances everything else being done. This also is not permission to let one's guard down after school or to not follow the directives of public health officials. Dr. Glucksman noted this is a first barrier like a security gate outside the school and is not a substitute for all the other mitigation efforts.

Ms. Hahn would like mandatory testing to be explored and pursued as an option. She does not want to see administrators, who are stretched thin, to spend their time messaging about participating in the test. Since there is 95% opt in with families, they are going to do it, they may just need the impetus. It will also inform the metrics which will lead to more accurate internal metrics if everyone is testing consistently every week. She would like to see resources spent getting more students into the building and having a quality educational experience as opposed to trying to get people to participate in the testing. She would like to see the District pursue mandatory testing.

Mr. McLane stated that he is on the side of mandatory testing as well. He shared that experts have weighed in on the test and does not understand why someone would opt to not take it. If a student chooses not to do the screener, to him, they would be automatically remote.

Ms. Albrecht would like the District to get to mandated testing and asked the administration to investigate the parameters for implementing it. She would like a report at the Regular Board meeting in December. Her initial preference would be after any major school breaks that students and staff would be amenable to 100% testing. Mr. Dronen noted that if the Board had the report at the December meeting, it could be implemented January 1st. Mr. Johnson noted it would also allow time to monitor the participation percentage and support people in participating.

Dr. Glucksman supports mandatory testing, noting that where he works, there is mandated testing for faculty and students to enter their building. He also shared on a condition where one does not produce much saliva, but not much is needed for this test.

Mr. Robitaille inquired why the District should wait on mandating testing, to which Ms. Albrecht responded that more advice is needed as there are some potential legal issues. Discussion continued with Mr. Robitaille, Ms. Albrecht and Mr. Johnson. Mr. Johnson said it is mandatory for extracurricular participation. Now, there is a winter athletics pause, but Mr. Augie Fontanetta, Athletic Director, instructed families to continue to participate so everyone is ready when any type of winter athletic season resumes. Discussion continued amongst the three and included Dr. Sally. Dr. Glucksman

said until this happens, he would make a plea to students and staff as partners of the school because it protects those in the school, their families and the larger community.

Ms. Ducommun noted that Glencoe is requiring a negative Covid test to return in January, which legally means it is not a high bar to mandate. It was determined that this would be discussed at the December 1st Special Meeting.

Ms. Albrecht noted that the metrics questions would be skipped for now to get to more of the main issues as they are still being worked out.

Next, Ms. Albrecht shared the next question for discussion which was if the current one track per day be maintained and enhanced to add additional students with identified needs within the 25% limit. Ms. Ducommun requested that there be discussion about what an enhanced E track would be like, to which Mr. Robitaille agreed. Ms. Ducommun shared her thoughts, noting that students should not only be identified by staff about needing to be in the building more often, but that there should be a component that allows students and families to self-identify and that a lot of credibility is given to that. She shared continued thoughts around this. Dr. Sally encouraged more conversation about this by Board members.

Dr. Glucksman shared comments noting that moderate steps need to be taken forward that focus on safety, stability and sustainability. The challenge is how to bring more students in, those who need it the most, with the yo-yo cycle of pause and go, especially given the time of year. He believes the enhanced single-track approach accomplishes this. Mr. Robitaille commented if it is a parent driven, good faith opt in, he feels better about the single track, instead of simply relying on social workers and advisers, then that would be the consolation prize. He went on to share thoughts that he still believes that this can and is happening safely at peer schools and around the world. He reiterated all that is in place at New Trier to keep the school safe. He is in favor of giving families the option to be in school. This would have to be subjected to a cap as the school cannot go above a certain number in the building. If the consolation prize is a broadly defined E track where parents can opt their students in who are struggling, by their determination, although it is not where he thinks the school should be, he could support it.

