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Committee History and District Overview
HISTORY OF DISTRICT 112 RECONFIGURATION

**2012**
- SCFFAC* CONVENED

**2014**
- SCFFAC REPORT

**2015-16**
- CONFIGURATION DEVELOPMENT & REFERENDUM

**2016-17**
- 2.0 TEAM CONVENED

**Identified Challenges:**
- Too many buildings
- Aging buildings
- Financial sustainability
- 21st century learning

**SCFFAC Recommendation:**
- Two middle school buildings (700-800 students)
- Consolidated elementary school buildings (400-500 students)

**Seven-Building Concept:**
- One middle school campus (5-6 / 7-8)
- Six elementary school buildings

**Reconfiguration 2.0 Community Team:**
- Co-develop options with input from Cabinet, Board of Education and community
- Recommend 2-3 configurations to Board of Education in July 2017

*SCFFAC is the Superintendent’s Citizen Finance and Facilities Advisory Committee*
The Reconfiguration 2.0 Community Team was formed in June 2016 after the March 2016 referendum did not pass at the polls. D112 convened a group of community members from the Highland Park, Highwood, and Fort Sheridan areas that could represent the many different perspectives on this complicated issue.

The charge of the 2.0 Team was to facilitate a community-based planning process to identify and recommend 2-3 viable reconfiguration proposals to the D112 School Board that support and advance the tradition of educational excellence in our district.

Over the past year, the 2.0 Team has worked in partnership with administrators, the D112 School Board, architecture and planning experts, and the community to develop the concepts identified in this report. All models have been designed by Nagle Hartray Architecture and priced by Gilbane Building Company, and were developed by considering educational objectives, financial considerations, and community feedback.
2.0 TEAM STRUCTURE AND APPROACH

At its inception, the 2.0 Team was formed with education, facilities, finance, and communications subcommittees. The subcommittees included many professionals from those fields, and all worked within their respective disciplines to review the reconfiguration work to date within NSSD112, study best practices, and research the processes and outcomes of reconfigurations and referenda in neighboring districts. The subcommittees also worked very closely with senior district administrators to understand the complexities of sectioning, staffing, and scheduling within NSSD112, and the interplay of those considerations with buildings, boundaries, district finances, and learning.

The 2.0 Subcommittees met regularly and held multiple joint meetings in 2016. In early 2017 the group determined that the district’s needs would be best served by a more interdisciplinary approach and moved to working as a Committee of the Whole. Building on the domain expertise developed in the subcommittees, the 2.0 Team has collaborated to develop, study, critique, and refine approaches to reconfiguration.
The 2.0 Team has prioritized understanding the issues and complexities of reconfiguration in D112.

- Toured all sites in D112, HPHS, and schools in other districts. Examined SCFFAC report, Nagle Hartray studies/analysis, and other research.

- Consulted with Cabinet and Board of Education on District educational objectives. Fact Sheets are available in the Appendix A of this report.

- Examined district finances, which led to the creation of the 2.0 Team’s financial model. Visit 112information.org/financial-model to learn more.
D112 LANDSCAPE

- D112 currently operates 12 buildings and aging buildings require substantial upgrades/capital investment.
- Class sizes vary widely across D112 and within schools, resulting in an uneven learning environment and inefficient use of space and staffing resources.
- Outstanding teachers.
- Excellent Early Childhood program.
- Nationally recognized Dual Language program.
- 17% of students are English language learners.
- Roughly 7% of students are from military families.
- Roughly 80% of adults who live and pay taxes in the district do not have children in D112 schools.
D112 FACILITIES LANDSCAPE

Long-term configuration solutions include design of secure, accessible, updated and flexible learning spaces

- All Kindergarten classrooms need to be on the ground floor with in-room toilet access.
- Security guidelines dictate closure of doors and windows, restricting adequate classroom ventilation.
- Aging and inaccessible buildings limit accommodation for disabilities and increase injury risk to students, staff, and parents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Fire Sprinklers</th>
<th>Intruder Prevention</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>ADA Access</th>
<th>Steep Slope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Braeside</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Yes (2017)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Trail</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Yes (2017)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Terrace</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Yes (2017)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravinia</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Oak</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Yes (2017)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherwood</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Yes (2017)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Thomas</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>Yes (2017)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Yes (2017)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm Place</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwood</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Yes (2017)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Bay</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The July 1, 2016 School Security and Standards Task Force recommended that all school follow guidelines for Access Control. These guidelines mandate that facilities have a single secure primary building entrance with direct visual observance from the reception area. All secondary entries should be locked down during the course of the day.
*Financial projection is an estimate based on a viable and researched set of assumptions, including professional reports on safely and properly maintaining district buildings. As of June 30 FY2016.

For more details, please see Reconfiguration 2.0 Financial Model at www.112information.org/financial-model
*Financial projection is an estimate based on a viable and researched set of assumptions, including professional reports on safely and properly maintaining district buildings. As of June 30 FY2016.
Data Collection and Research Findings
KEY 2.0 TEAM RESEARCH FINDINGS: EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMMING

Based on population trends and projections, SCFFAC findings, and discussions with the Superintendent’s Cabinet regarding Middle School Philosophy, the 2.0 Team believes that fewer than three middle schools is the best approach for any proposed reconfiguration. See the following graphics on comparable school district configurations and D112 middle school enrollment projections.

Following in-depth discussions with the Superintendent’s Cabinet, analysis of the 6th Day Counts, and review of SCFFAC findings, the Education Committee has determined that too few sections per grade level per school has resulted in wide variations in class sizes, social and academic limitations for many students and staff, and operating inefficiencies across the district. See the following graphic on class size and sectioning based on the 2016-2017 student enrollment numbers.

