

Appendix 1: Launch Team Membership and Consultants

In January, 2017, Dr. Pruitt-Adams invited the following community members to serve as members of a launch team, whose primary responsibility would be to select the members of a community engagement committee which came to be called the Imagine Team:

Representing the vote yes leadership from the November 2016 referendum: Lynn Kamenitsa and John Phelan. Mr. Phelan chose not to participate and was replaced by Matt Kosterman.

Representing the vote no leadership from the November 2016 referendum: Monica Sheehan and Mike Poirier.

Representing the community at-large: Jason Fried, James Hunter, Latonia Jackson, and Rito Martinez. Mr. Martinez was unable to participate.

Facilitation for the Launch Team's work was provided by Gil Hermann.

Appendix 2: Imagine Team Membership and Consultants

As selected by the eight active members of the Launch Team, the original Imagine Team was comprised of 33 individuals, representing a diverse cross section of the Oak Park and River Forest communities:

Keven Allen	Victor Guarino	Kim O'Donnell
Victor Ancieta	Randall Hampton	Ellen Pimentel
Floyd Anderson	Tanesha House	Mike Poirier
Cynthia Ashford-Hollis	Kim Hoyt	Tom Powers
Renee Bell	Lynn Kamenitsa	Regina Robinson
Tim Brandhorst	Leon Li	Mary Jo Schuler
Chelsea Matthews Cobb	Theresa Lipo	Monica Sheehan*
Jennifer Czajka	Ryan Magnuson	Stacia Smith
Kelly DeLoria	Ken Maschke*	Respico Vasquez
Steven Endres	Tim McGrath	Audrey Williams-Lee
Sally Gibbs	Sarah Staszak Miller	Jacob Worley-Hood

In addition, Superintendent Pruitt-Adams selected the following 11 faculty and staff members of the high school to serve on the Imagine Team:

Donie Collins	Andrea Neuman	Meredith McGuire
Donnie Davis	Danny Matos	Lindy Novotny
Jason Fried	Leila McGowan	Carolyn Ojikutu
Jim Hunter	Tanya White	

*Before the first organizational meeting of the Imagine Team was held in late August of 2017, Ken Maschke and Monica Sheehan resigned. We began work with a group of 42.

Assisting the Imagine Team in its work were consultants from Unicom-ARC (Rod Wright and Jennifer Volk, through early March 2018), ICI (Terry Fielden and Marc Poskin), and Perkins + Will (Mark Jolicoeur, Michael Dolter, and Rick Young).

Board of Education liaisons to the Imagine Team were Fred Arkin and Matt Baron.

Appendix 3: Imagine Data Sources Overview

Tours

- 4 OPRF (comprehensive)
- 23+ OPRF (specialized)
- 5 Peer schools (tours of renovations)
- 5 Peer schools (tours of specialized spaces)

Surveys

- 669 Student respondents
- 360 Faculty & staff respondents
- 175 Club sponsors, coaches, & PE respondents

Meetings & listening sessions - Faculty & Staff

- 29 Meetings with Department/Division Heads and administrators
- 21 Work Team listening sessions with faculty & staff
- Conversations and email exchanges with scores of additional faculty & staff
- Lunchtime drop in sessions with students, faculty, and staff
- 3 Meetings with Faculty Senate

Other sources consulted:

- Detailed inventories & investigations of hundreds of spaces at OPRF
- Current facilities reports & intergovernmental agreements
- Previous OPRF facilities committees' & consultants' reports
- Professional research, architects, and construction consultants

Listening Sessions - Students

665+ Students heard in 28 listening sessions with the following groups/classes:

- A Place for All (LGBTQ+/Allies)
- Aspira (Latinix student organization)
- Band informal lunch groups (3 periods)
- Best Buddies
- Beyond the Binary Social Work Group -(trans and non-binary students)
- Bioengineering Club
- BLU (Black Leaders Union)
- Drill Team with other dance students
- Hip Hop Club
- Leadership course (4 periods)
- Motivational Mentors (3 periods)
- Orchestra class
- Spanish Club
- Spirit Council
- Student Council
- Tau Gamma
- Theatre musical cast (Hairspray)
- Visual arts informal lunch groups (3 periods)

Women in Leadership

Spoken Word Slam Team – canceled due to scheduling conflict

S.A.F.E. (Students Advocating for Equity) – canceled due to weather

Cocoa & Conversation – canceled

FREE - scheduled but delayed by advisor

Harmony (Gospel choir, dance & mime) – scheduled but delayed by advisor

Spoken Word - only a brief information session due to club's rehearsal schedule

New Era - declined by advisor

Multicultural Leadership – no group meeting scheduled

Imagine reached out directly to several groups, clubs, and activities that we believed were likely to include students whose voices are often not heard. In addition Imagine reached out, via Susan Johnson, Director of Student Activities, and John Stelzer, Athletic Director, to all activities sponsors and athletics coaches with the opportunity to schedule student listening sessions.