Mr. Dronen inquired how many additional students could be accommodated with the enhanced E track, what the track looks like along with the capacity to handle those students with most significant needs. Discussion ensued with Dr. Sally noting that there are reasonable caps in terms of what the school thinks it can manage. For this conversation, the Enhanced Single-Track chart was displayed, and Dr. Sally walked through the three different E tracks, with the focus being on E-AB and E-CD. Currently, there are about 180 students in these tracks that were identified through various processes, and this is the group that may potentially be expanded. He further explained, noting that parents would have a component in this as well as student services. Mrs. Dubravec encouraged including the adviser in the process. Mr. Scott Williams, Assistant Principal for Student Services, and Ms. Gail Gamrath, Assistant Principal at the Northfield Campus, are working on the parameters such as how many students can be brought in, the number of days as well as a current list of students who have academic and/or anecdotal information from families on their mental health and those who more information is still needed.

Mr. Dronen followed up on what the total capacity would be for the expanded E track on each campus. Dr. Sally noted that it is different for each campus and stated that he needed time with the administrative team to work through some of these items and a more extensive proposal. Mr. Johnson noted that students are being added to the E track and Dr. Sally shared it has been a success and the question is if the school can expand on that success. Mr. Waechtler commented that most of the students that adviser chairs are identifying end up in the E-4 track and can attend daily as that is the need they have in order to be successful. Ms. Ducommun inquired how those students become part of the two days a week E track, to which Mr. Waechtler responded. Ms. Albrecht inquired if the E-4 numbers were growing past what is in the chart or if those numbers represent what the school knows now, to which Dr. Sally responded they were from last Friday.

Ms. Hahn commented that her understanding is that parents already have input through, and perhaps it needs to be more explicit, their child's adviser or teacher if they are seeing issues. She shared her concerns of opening this up to complete parent input at this stage and the District may generate more controversy over this subject. Her suggestion was to make it clear that parents contact their child's adviser with concerns and then let the educational professionals determine who makes it into that track. Then in January, the school would go to the two tracks per day model for those students who do not need to be in immediately. Ms. Ducommun responded to Ms. Hahn's comments, noting that parents are seeing things about their children that staff is not. Ms. Ducommun went on to share additional thoughts, noting that like Mr. Robitaille, the expanded E track is a consolation prize and she is not in favor of abandoning the two-track model. In listening to the health professionals last night who strongly supported that model, she noted her disappointment in the

recommendation. Ms. Ducommun believes there is a gray area with many students who need in-person more than it is known at all levels of academic ability. She shared additional thoughts around this. Mr. Dronen inquired how would one identify, within a week or two, those students and get them in school. He agrees with Ms. Ducommun that track E should be expanded, questioned how it would be done, what the number might be and would the school have the capacity. Dr. Sally shared that the school knows there are classrooms that there could be more students in, there could be controversy and disappointment, but the question is if the District identifying students that really need to be in the building. He went on to share other thoughts. Ms. Albrecht agreed that what Ms. Ducommun shared is the ideal, but eventually there will be prioritizing that has to be done. With that said, Mr. Robitaille noted that he then goes back to two tracks. Dr. Sally clarified that the question is how far the District can get and how can it be managed.

Mr. McLane supports the expanded E track and appreciates the on-going effort and input from teachers, advisers and social workers to continue to add more students to this track. He shared other thoughts, noting that he likes how it is evolving and is comfortable with the gradual build without making the full leap to a two-track system as he does not believe the school is ready for it. Dr. Glucksman shared that he tends to agree with Mr. McLane's comments, it is a multi-input system, but the details need to be left to the administration. Mr. Robitaille responded that it will put people in a horrible position. Ms. Albrecht countered that if the District wants to move on to the second track, it has to build there. Conversation continued between the two. Ms. Albrecht continued to share thoughts on avoiding the adaptive pause and sustainability.