Following extensive analysis of surrounding districts’ full day kindergarten offerings and review of previous research, including the District 112 November 17, 2015 presentation to the Board, Full Day Kindergarten Study, the Reconfiguration 2.0 Community Team is recommending that full day kindergarten (FDK) be a component of any reconfiguration plan. See the following graph depicting full day kindergarten offerings in surrounding districts.
SIMILAR DISTRICTS USE FEWER SCHOOLS

Districts with similar numbers of students have fewer buildings to staff, operate, and maintain. Consolidation would enable greater opportunities for students both socially and academically through increased cohorts and would nurture consistency in programming through larger teaching teams per grade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF STUDENTS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF SCHOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSSD112 4309</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenview 34 4869</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorn 73 4202</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmette 39 3740</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deerfield 109 2973</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ISBE Illinois Report Card 2015-2016 (districts of comparable student populations)
Disparities in facilities, play
scape, and class size perpetuate inequities in student experience across the district.

• Growth of the Dual Language program pushes Northwood further past capacity in the next five years.

• Edgewood and Elm Place projected to operate well below capacity by 2021/22.

*Source: D112 school year 2016-2017 6th Day Counts. Year 2021/22 projection reflects current first grade population as incoming sixth grade.
### MANY D112 1ST GRADERS IN UNDERSIZED CLASSES, TWO-SECTION PROGRAMS

#### Class Size
- We have 406 1st graders spread across 23 sections (classes)
- Average class size of 18 students per class

#### Section Examples
- The 1st Grade Gen Ed students at Indian Trail will spend their entire 6 years with the same 34 students
- The DL class at Sherwood will spend their entire 6 years with the same 19 students

### 2016-2017 1st Grade Students by Class (6th Day Counts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>1st Grade Gen Ed</th>
<th>Dual Language</th>
<th>One-way Immersion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oak Terrace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Oak</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braeside</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherwood</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Trail</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravinia</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Thomas</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Number of 1st Grade Sections
- **Oak Terrace**: 4
- **Red Oak**: 2
- **Braeside**: 2
- **Sherwood**: 3
- **Indian Trail**: 2
- **Ravinia**: 1
- **Wayne Thomas**: 2
- **Lincoln**: 2

#### Max. class size per BOE (23)
SURROUNDING DISTRICTS ALL OFFER OR ARE INTRODUCING FULL DAY KINDERGARTEN
DUAL LANGUAGE PROGRAM CONSIDERATIONS

• **Dual Language Program (DL)** is a two-way immersion bilingual, bi-literate, and bicultural educational program offered at Oak Terrace, Red Oak, and Sherwood that fulfills the government requirement for educating English Language Learners (ELLs). Indian Trail houses a one-way immersion bilingual program.

• **Growth in the DL program** is the most dramatic change since the release of the SCFFAC report in Feb. 2014. Kindergarten currently registers seven sections of DL with a waiting list of native English-speaking families.

• **Sectioning implication**: An elementary school with four sections per grade level, including two DL and two monolingual, is a de facto two-section school for both programs with the same challenges for teachers and students of a small cohort.

• **Middle School Feeders**: All DL sections feed into Northwood for continuation of DL programming during three blocks of the day. As larger DL classes age into middle school, the population balance shifts across middle school buildings.
The 2.0 Team recommends that **Improved Air Quality** be a priority in the reconfiguration of the district. Based on recent state building safety recommendations and EPA recommendations on Healthy Indoor Environments in Schools, proper classroom ventilation can reduce absences and the transmission of infectious diseases, improve overall health and productivity of teachers, and improve test scores (up to 15%) and student performance in completing mental tasks. With the need to keep all doors and first floor windows closed in order to ensure the safety of students and staff, D112 is not able to provide a healthy indoor environment within 11 out of 12 of its buildings.

The 2.0 Team recommends that all high priority **Health/Life Safety Improvements** recommended in the Green Report to be completed within the next five years be incorporated in the reconfiguration process.

The 2.0 Team recommends compliance with the Illinois School Code requirements regarding the **Installation of Fire Suppression Systems** in school facilities. Specifically, plans and specifications shall comply with rules and regulations established by the State Board of Education, and such rules and regulations shall be consistent so far as practicable with nationally recognized standards, such as those established by the National Fire Protection Association.

The 2.0 Team recommends compliance with the **2010 ADA Standards for Accessible Design** with regard to all D112 facilities utilized by students and staff on a daily basis.
Community Engagement Process
DATA COLLECTION EFFORTS AND COMMUNITY OUTREACH

The 2.0 Team has contributed thousands of hours of research, deliberation, and engagement with our community and district partners. The below timeline provides a roadmap for our work and the steps planned toward a reconfiguration decision by the D112 School Board.

June 2016
Citizen-led Reconfiguration
2.0 Community Team is formed. Committees include:

Summer 2016
2.0 Team researches existing challenges and conducts community survey to gain a greater understanding of the previous referendum outcome and identify areas of improvement.

Fall 2016
2.0 Team continues research into D112's educational, facilities, and financial challenges to develop a knowledge base that incorporates previous studies and current evaluation.

Winter 2016 - Spring 2017
2.0 Team conducts community interviews, focus groups, and forums to identify community preferences for the future of our schools.

March 2017 - April 2017
2.0 Team conducts community survey on reconfiguration priorities and collaborates with D112 staff and planning experts to identify initial reconfiguration options.

May 2017
2.0 Team explores reconfiguration options using criteria in three areas: education, community feedback, and finance.

June 2017
2.0 Team engages community around reconfiguration options to explore and refine models prior to making recommendations to the D112 School Board.

July 2017
2.0 Team continues analysis of reconfiguration options and makes recommendations to the D112 School Board.