Appendix 4: Imagine Student Survey Summary

The Imagine OPRF Student Survey was available for OPRFHS students to complete from January 18 to February 26, 2018. The information and insights provided by the 669 student respondents were invaluable in helping Imagine understand how the OPRF facilities affect students and student learning. While the Imagine Work Group was pleased with the response rate, the fact that respondents were self-selected means we cannot treat the data as a representative sample for statistical analysis. We can, however, provide basic demographic information and basic ordinal information about their responses.

Total Respondents: 669

Gender: Female	62.2%	Grade: Freshman	30.6%
Male	33.8%	Sophomore	19.0%
Non-binary	1.5%	Junior	26.6%
Prefer not to answer	2.5%	Senior	23.8%

Race/Ethnicity:

White	57.7%	Asian	4.2%
Black/African American	13.8%	American Indian/Alaskan Native	0.2%
Multi-racial	12.1%	Prefer not to answer	5.5%
Hispanic	6.3%		

When asked what spaces do not work well for them, the top five student responses were:

All Students (669 students)	Students of Color (245 students)	Black/African-American Students (92 students)
1. Bathrooms	1. Bathrooms	1. Bathrooms
2. Locker rooms	2. Locker rooms	2. Locker rooms
3. Pools	3. Pool	3. Cafeteria
4. Cafeteria	4. Cafeterias	4. Pool
5. Classrooms (tied with cafeteria for 4/5)	5. Classrooms/Gyms (tied for 5/6)	5. Music spaces (tied with pool for 4/5)

Note: Each respondent could list up to three spaces.

When asked what spaces work well for them, the top five student responses were:

All Students (669 students)	Students of Color (245 students)	Black/African-American Students (92 students)
1. Tutoring Center	1. Tutoring Center	1. Tutoring Center
2. Classrooms	2. Classrooms	2. Balcony
3. Library	3. Library	3. Cafeteria
4. Cafeteria	4. Cafeteria	4. Classrooms
5. Hallways	5. Balcony	5. Library

Note: Each respondent could list up to three spaces.

Appendix 5: Imagine Team's Prioritization Process

The Imagine Team's process for prioritizing facilities challenges and solutions has followed a similar pattern at each stage of our work: thorough research by sub-teams, identification of issues to be addressed, discussion of those issues with the broader team, building consensus within the team about issue importance, and gathering feedback about our consensus from facilities users and community members.

Ours is an iterative, discursive process with consensus as the goal. Group members respectfully challenge the conclusions and arguments of others at every stage. Ongoing interaction with facilities users and community members pushes us to further refine our concepts. At times, the Imagine group has also used formal exercises to prioritize needs and the approaches to meeting those needs. This group work helps ensure that no sub-group or individual dominates or steers the prioritization process.

Our prioritization process has not been driven by formal metrics, but by consensus around multiple dimensions, including, but not limited to:

- Safety, health, and security of users
- Systems/facilities on the verge of failure
- Equity and accessibility
- Percentage of students impacted
- Facilitating student learning and achievement
- Creating welcoming and inclusive facilities

Individual Imagine members may give different weight to different dimensions, but one advantage of a large group using a discursive, consensus-focused approach is that such disparities are balanced out as the process moves forward.

Additional considerations include:

- Efficiency (for students, faculty, and staff)
- Return on investment
- Capacity for multiple uses and flexibility
- Life expectancy
- Balancing academic, social, emotional, and physical impact of facilities
- Avoiding Band-Aids, inefficient short-term fixes, and the fallacy of sunk costs

Appendix 6: Calendar of Major Activities and Events

January - May, 2017

- Launch Team established
- Launch Team meets five times to establish the selection process and criteria, and to select the members of the Imagine Team from an applicant pool of 90.