Ms. Ducommun walked through the calendar sharing her thoughts, concluding that the difference between either one track or two tracks are four days, while disappointing, it probably will not crush anyone's semester or expectations. She shared additional thoughts, noting that when second semester opens it will be two tracks. She then spoke to Mr. Dronen's question about metrics. Ms. Albrecht responded that the hope is to build consistency and reliability within the school's own environment over the next few weeks. Conversation continued between Ms. Albrecht and Ms. Ducommun, with Ms. Albrecht noting that she liked Ms. Ducommun's idea of testing all students regardless of if a student is remote or in-person. Dr. Sally and Mr. Johnson will revisit this potential move up in capacity with Dr. Campbell.

Ms. Ducommun commented that over the next four weeks the goal is to understand the stress points within the buildings in terms of the staff, all three associations and how they function. She shared thoughts, particularly about needs in health services. Dr. Sally spoke to this, noting that a position will be posted, and contract nurses have been sought, but the District could cast a wider net to ensure that the District has the capacity. Mr. Dronen shared his thoughts on health services as well as ramping up. Mr. Johnson shared that health services staffing is now included on the new draft metrics chart and is an area that the District is watching. Dr. Glucksman added that one does not need to be a medical professional to do contact tracing and noted two courses that can be taken in order to become one. Ms. Hahn added that the four week period is a more thoughtful approach to the ramp up to two tracks in addition to beefing up the health services department, it allows the District to work through the metrics and proposed responses and allows for clear communication to the community. She heard from the medical professionals last night and was surprised at how encouraging they were that the school could do 50% as early as December 8th but did not hear that the District should do it. Earlier in the day, she heard at the RAB meeting, a lot of anxiety jumping to 50% after only two weeks of 25%. This anxiety was not just from teachers, but parents and students too. Area schools are adapting a pause and people will question why New Trier is not pausing, let alone ramping up and one needs to be prepared to speak to that. She supports the expanded E track as well as encouraging parents to reach out to work with the school but is still uncomfortable about the opt in program. Ms. Albrecht also noted the importance of mandatory saliva testing, which Ms. Hahn agreed with.

Ms. Albrecht noted that since the new metrics were seen only yesterday that the Board was not ready for the discussion, but when it is time, to remember that the metrics are ever changing. Dr. Sally noted that the focus is turning to internal metrics and even if the District obtains 100% participation in the saliva testing, it does not mean that other mitigation steps will stop. The medical professionals on the RAB support the move from where different thresholds are to specific actions that the school takes. Ms. Ducommun agreed with Ms. Albrecht that the metrics are a dynamic model, not a static one. Mr. Dronen clarified that the school would be moving away from the trigger points, which Dr. Sally responded that it would move away from the on/off switch as it did not offer clarity to the community and staff. He shared other thoughts noting that there are decision points that need to be determined. Ms. Hahn heard the same from the medical professionals that each threshold or metric that is met does not necessarily trigger a specific action, as each situation is unique with unique factors. Rather, the school should investigate and consider certain options. Mr. McLane does not want to overlook, as the conversation turns to internal metrics, that the dashboard is a surrogate for the entire Township, and it is the taxpayers who are funding New Trier High School. He still wants to encourage the school to

continue that broad view of the external metrics. He shared additional comments around this. Ms. Albrecht noted that is what the Board is trying to get to with its discussion about the internal metrics to then determine which external ones are still important to display. Mr. Johnson encouraged feedback from Board members regarding the metrics before next Tuesday's Special Meeting so they can be reviewed in more detail at that time. Mr. Dronen eagerly awaits Dr. Sally's information on the participation rate.

Ms. Albrecht asked if the Board was ready for a motion. Mr. Robitaille questioned why the Board was voting tonight, to which Ms. Albrecht responded so as to provide some certainty for the community that this is the route that will be taken. Conversation around this continued with the decision to wait on voting until next Tuesday's meeting when more information will be provided on how the school can accommodate the expanded E track.