August 2017 - September 2017
D112 School Board assesses reconfiguration options in consultation with 2.0 Team, D112 staff, and community.
2.0 TEAM COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PROCESS

**2016 JUN**
COMMUNITY SURVEY | random sample of 301 respondents
Identified the $198 million figure and single middle school concept as factors leading to the failure of the referendum

**2017 JAN**
STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS | 30 individuals
Calls with supporters and detractors of the referendum clarified how to improve engagement and identified next steps

**2017 FEB**
FOCUS GROUPS | 33 participants
Evaluated public understanding about D112 and the failed referendum and set priorities for next steps

**2017 MAR**
"STATE OF THE DISTRICT" MAILER | 12,000+ households
Provided an update on the key factors driving the need for change in D112 and promoted opportunities for the community to get involved

**2017 MAR**
COMMUNITY FORUMS | ~200 attendees
Catalogued community feedback on facilities, finances, elementary and middle school preferences and engagement

**2017 APR**
COMMUNITY SURVEY | random sample of 448 respondents
Identified support for curriculum and educational consistency, manageable class sizes, consolidation, facilities modernization, and closing one middle school

**2017 APR**
COMMUNITY SURVEY | public opt-in 1,000+ respondents
See above

**2017 JUN**
"ROADMAP FOR THE DISTRICT" MAILER | 12,000+ households
Provided an update on the 2.0 Team’s engagement process and community feedback received to date, as well as a review of the criteria used to refine configuration options

**2017 JUN**
COMMUNITY FORUMS | ~400 attendees
Two events resulted in 1,118 Post-It Notes, approximately 230 exit surveys, and approximately 100 inquiries for future focus group participation on the eight proposed models

**2017 JUN**
FOCUS GROUPS | 42 participants
Participants supported change and equitable opportunity across D112 and chose Models B, D, and E as the most “reasonable” options
Criteria for Reconfiguration and Developing Recommendations
EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR RECONFIGURATION MODELS

**Educational/Facility Impact:** Number of grade sections in each elementary school, middle school cohort sizes, number of teaching teams at middle schools, flexibility of programming, Dual Language efficiency, and enhanced educational and programing opportunities for 5th graders.

**Community Feedback:** Maintaining neighborhood elementary schools, consolidating to two middle schools, referendum needs, travel impact, additional transitions, amount of change across district, and balancing school sizes. This work was informed by the June 2016 FAKO survey, February 2017 focus groups, March 2017 aQity survey, and March 2017 community forums.

**Financial Analysis of the Reconfiguration Options:** Estimates of the cost of implementation for each of the options submitted to D112’s architecture and planning experts are under evaluation. Consideration of both up-front costs and D112’s long-term financial sustainability should be components of continued discussions regarding reconfiguration options.
The 2.0 Team took a number of educational and facility criteria into account when evaluating reconfiguration models. These criteria, which are not ranked or prioritized, included:

- Minimize/eliminate two-section programming to achieve the academic and social benefits of a larger cohort
- Fewer than three middle schools
- Planning of space and funding to allow for full day kindergarten
- Enhanced educational and extracurricular opportunities for 5th graders
- Shared/common opportunities across the district
- Equitable facilities (similar cohort and class sizes, spaces of like quality and function)
- Learning spaces that support collaboration and opportunities to attract the best staff
- Educationally and developmentally appropriate indoor and outdoor spaces
- Improved indoor air quality to enhance the learning environment
The vast majority of our community believes in D112’s tradition of educational excellence, and most community members also recognize the need for change.

- More than 80% of residents surveyed recognize that reconfiguration is needed to stabilize D112 finances.
- Nearly two in three (66%) residents understand significant facility improvements are needed.
- Many residents are understandably concerned about property taxes and district costs. More than 35% of residents listed property taxes and cost considerations as top priorities for any reconfiguration proposal.

Our community prioritizes providing an equitable and high-quality education for our children.

- Nearly seven in ten residents (69%) believe improving consistency in providing a high-quality education should be a top priority of reconfiguration.
- Virtually every resident surveyed (92%) believes providing a consistent curriculum across all schools is an important consideration for reconfiguration.
- Nearly three of four residents (73%) believe it is “extremely” or “very” important for D112 to provide consistent technologies and amenities across all schools.
Our community understands that reducing the number of buildings will maximize our resources and provide opportunities to better serve our students. Four in five residents:

- Do not believe that all 12 elementary and middle schools should remain open (79%).
- Would support closing one of the three middle schools in the district (80%).

Most residents surveyed recognize the opportunities in facility improvements. Priorities include:

- Providing STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics) labs to all elementary schools for more hands-on, real-world learning (94%).
- Adding fire sprinklers to all buildings (94%).
- Ensuring all schools are ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) compliant (89%).
PROCESS STEPS: CRITERIA SCATTERGRAM

Depicted to the right is the Scattergram used to identify potentially viable reconfiguration options.

2.0 Team members submitted a total of 24 models for consideration. Each model was analyzed using a heat map for: (1) educational and facility criteria (see the y-axis); and (2) community feedback criteria (see the x-axis). The models that were plotted close to or above the uppermost arc of the Scattergram were then identified as those to be presented and further tested in the June community forums and focus groups.
FACTORS OUT OF SCOPE/NOT CONSIDERED

There are a number of criteria that are important to the selection of a reconfiguration option that we did not consider, either because they are outside the scope of our mandate or because we do not have the means to evaluate them. These factors should be assessed by the Board as it studies, refines, and identifies a reconfiguration proposal to put forward. These factors include:

- Attendance boundaries
- Educational objectives that could not be measured (e.g., value of shared play spaces, gyms/stages, STEM, and other curriculum and programming options)
- Traffic patterns, traffic studies, bus routes, and travel times
- Options for reconfiguration in the absence of a successful referendum
- Impact of any reconfiguration proposal on staffing and teaching structure
- Long-term financial sustainability of the reconfiguration proposals based on specific staffing models
- Changes to some of our basic assumptions (e.g., district class size guidelines or the feasibility of offering Dual Language in more than one middle school)
REFINING OPTIONS USING COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

Initial Options
Initial reconfiguration options featured an array of possibilities developed using insights from evaluation of D112 educational, facilities, and financial challenges, and community engagement.

Refined Options
Options were refined based on insights from direct community engagement, a community-wide survey, and 2.0 Team deliberation using three criteria: education, community feedback, and finance.