August and September, 2017

- Imagine Team first organizational meeting
- Development of Imagine Team work processes
- Organizing the Imagine Team into four work teams
- Imagine Team tours of the school

October and November, 2017

- Work teams develop understanding of current conditions
- Initial data gathering begins
- First Community Engagement Meeting -- November 15
- Meeting with Faculty Senate

December, 2017 and January, 2018

- Continuation of data gathering
- Visits to five metro high schools
- Student Survey
- Student listening sessions
- Meeting with Faculty Senate
- Listening sessions with faculty and staff

February and March, 2018

- Continuation of student and faculty listening sessions
- Development of initial conclusions
- Second Community Engagement Meeting - February 28

April and May, 2018

- Development of conceptual solutions
- Meetings with PTOs
- Third Community Engagement Meeting - April 16
- Refinement of conceptual solutions
- Fourth Community Engagement Meetings - May 19 and 21
- Faculty reviews of refined conceptual solutions

June and July, 2018

- Development of the initial master plan
- Review of initial master plan with BOE - June 26

August and September, 2018

- Refinement of master plan
- Development of initial cost estimates
- Review of refined master plan with BOE - September 11
- Farmers market information booth
- Faculty review of refined master plan

October and November, 2018

- Fifth Community Engagement Meeting - October 3
- Review of reorganized documents and additional cost information with BOE - October 25
- BOE Town Hall meeting - October 30
- Presentation of Summary Report and Recommendations to the BOE - November 15

Appendix 7: Open Issues

During the course of its work, the Imagine Team identified three issues which we could not fully resolve due to the limitations of our authority. These require further attention from the OPRFHS administration.

SPECIAL EDUCATION CITE PROGRAM AND HUSKIE PUPS PROGRAM

Current and immediate future conditions

The District 200 administration has recently entered into an amended agreement with the River Forest Community Center to support the two subject programs for the next four years.

District 200 provides space at the high school for the Huskie Pups childcare program (as spelled out specifically in the agreement). The program is staffed and managed by employees of the River Forest Community Center.

In exchange, the River Forest Community Center provides space for the OPRFHS Special Education CITE I, CITE II, and CITE III programs in River Forest. These programs are staffed and managed by faculty of the OPRFHS. The CITE programs are an extension of the on-campus special education program. These programs help OPRF students between the ages of 18 and 22 learn the life skills necessary to transition to the real world. One class of the CITE program remains housed at OPRFHS. This class is also managed and staffed by OPRFHS faculty.

It is the consensus desire of the OPRFHS Special Education faculty and staff that the full CITE program be located somewhere other than at the OPRFHS, because this helps students make the transition away from school life. The River Forest Community Center is a desirable location for a number of reasons but currently does not provide adequate facilities to support the entire program.

Long Range Facilities Master Planning Implications

With regard to the CITE program, it is the recommendation of the Imagine Team that the District 200 administration provide an off-site facility for the entire CITE Program. It is very important that this location:

- 1) Be off-campus, in order to allow for the necessary transition away from the high school building, but still with the support and resources that the OPRFHS staff and district are able to provide.
- 2) Is in a location that allows the students to interact with and be a part of the larger community.
- 3) Be appropriately equipped and designed to meet the educational needs of this group of students that are learning to become independent adults.
- 4) Ensure that all CITE classes are located together. This allows staff to better collaborate, plan and work together as a team to ensure the success of this group of students.

It may be possible for District 200 to negotiate modifications to the current agreement with the RFCC to provide sufficient space at the RFCC for the full CITE program requirements. It should be pointed out to the RFCC that the high school currently devotes considerable space to the Huskie Pups program. If this proves unfeasible, the District 200 administration should work to secure a different off-campus location which will meet the expected long term facilities needs of the full CITE program. For its long term facilities master planning process, the Imagine Team will assume that one of these courses of action will be successful, and will not include any long term space at the high school for any part of the CITE program.

With regard to the Huskie Pups program, the Imagine Team will assume that this program will continue at its current rate of enrollment and space requirements. For its long term facilities master planning process, the Imagine Team will assume that today's Huskie Pups space requirements will continue for the foreseeable future.

OUTDOOR PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND ATHLETIC SPACES

Current and immediate future conditions

The high school has a very limited amount of outdoor space to devote to Physical Education and athletic activities. The Lake Street Field and the West Field (including the football stadium and field) are the only proximate and OPRF controlled pieces of property.