B. 15-Year Plan Update: Winnetka Campus East Side Academic and Athletic Study

Mr. Johnson presented on the 15-year plan update: Winnetka Campus East Side Academic and Athletic Study, noting that this item was continued from the Regular Board Meeting on November 16th as there was not enough time to adequately cover it. He noted that there is a lot of good work happening beyond Covid at New Trier thanks to many from physical plant services, support staff, administration and teachers. It is important work because the community has entrusted the District with the asset of the building and a lot of time, energy and resources to maintain them for the benefit of students. As students come back at some point, the District needs to ensure they are returning to a well-maintained campus that meets their needs. Mr. Johnson reviewed the agenda for his presentation noting that there was be a review of the 15-year plan, then information on year one work that took place during the summer of 2020, year two work that will take place during the summer of 2021 and year three work that is being considered for the east side of the Winnetka campus as well as next steps.

Mr. Johnson gave a brief background on the 15-year facility plan. The review included the role of facilities in learning, the history of investment in the facilities, the Winnetka campus project and the stewardship of financial resources. He provided the 15-year framework or roadmap with a focus on flexible plans that connect year over year. The framework categories classify the District's need over the next fifteen years and include academics, athletics and Kinetic Wellness (KW), mechanical/infrastructure, safety, and environmental. He shared information about the principles and findings of the plan. He noted that the District is not asking the community for a referendum but is rather working within its existing operating budget to meet these needs. Mr. Johnson then discussed balancing priorities by addressing a variety of needs in a purposeful manner in the framework categories. He shared the priorities for the first five years and highlighted the year 1, summer 2020, accomplishments providing details on each. He then discussed the scope of the planned summer 2021 work that has already been approved and is in process.

Mr. Johnson then moved on to year three, noting that the District has been carefully analyzing the needs at both campuses. In most places work can be sectioned off and completed in a summer, but in other areas this does not work as well such as the east side of the Winnetka campus. He shared further information on this, noting there were some challenges that required more study and a wider lens. With approval from the Board, in November of 2019, the District engaged a team from Wight, the architecture firm from the west side project at Winnetka, Mr. Steve Cashman, the long-time District architect, and HOK, an athletic facility firm to help the District do a study and analysis. The goal is to figure out how to best meet the needs of students in academic and athletic areas on the east side of the Winnetka campus. That work involved site visits to other schools and an internal needs analysis, which was done with the support of leaders in the departments with engagement from faculty and coaches along with the Facilities Steering Committee guiding that process. Financing options have also been discussed with the Finance Committee and how improvement can be made on that side of the campus within the District's means maintaining the non-referendum commitment. Finally, the District wanted to maintain character and tradition with a unified design aesthetic. Mr. Johnson then went through the study timeline beginning in November 2019, with the contract for study services extended with Wight, Cashman and HOK in June 2020. Mr. Johnson shared that the Gates Gym is expensive to maintain and energy inefficient as it is the only part of the campus that still runs on the 1970s steam boilers. He went on to show a visual of the Winnetka Campus and shared additional details. Findings, from the work of the Facilities Steering Committee (FSC), showed that the facility does not adequately support many parts of the school's programs such as KW classes that 3,000 students access daily and 35 sports that fall under the umbrella of the Illinois High School Association (IHSA). There is a cramped and unsafe indoor track. The Gates Gym only supports single events while more modern gyms support multiple, simultaneous events or practices. There are also cramped and dilapidated bathrooms, corridors and hallways that are not suitable for the 3,000 students who use the space during the school day or for the thousands of students and visitors during athletic events. It is the most heavily used and visited parts of the campus and is the oldest and most decrepit. Mr. Johnson continued with the FSC's findings noting that the classrooms in this space are inadequate and antiquated, maintenance costs are substantially increasing, the space was built for a different time with

different needs and it is difficult to adapt these existing spaces. He shared additional information on these items. He shared pictures from the current facility and then went through the potential funding sources. The Finance Committee continues to review financial models and capacity, continuing the no referendum commitment and continued use of existing Debt Service Extension Base capacity and operational budget. He shared next steps which include a continued review of financial resources, review design options, and the continued neighbor and village engagement, and the start of bringing forward the work of the FSC and the Finance Committee for Board discussion as they reach a decision point. Mr. Johnson then invited comments from the two Board members who sit on the FSC, Mr. Dronen and Mr. McLane, as well as questions and comments.