Recommended Options
Recommendations will be made to the D112 School Board, taking into account community feedback, previous research and evaluation, and ongoing financial analysis.
2.0 TEAM RECOMMENDATION PROCESS

• Considered more than 20 different configuration models over the last year

• Narrowed the list to eight models that were presented to the public in two open forums at HPHS, three focus groups, and on our website

• Analyzed community feedback, surveys, and existing body of research to make informed recommendations

Note: The 2.0 Team did not have the opportunity to evaluate or test public opinion on variations for these models, but we have included suggestions in Appendix B of this report. These ideas may impact the feasibility and desirability of various models.
Preferred Models and Additional Models for Consideration
The 2.0 Team formed a number of basic assumptions in the course of our study and analysis. We took these assumptions as underlying facts of our analysis and they informed our process. It is possible that changes to these core assumptions could lead to the identification of different reconfiguration options:

- Full day kindergarten will be introduced to D112 along with reconfiguration; fiscal sustainability through 2030 is a precondition for any reconfiguration option; district class size guidelines will remain unchanged; the student population will be composed of 19 sections per grade; demographic patterns will remain the same; and Dual Language will continue to be offered in a single middle school.

- ADA, fire, health/life safety, as well as Green Report (long-term and deferred maintenance) work identified to be performed within the next five years, is included within the scope of reconfiguration work.

- Maintaining the current 12 building model is not financially sustainable. Survey results reflect wide community support for closing a number of schools, leading us to focus on 8-9 building models.

- Recommendations developed support the mission of D112, which is to nurture every child to become an inspired learner, a well-rounded individual and a contributing member of a global community by striving for excellence within an environment that fosters innovation, respect, engagement and intellectual inquiry.
• The committee chose models B, D, and E as preferred models because they contain the greatest number of features that are in the best interest of D112 students and garnered the strongest support from those who attended the community forums and focus groups.

• There are tradeoffs for all configurations and any of the models require compromise. Dissenting opinions existed among all models.

• There may be elements of some non-preferred models that merit the Board's consideration.

Note: Preferred models are presented alphabetically, not in order of preference.
MODEL B

9-Building Plan
- Early childhood center (attached to Oak Terrace)
- Six elementary schools: NW, OT, RO, SW, RV, BR
- Two middle schools: IT (5-6), EP (7-8), EW (5-8)
- Administrative offices attached to SW

Goals and Key Elements
- Three sections per grade level at all elementary schools district-wide to achieve larger cohorts and teaching teams.
- Two Dual Language Academies to consolidate resources and accommodate six sections.
- Students would transition to middle school in 5th grade. Edgewood will function as two schools (5-6 and 7-8) to the greatest extent possible.
- Elm Place/Indian Trail Middle School would include a 60/40 split of Dual Language/monolingual students to achieve diversity.

Community Perspective Based on Forums and Focus Groups
- Opinions from the community were mixed on this concept. Some felt strongly that 5th grade is a good time to transition to middle school while others felt strongly that students are not ready for middle school at that age.
- Diversity was a key theme of feedback for this concept at the elementary level, with regard to Dual Language and monolingual sections concentrated in different schools.
# Model B Financial Summary

## Project Costs (\$ millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renovation of Existing Space</th>
<th>Additions to Existing Space and Site Improvements</th>
<th>Ongoing Capital Expense ($ millions)</th>
<th>Total Costs ($ millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvements ¹</td>
<td>State-mandated Health &amp; Safety ²</td>
<td>Maintenance and Repair Planned through 2025 ³</td>
<td>Est. 40% funded by District Sources ⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$99.2</td>
<td>$11.2</td>
<td>$12.7</td>
<td>$13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35.5</td>
<td>$19.7</td>
<td>$19.7</td>
<td>$178.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$32.8</td>
<td>$19.7</td>
<td>$19.7</td>
<td>$151.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Improvements required to accommodate sections per grade, classroom configurations, student population, and upgrades to meet educational requirements, as well as ADA, HVAC and Safety/Security
2. Improvements already mandated by Health Life Safety (HLS) that are due to be completed during the project term
3. Additions to buildings to accommodate sections per grade, configurations, student population, educational requirements, and security vestibules, and site work for grading, parking and driveways
4. Includes Architect, Engineers, General Contractors, reserve for contingencies, permits, utility fees, security, Legal, financial, and escalation (increasing of construction costs during later years of the project)
5. Capital expenses identified in the Green Report
6. Portion of Capital Expenses identified in Green Report that may be funded by District sources, such as District Reserve, future operational savings, and/or future tax revenue to be completed
7. Lower Range estimate assumes potential refinement of 15%
MODEL D

8-Building Plan
- Early childhood center attached to NW
- Three primary schools (K-2): OT, SW, BR
- Three secondary schools (3-5): IT, RO, RV
- Two middle schools: NW and EW
- Administrative offices attached to EW

Goals and Key Elements
- Three sets of regional pairs of schools establishes 3-4 sections per grade at each elementary school.
- Dual Language students would be in a common building with monolingual students.
- The south end of WT would be connected to NW middle school to eliminate trailers, accommodate a larger student population, and dedicate entire field space to middle school students. The north end of WT would be used for an early childhood center.

Community Perspective Based on Forums and Focus Groups
- Allows for more consistency across the district and provides for opportunities to allow for team teaching and collaborative learning in alignment with best educational practices.
- Community comments were positive on mixing the Dual Language and monolingual sections at the schools.
- Community members who disliked this model overwhelmingly flagged the number of transitions as the reason. Further studies on this model should include staggering start and end times of the school day.
- Community members also expressed interest in the educational opportunities that regional pairings of schools would provide.
Model D Map and Feeder Pattern
## MODEL D FINANCIAL SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renovation of Existing Space</th>
<th>Additions to Existing Space and Site Improvements</th>
<th>Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment</th>
<th>Maintenance and Repair Planned through 2025</th>
<th>Est. 40% funded by District Sources</th>
<th>Net Est. Capital Expense</th>
<th>Total Costs (Upper Range)</th>
<th>Total Costs (Lower Range)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvements¹</td>
<td>State-mandated Health &amp; Safety²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90.7</td>
<td>$5.2</td>
<td>$34.8</td>
<td>$11.8</td>
<td>$29.4</td>
<td>$11.8</td>
<td>$17.6</td>
<td>$160.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Improvements required to accommodate sections per grade, classroom configurations, student population, and upgrades to meet educational requirements, as well as ADA, HVAC and Safety/Security.
2. Improvements already mandated by Health Life Safety (HLS) that are due to be completed during the project term.
3. Additions to buildings to accommodate sections per grade, configurations, student population, educational requirements, and security vestibules, and site work for grading, parking and driveways.
4. Includes Architect, Engineers, General Contractors, reserve for contingencies, permits, utility fees, security, Legal, financial, and escalation (increasing of construction costs during later years of the project).
6. Portion of Capital Expenses identified in Green Report that may be funded by District sources, such as District Reserve, future operational savings, and/or future tax revenue to be completed.
7. Lower Range estimate assumes potential refinement of 15%.
MODEL E