Long Range Facilities Master Planning Implications

Lake Street Field

The outdoor track at Lake Street field was never intended to serve as much more than a jogging track. It is not regulation-sized, and the corners are far too tight to conduct even outdoor track practices. Nonetheless, this field serves its purposes for other sports and the Imagine team recommends only that alternative options for spectator seating and storage be pursued. Detailed recommendations are included in the facilities master plan.

Outdoor Track Program / West Fields

The school's current agreement with Concordia for use of their outdoor track ends in June 2022, and Concordia has indicated that they will not renew the agreement beyond that date. The Imagine Team has concluded that there is no viable option for building a regulation sized outdoor track on the OPRFHS campus. Although an outdoor track could be made to fit on the current West Field area, it would displace all the other programs which the West Field currently serves. We recommend that the school renegotiate its Intergovernmental Agreement with Triton College to include the necessary use of their outdoor track. Separately, as part of the facilities master plan, we recommend installing artificial turf on the West Field areas to improve drainage and to maximize utilization.

Stadium

The Imagine team recommends several changes and improvements to the stadium, and those will be itemized separately as part of the facilities master plan.

Tennis Courts

The school has completed badly needed, but not long term, repairs to the tennis courts this past summer. With proper follow-up, these repairs could prolong the life of the current courts for another ten years. Beyond that, a long term solution should be independently evaluated by the administration, including the potential for an off-site location, as any major reconstruction of the current courts will result in the loss of one tennis court space.

Renegotiating / strengthening partnerships with other organizations

Overcrowding during peak activity periods is an outstanding issue for all of the school's outdoor spaces. The Imagine team recommends that the district administration develop stronger partnerships with the Park District of Oak Park, local educational institutions, and other community organizations to 1) identify additional options for using off-campus facilities and securing additional space, and 2) ensure that the interests of both parties to any agreements are being met in a balanced manner. Some of these agreements are already in place, but all of them should be re-examined to insure that the school's best interests are protected, and that the future needs of our students' outdoor Physical Education and Athletics will be met.

SECURITY ISSUES

Current and immediate future conditions

The safety and security of the students, faculty, and staff at the OPRFHS is a top priority issue for the District 200 administration, the District 200 Board of Education, and for the Imagine Team. Imagine Team members have interviewed security administrators, security personnel, students, and faculty to identify the current issues and to recommend changes and next steps.

Industry Trends related to Incorporating Security into School Design

Common security practices include providing clear sightlines to parking lots from staffed administration locations, limiting building access to a single entry point with a sallyport design, target hardening through security glazing, enhancing passive supervision through interior transparency, territorial reinforcement through fencing and thoughtful landscaping, and other solutions.

When evaluating security we must not let fear overly dictate design, or design our schools to resemble prisons. Many school and university officials, national educational organizations, affiliated organizations, and individuals have come together as an interdisciplinary group to develop a "Call for Action to Prevent Gun Violence in the US" where they stress the importance of creating stronger, more connected school communities focused on development and identification of soft skills in students to reduce the incidence of isolation, depression, bullying and discrimination in our schools.

The creation of secure spaces must be balanced by the design of collaborative areas, transparency, and informal learning environments. Inviting spaces which create connection, ownership, and fellowship are critical to creating a secure school community. A welcoming space creates a positive relationship between students, the institution, and the larger

community. The masterplan in turn must create spaces that are secure and support relationship building.

Long Range Facilities Master Planning Implications

Student safety and security are two of the principal drivers behind the development of the “Commons” concept in the center of the school. The concept of aggregating all of the student-centric common functions (cafeteria, library, tutoring center, student services, help desk) in the center of the school makes sense logistically, but more importantly, creates a secure zone which is manageable for the security organization.

Beyond this, however, the Imagine Team recognizes that there are other security issues, both in terms of facilities, as well as a policies and practices, which require further evaluation. The members of the Imagine Team do not have the professional expertise to do this work, so it is our recommendation that the D200 administration establish a contract with an experienced security consultant to complete a thorough audit of the school’s facilities, policies, and practices related to security in order to establish a comprehensive plan and program to address this issue.

Prior to implementing extensive security improvements, further developing a security program is key. We envision a collaborative effort including the board, security staff, security consultants, design professionals, students, faculty, and parents. A cohesive program consists of planning, training, and empowerment. The brief security review conducted by the Imagine Team found a need for improvement in many of these areas.