Mr. Dronen shared that he and Ms. Hahn had an opportunity to view the boiler room and Gates Gym. He noted it is not serving students' KW needs. There will also be the ability to add classrooms either for use by KW classes or others. Mr. Dronen noted that the committee will continue to move forward with their work.

Ms. Ducommun inquired what the timeframe for a decision might be, to which Mr. Johnson replied, that ideally, it would be in February. The goal would be to bring the enhanced facility online for the 2023 school year.

Mr. McLane noted that Mr. Johnson's leadership brings a thoroughness to the FSC, as well as, bringing all the different groups such as academics and athletics together. He noted that meetings have been refreshing and are linear and predictable as to what the Board should do as it looks ahead. Mr. McLane thanked Mr. Johnson for orchestrating and for a concise presentation.

Ms. Ducommun inquired if the Finance Committee would have adequate time to make its proposal about the funding of this. Mr. Johnson noted that the committee will revisit it at their meetings in December and January.

Ms. Albrecht inquired when the next FSC meeting is and if the Board could be silent observers. Mr. Johnson shared additional comments. Mr. Dronen noted the next meeting is Thursday, December 3rd at 5:00 p.m.

Mr. Robitaille inquired about the February decision date and if it would be a decision to fully commit, to which Mr. Johnson confirmed. Mr. Robitaille then inquired where the District would be with the architects and the general contractor. Mr. Johnson replied that at that point there will be fine-tuned cost estimates. From the architects, they would be getting to the schematic design such as the floor plans and extensive analysis of mechanical systems. Mr. Robitaille inquired who would do the cost estimates, to which Mr. Johnson replied that Pepper Construction would do them and have been doing them in draft form over the past year.

Mr. Johnson thanked Mr. Dronen and Mr. McLane for their work on the FSC. He also thanked Mr. Dave Conway, Director of Physical Plant Services, who has kept this going while also doing everything else to keep the buildings safe along with Mr. Steve Linke, Facilities Manager at the Winnetka Campus and Mr. Jim Maile, Facilities Manager at the Northfield Campus. He also thanked Mr. Augie Fontanetta, Athletic Director, and Mr. Andy Butler, KW Department Chair, who have been very engaged and have advocated for the needs of their students. Mr. Johnson also acknowledged that it can be tough to discuss something like this while the District is focusing on getting students back in the building. There will be a time when students are back in the building and the District wants to have a facility that respects the taxpayers' investment in the school and meets the needs of students. These plans take multiple years to accomplish and it is important to stay engaged. Mr. Robitaille noted there is a bit of whiplash going from deciding when students should be back in the building to a fifty-year decision. Ms. Hahn shared that it is a nice reminder that the work of running a school is continuing and not just trying to keep one's head above water during Covid. She agreed with Mr. McLane that it is refreshing to focus on this, which Mr. Robitaille also agreed with. Ms. Hahn shared her appreciation that there is a lot going on, not just dealing with Covid. Mr. Johnson noted that both committees will discuss this next month, then he will speak with Ms. Albrecht about what might be appropriate to bring to the Board. He asked that any questions or thoughts be relayed to either him or Dr. Sally prior to the next meeting. Dr. Sally also thanked Mr. Johnson for all his work.

Ms. Ducommun shared that she was instrumental in writing the facilities plan prior to the 2010 referendum, which was similar to what Mr. Johnson shared this evening. She understands that items intervened, but noted it is more than time for improvements. Mr. Johnson noted that thousands of students have graduated since then and while they have done an amazing job, they have done so in facilities that have not been adequate. Conversation continued around this as well.

***VI. ADJOURNMENT**

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

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

NAY: none

The motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 9:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lindsey Ruston, Secretary

Cathleen Albrecht, President