8-Building Plan
- Early childhood center attached to WT
- Six elementary schools (K-5): OT, IT, RD, SW, RV, BR
- Two middle schools (6-8): NW and EW
- Administrative offices attached to IT

Goals and Key Elements
- Three or more sections per grade level at each elementary school district-wide to achieve larger cohorts and teaching teams.
- Two Dual Language Academies to consolidate resources and accommodate 6+ sections of students.
- The south end of WT would be connected to NW middle school to eliminate trailers, accommodate a larger student population, and dedicate entire field space to middle school students. The north end of WT would be used for an early childhood center.

Community Perspective Based on Forums and Focus Groups
- Many community members saw this model as a good compromise.
- Community members who disliked the plan mentioned that the balance in buildings favors the south side of the district.
- There was also concern that Northwood has too few monolingual sections.
MODEL E MAP AND FEEDER PATTERN
## MODEL E FINANCIAL SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Costs ($ millions)</th>
<th>Ongoing Capital Expense ($ millions)</th>
<th>Total Costs ($ millions)</th>
<th>Total Costs ($ millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renovation of Existing Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements¹</td>
<td>State-mandated Health &amp; Safety²</td>
<td>Additions to Existing Space and Site Improvements³</td>
<td>Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$87.7</td>
<td>$5.3</td>
<td>$36.1</td>
<td>$11.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Improvements required to accommodate sections per grade, classroom configurations, student population, and upgrades to meet educational requirements, as well as ADA, HVAC and Safety/Security
2. Improvements already mandated by Health Life Safety (HLS) that are due to be completed during the project term
3. Additions to buildings to accommodate sections per grade, configurations, student population, educational requirements, and security vestibules, and site work for grading, parking and driveways
4. Includes Architect, Engineers, General Contractors, reserve for contingencies, permits, utility fees, security, Legal, financial, and escalation (increasing of construction costs during later years of the project)
5. Capital expenses identified in the Green Report
6. Portion of Capital Expenses identified in Green Report that may be funded by District sources, such as District Reserve, future operational savings, and/or future tax revenue to be completed
7. Lower Range estimate assumes potential refinement of 15%
OTHER MODELS FOR CONSIDERATION: C, A, F, G AND H

• The remaining models have positive features, but were not identified as the top choices by the 2.0 Team or by individuals that attended forums and focus groups.

• Certain features within these models may be of interest to the Board in considering their choices.
MODEL C

5-Building Plan
- Early childhood center attached to WT
- Four elementary schools: WT, OT, SW, EW
- One middle school: IT/EP campus
- Administrative offices attached to EW

Goals and Key Elements
- 2-5 sections per grade level to allow for larger cohorts and better teaming of teachers.
- One Dual Language Academy and two sections in a common facility with monolingual programming to accommodate six sections.
- Single middle school allows for more collaborative teaching environment and operational efficiencies.

Community Perspective Based on Forums and Focus Groups
- This model garnered the most feedback. Opinions were either strongly in favor or strongly against the plan.
- Community members who were strongly in favor of this plan thought that it provided equitable distribution across the district and aggressive change via reconfiguration.
- People that were strongly against the plan thought that it was too much change and provided for only one middle school. Some liked the idea of the middle school in the center of town while others thought traffic may be a problem, especially given its proximity to the high school.
- Even though no long-term sustainability studies have been done, since this plan is only five buildings, community members indicated that it provides the greatest opportunity for operational efficiencies.
MODEL C MAP AND FEEDER PATTERN
# Model C Financial Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renovation of Existing Space</th>
<th>Additions to Existing Space and Site Improvements</th>
<th>Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment</th>
<th>Maintenance and Repair Planned through 2025</th>
<th>Est. 40% funded by District Sources</th>
<th>Net Est. Capital Expense</th>
<th>Total (Upper Range)</th>
<th>Total (Lower Range)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvements¹</td>
<td>State-mandated Health &amp; Safety²</td>
<td>Improvements³</td>
<td>Maintenance and Repair Planned through 2025</td>
<td>Est. 40% funded by District Sources</td>
<td>Net Est. Capital Expense</td>
<td>Total (Upper Range)</td>
<td>Total (Lower Range)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$76.3</td>
<td>$9.5</td>
<td>$74.3</td>
<td>$11.7</td>
<td>$26.1</td>
<td>$10.4</td>
<td>$15.7</td>
<td>$187.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Improvements required to accommodate sections per grade, classroom configurations, student population, and upgrades to meet educational requirements, as well as ADA, HVAC and Safety/Security
2. Improvements already mandated by Health Life Safety (HLS) that are due to be completed during the project term
3. Additions to buildings to accommodate sections per grade, configurations, student population, educational requirements, and security vestibules, and site work for grading, parking and driveways
4. Includes Architect, Engineers, General Contractors, reserve for contingencies, permits, utility fees, security, Legal, financial, and escalation (increasing of construction costs during later years of the project)
5. Capital expenses identified in the Green Report
6. Portion of Capital Expenses identified in Green Report that may be funded by District sources, such as District Reserve, future operational savings, and/or future tax revenue to be completed
7. Lower Range estimate assumes potential refinement of 15%
MODEL A

8-Building Plan
• Early childhood center at Green Bay
• Administrative offices at Green Bay
• Five elementary schools: OT, IT, RO, SW, new southeast elementary school
• Two middle schools: EW, and new NW

Goals and Key Elements
• 3-4 sections per grade to achieve larger cohorts and teaching teams at all buildings.
• Two Dual Language Academies to consolidate resources and accommodate 6+ sections of students.
• New middle school at the NW/WT site and a new four section per grade level elementary school in the southeast part of the district.

Community Perspective Based on Forums and Focus Groups
• People believed that this plan was too expensive. It includes two new buildings.
• There were a number of concerns about the lack of diversity and lack of monolingual resources in the north end of the district.
• Many thought it was the most strategic suggestion, but also believed that it would be difficult to pass in a referendum.
MODEL A MAP AND FEEDER PATTERN
### MODEL A FINANCIAL SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Costs ($ millions)</th>
<th>Ongoing Capital Expense ($ millions)</th>
<th>Total Costs ($ millions)</th>
<th>Total Costs ($ millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renovation of Existing Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements¹</td>
<td>State-mandated Health &amp; Safety²</td>
<td>Additions to Existing Space and Site Improvements³</td>
<td>Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50.8</td>
<td>$5.1</td>
<td>$135.5</td>
<td>$11.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Improvements required to accommodate sections per grade, classroom configurations, student population, and upgrades to meet educational requirements, as well as ADA, HVAC and Safety/Security
2. Improvements already mandated by Health Life Safety (HLS) that are due to be completed during the project term
3. Additions to buildings to accommodate sections per grade, configurations, student population, educational requirements, and security vestibules, and site work for grading, parking and driveways
4. Includes Architect, Engineers, General Contractors, reserve for contingencies, permits, utility fees, security, Legal, financial, and escalation (increasing of construction costs during later years of the project)
5. Capital expenses identified in the Green Report
6. Portion of Capital Expenses identified in Green Report that may be funded by District sources, such as District Reserve, future operational savings, and/or future tax revenue to be completed
7. Lower Range estimate assumes potential refinement of 15%
MODEL F

9-Building Plan
- Early childhood center attached to WT
- One primary school (K-2): BR
- One secondary school (3-5): RV
- Five elementary schools (K-5): OT, WT, RO, SW, IT
- Two middle schools (6-8): EW, NW
- Administrative offices attached to RO

Goals and Key Elements
- 2-4 sections in elementary schools per grade level and one regional pairing.
- Two Dual Language Academies to consolidate resources and accommodate 6+ sections of students.
- Northwood expansion to accommodate larger student population.

Community Perspective Based on Forums and Focus Groups
- Community members felt that there were too many buildings, so not enough money would be saved.
- There were concerns about not enough balance between Northwood and Edgewood with only two monolingual sections at NW.
- Stakeholders noted inconsistency across the District with some students attending two schools from K-5 and some attending one school K-5.
- Wayne Thomas would only have two sections per grade so would not allow for as much team teaching as the other schools.
## MODEL F FINANCIAL SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renovation of Existing Space</th>
<th>Additions to Existing Space and Site Improvements</th>
<th>Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment</th>
<th>Maintenance and Repair Planned through 2025</th>
<th>Est. 40% funded by District Sources</th>
<th>Net Est. Capital Expense</th>
<th>Total Costs (Upper Range)</th>
<th>Total Costs (Lower Range)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvements¹</td>
<td>State-mandated Health &amp; Safety²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$88.0</td>
<td>$5.3</td>
<td>$30.1</td>
<td>$11.7</td>
<td>$29.4</td>
<td>$18.1</td>
<td>$152.8</td>
<td>$129.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Improvements required to accommodate sections per grade, classroom configurations, student population, and upgrades to meet educational requirements, as well as ADA, HVAC and Safety/Security
2. Improvements already mandated by Health Life Safety (HLS) that are due to be completed during the project term
3. Additions to buildings to accommodate sections per grade, configurations, student population, educational requirements, and security vestibules, and site work for grading, parking and driveways
4. Includes Architect, Engineers, General Contractors, reserve for contingencies, permits, utility fees, security, Legal, financial, and escalation (increasing of construction costs during later years of the project)
5. Capital expenses identified in the Green Report
6. Portion of Capital Expenses identified in Green Report that may be funded by District sources, such as District Reserve, future operational savings, and/or future tax revenue to be completed
7. Lower Range estimate assumes potential refinement of 15%
MODEL G

10-Building Plan
- Early childhood center at Green Bay
- Administrative offices at Green Bay
- Seven elementary schools: OT, WT, RO, IT, SW, RV, BR
- Two middle schools: NW, EW

Goals and Key Elements
- 2-4 sections per grade level maintains status quo at most buildings.
- Two Dual Language Academies to consolidate resources and accommodate 6+ sections of students.
- No change to the early childhood center, remains at GB.

Community Perspective Based on Forums and Focus Groups
- This plan had the most negative reaction from the community.
- People felt that there were too many buildings with too few sections per school.
- Not enough change would mean this model becomes too expensive for the district.
- Stakeholders voiced concerns that there were too few monolingual sections at Northwood (two sections per grade versus eight sections of Dual Language).
MODEL G MAP AND FEEDER PATTERN
### MODEL G FINANCIAL SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renovation of Existing Space</th>
<th>Additions to Existing Space and Site Improvements</th>
<th>Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment</th>
<th>Maintenance and Repair Planned through 2025</th>
<th>Est. 40% funded by District Sources</th>
<th>Net Est. Capital Expense</th>
<th>Total Costs (Upper Range)</th>
<th>Total Costs (Lower Range)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvements¹</td>
<td>State-mandated Health &amp; Safety²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$97.2</td>
<td>$5.5</td>
<td>$21.7</td>
<td>$11.9</td>
<td>$29.4</td>
<td>$11.8</td>
<td>$17.6</td>
<td>$153.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Improvements required to accommodate sections per grade, classroom configurations, student population, and upgrades to meet educational requirements, as well as ADA, HVAC and Safety/Security
2. Improvements already mandated by Health Life Safety (HLS) that are due to be completed during the project term
3. Additions to buildings to accommodate sections per grade, configurations, student population, educational requirements, and security vestibules, and site work for grading, parking and driveways
4. Includes Architect, Engineers, General Contractors, reserve for contingencies, permits, utility fees, security, Legal, financial, and escalation (increasing of construction costs during later years of the project)
5. Capital expenses identified in the Green Report
6. Portion of Capital Expenses identified in Green Report that may be funded by District sources, such as District Reserve, future operational savings, and/or future tax revenue to be completed
7. Lower Range estimate assumes potential refinement of 15%
MODEL H

8-Building Plan
• Six elementary schools: OT, WT, RO, SW, IT, BR
• Two middle schools: EW, NW
• Early childhood enter connected to WT
• Administrative offices attached to RO

Goals and Key Elements
• 2-4 sections in elementary schools per grade level.
• Two Dual Language Academies to consolidate resources and accommodate 6+ sections of students.
• Early childhood center at WT, sharing space with two-section elementary school.
• Additions at BR and IT absorb populations from RV and LI.

Community Perspective Based on Forums and Focus Groups
• Community members noted similarities to BDR3.
• There were concerns about not enough balance between Northwood and Edgewood with only two monolingual sections at NW.
• Stakeholders felt that there were too few elementary sections at WT (2 per grade).
• Students from WT would also be the only monolingual students at NW.
• People noted that this model had the lowest price overall.
MODEL H MAP AND FEEDER PATTERN
## MODEL H FINANCIAL SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Costs(^4) ($ millions)</th>
<th>Ongoing Capital Expense ($ millions)</th>
<th>Total Costs ($ millions)</th>
<th>Total Costs(^7) ($ millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renovation of Existing Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements(^1)</td>
<td>State-mandated Health &amp; Safety(^2)</td>
<td>Additions to Existing Space and Site Improvements(^3)</td>
<td>Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$76.8</td>
<td>$4.2</td>
<td>$42.1</td>
<td>$11.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Improvements required to accommodate sections per grade, classroom configurations, student population, and upgrades to meet educational requirements, as well as ADA, HVAC and Safety/Security
2. Improvements already mandated by Health Life Safety (HLS) that are due to be completed during the project term
3. Additions to buildings to accommodate sections per grade, configurations, student population, educational requirements, and security vestibules, and site work for grading, parking and driveways
4. Includes Architect, Engineers, General Contractors, reserve for contingencies, permits, utility fees, security, Legal, financial, and escalation (increasing of construction costs during later years of the project)
5. Capital expenses identified in the Green Report
6. Portion of Capital Expenses identified in Green Report that may be funded by District sources, such as District Reserve, future operational savings, and/or future tax revenue to be completed
7. Lower Range estimate assumes potential refinement of 15%
Process Going Forward
NEXT STEPS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

• The 2.0 Team based its recommendations on the interpretation of data and research collected over the past year. We recognize that there are still many community members who have yet to learn about the details of our process.

• The submission of this report is the close of a research and preliminary engagement process, and we recommend that the next phase further extend and expand the engagement process.

• The Board should quickly determine if and when to pursue a referendum and continue community engagement to maintain the momentum achieved over the past year.
COMMUNICATION RECOMMENDATIONS

• The Board should announce a short- and long-term timeline to the community, as necessary.

• This timeline should clearly signal to the community what happens next on the path to reconfiguration and future engagement opportunities.

• The engagement timeline should be a "living document" and be updated to meet the needs of community members and to ensure the integrity of the process.

• Establish an online resource where people can learn about next steps and explore background information about the process. This could be done by adapting and updating the existing 2.0 Team website as appropriate.
OPEN ENGAGEMENT WITH THE PUBLIC

• The Board should actively consult and involve all 2.0 Team members interested in continuing their participation in the process.

• The 2.0 Team recommends that the Board engage stakeholders from the wider community in all future phases of the process.

• The transition from the 2.0 Team to the Board must inspire continued community confidence in the process.

• All meetings should be transparent and open to the public to attend and provide comment.

• Stakeholder groups should represent demographics that may be affected by changes, such as neighbors and staff members (to advise on a plan to close or build additions to a school), Military, Special Education, and Dual Language representatives. The 2.0 Team has identified potential liaisons for these groups.
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER INQUIRY

• Convene a cost-reduction team for the proposed models to offer the community a range of refined costs.

• Run a new survey to test public opinion on the proposed reconfiguration models and test these against the survey preferences that preceded specific models.

• Conduct reliable traffic studies of the areas impacted by potential models.

• Determine draft boundaries for potential reconfigurations as soon as possible.

• Conduct financial stress-testing.
# 2.0 TEAM GLOSSARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Community Team</td>
<td>A committee comprised of more than two dozen Highland Park, Highwood, and Fort Sheridan residents chosen to research and present 2-3 viable reconfiguration options to the D112 Board of Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Day Counts</td>
<td>The administration uses the student registration numbers as of the 6th day of school each year as the marker for that year's student body population. The 6th day counts are frequently referenced when discussing populations at specific schools or of specific grade levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundaries</td>
<td>The dividing lines that separate and distinguish what schools students attend based on the location of their home. Students who participate in special programs (e.g., Dual Language, special education programs) may attend a school that is different than their home school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>A freestanding structure that requires ongoing district maintenance. In the case of two buildings being joined by an addition (e.g., Wayne Thomas and Northwood), those are counted as a single building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>Peers of the same grade level or students within a similar group. EX: At Elm Place Middle School, there are 98 students in the 6th grade cohort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Configuration</td>
<td>A proposed school plan that indicates which buildings remain open and in what capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Language Program (DL)</td>
<td>Two-way immersion bilingual, bi-literate, and bicultural educational programming that operates independently from monolingual programming. Bilingual services are mandated by law and the DL program has been proven through research to be the best practice for bilingual education. The DL program strives for a composition of 50 percent of students whose primary home language is Spanish and 50 percent of students whose primary home language is English. DL students start in Kindergarten, with 80% of their day in Spanish. By the time they're in 5th grade, 50% of their day is in English and 50% of their day is in Spanish. When students reach middle school, three of their nine classes are in Spanish, and students attend all other classes in English with their monolingual peers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECC</td>
<td>Early Childhood Center for preschool aged children, currently housed at Green Bay School. Services for preschool aged children with disabilities are mandated by the state, and there is a requirement that students have typically developing peers. District 112 accomplishes this through a combination of tuition-based programming, Preschool for All Grant Funding, and Special Education services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDK</td>
<td>Full Day Kindergarten</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2.0 TEAM GLOSSARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feeder Pattern</td>
<td>Determination of which elementary schools feed into which middle schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Report</td>
<td>Maintenance capital expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLS Report</td>
<td>Health/Life and Safety building specifications required by law for all public education buildings; report summary filed with Illinois Board of Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home School</td>
<td>The school a student is assigned to based on their home’s geographical location and current district boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monolingual Program</td>
<td>The primary method of education in D112, where the students are taught all school subjects in English throughout the school day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Capital Expense</td>
<td>Future maintenance capital expenditures through 2025 included in project; it does not refer to ongoing operating efficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Space</td>
<td>The grass and/or concrete outdoor space that is available for students to play on for recess and/or physical education classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>While multiple programs may be housed in a single building, students cannot be moved between programs in order to balance class sizes or placements. Some examples of programs in NSSD112 include Dual Language, Special Education (STEP, SAIL, and LEAP), and Early Childhood. Programs may be housed in the same building, but shared staffing opportunities are limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Pairs</td>
<td>Organization of district elementary school buildings into pairs that serve a combined K-5 population in two narrower age span buildings, a primary (grades K-2) building and a secondary (grades 3-5) building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sections</td>
<td>Number of individual classes per grade level. Example: At Red Oak, there are three sections (or classes) of 3rd grade students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>A district-owned property that includes play space, parking, and buildings therein.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracking</td>
<td>Middle school scheduling limitations can result in the same 20-25 kids having the majority of their classes together during a school day. This constraint is alleviated by having larger cohorts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 2.0 Team’s Education Subcommittee has developed a series of fact sheets that are available at the URLs below:

Sectioning Fact Sheet: www.nssd112.org/sectioning_factsheet

Full Day Kindergarten Fact Sheet: www.nssd112.org/FDK_factsheet

Middle School Fact Sheet: www.nssd112.org/MS_factsheet

IAQ Fact Sheet: www.nssd112.org/IAQ_Factsheet
2.0 TEAM ENGAGEMENT DOCUMENTS

The following 2.0 Team community engagement documents are available online:

June 2016 Survey Results: www.nssd112.org/2.0_Survey2016

February 2017 Focus Group Report: www.nssd112.org/February_2017_Focus_Group

March 2017 Forum Feedback: www.nssd112.org/2017_Forum


April 2017 Survey Results: www.nssd112.org/2.0_Survey_2017

June 2017 Roadmap for the District Mailer: www.nssd112.org/June_2017_Malier

June 2017 Focus Group Report: www.nssd112.org/June_2017_Focus_Group
2.0 TEAM RESEARCH REFERENCES

The 2.0 Team utilized the following research materials:

State School Security and Standards Task Force: www.nssd112.org/SSSSTF
ESL Regulations: www.nssd112.org/ESL_Regulations
ADA Part 35: www.nssd112.org/ADA_Part35
Steep Slope Zone: www.nssd112.org/Steep_SlopeZone
EPA IAQ: www.nssd112.org/epa.gov
Illinois School Readiness Initiative: www.nssd112.org/School_Readiness
Educating Young Adolescents: www.nssd112.org/Educating_Adolescents
2015 Review of Special Education Services North: www.nssd112.org/2015_Special_Ed_Review
Accelerate Learning State of STEM: www.nssd112.org/acceleratelearning.com
Full Day Kindergarten Study: www.nssd112.org/FDK_BOE_presentation
Dual Language Program Overview: www.nssd112.org/DL_Philosophy
2.0 TEAM MEMBERS

Current Members of the 2.0 Team:

Roni Ben-Yoseph
Julie Campbell
Ira Chaplik
Carol Daum
Mark Frye
Megan Geelhoed
Jori Graham
Laurie Hart
Rick Heineman
Kenneth Henry
Rocki Hunter
Melissa Itkin
Bivan Kischer
Rafael Labrador
Marc Lawrence
Darren Margulis
Rebecca Mueller
Jeff Orlove
Ann Rosenblum
Dan Rubin
Davis Schneiderman
Helen Singer
Ronald Sonenthal
Brian Septon
Dan Struck

Former 2.0 Team Members & Current D112 Board Members:

Alexander Brunk
Dan Jenks
Art Kessler
Adam Kornblatt

Former Members of the 2.0 Team:

Paula Barrett
Jennifer Freeman
Tracy Jacobson
Carol Lazarus
Paul Martinez

D112 Administration Partners:

John Fuhrer, Director of Operations, Facilities & Transportation
Nicholas D. Glenn, Director of Communications
John Sprangers, Interim Personnel Manager
The below model variations were proposed by individual 2.0 Team members and have not been evaluated by the team or presented to the public. These ideas have also not been vetted for feasibility or viability.

MODEL A

- Model A potentially can be made less expensive by renovating existing sites instead of creating two new buildings by 1) renovating the existing NW/WT site as the expanded middle school and building a new SE elementary school, 2) renovating and building an addition to one of the existing SE elementary sites and building a new NW/WT middle school, or 3) renovating the existing NW/WT site as the middle school and renovating one of the existing SE elementary sites.

MODEL B

- To potentially decrease the cost of work on Oak Terrace and Sherwood, the early childhood center and administrative offices could be relocated to Wayne Thomas or could remain at Green Bay.
- Model B can be changed by building a new K-4 School at the Ravinia site, replacing the existing Ravinia and Braeside.

MODEL C

- A two-middle school version of Model C could include six schools: four elementary schools (Wayne Thomas, Oak Terrace, Sherwood, and a new SE elementary school) and two middle schools (Edgewood and Indian Trail).
POTENTIAL MODEL VARIATIONS

MODEL E
• Model E can be revised into a seven-building model by closing Ravinia and Braeside and building a new four-section school at the Ravinia site. The remaining two sections can be fit at Indian Trail and Sherwood.

MODEL F
• Model F can be modified by building a new four section school at Ravinia or by building a three-section school at Ravinia, then shifting one of the sections to Wayne Thomas to make it a three-section school.

MODEL H
• Model H can be changed by shifting a section from Indian Trail to Wayne Thomas and locating the early childhood center at Indian Trail.
THANK YOU