

**Oak Park and River Forest High School
201 N. Scoville
Oak Park, IL 60302**

**Policy, Evaluation and Goals (PEG) Committee
Thursday, January 20, 2011
Minutes
Board Room**

A Policy, Evaluation and Goals Committee meeting was held on Thursday, January 20, 2011, in the Board Room. Co-chair Patchak-Layman opened the meeting at 9:19 a.m. Committee members present were John Allen; Terry Finnegan (attended electronically departed at 10:55 a.m.), Dr. Ralph H. Lee, Amy McCormack, Dr. Dietra D. Millard, and Sharon Patchak-Layman. Also present were: Dr. Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; Lauren M. Smith, Director of Human Resources; and Cheryl L. Witham, Chief Financial Officer; Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Visitors: Kay Foran, Communications and Community Relations Coordinator; James Paul Hunter, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair.

Minutes

It was the consensus of the Policy Committee members to accept the minutes of the December 9, 2010 meeting, as presented.

Consideration for Second Reading and Action

Policy 4113, Certified Personnel – Certification

It was the consensus of the PEG Committee members to recommend to the Board of Education that it amend Policy 4113, Certified Personnel—Certification, at its regular January Board of Education meeting with the addition of the different categories of certified personnel.

Consideration for First Reading and Action

Policy 4122, Substitute Teachers

It was the consensus of the PEG Committee members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve Policy 4122, Substitute Teachers, for first reading, at its regular January Board of Education meeting, as presented.

The policy is being amended to reflect current practices of the Regional Office of Education. In April, the Board of Education will approve a separate salary schedule for outside substitutes. Those teachers who work one of their unscheduled periods as an internal sub are paid \$30 per the Collective Bargaining Agreement. External substitutes do qualify for workers' comp, per state law.

Policy 4105, Equal Employment and Minority Recruitment

It was the consensus of the PEG Committee members to review Policy 4015, Equal Employment and Minority Recruitment again, for first reading at its February committee meeting, with the

footnotes removed. The reference codes will document where more information may be found about this policy.

It was noted that the names of the nondiscrimination coordinators should be included in the policy. Ms. Smith was asked to obtain an opinion from the attorney as to the best practices and conflicts with regard to who takes the EEOC complaint, investigates it, and then defends it.

PAC Program

Dr. Isoye and Mr. Rouse informed the Committee members of the administration's plan to continue to work with the Parent Action Committee, an independent group that grew out of Citizens' Council, and the High School Action Committee, a subcommittee of PAC. Recognizing that both of these groups are small, the District contemplated how to acquire input from a larger community to help the Board of Education make any decisions. As such, the administration's recommendation is to host a community forum on February 15 in order to gather that information. The objectives will be to 1) provide similar information so that all stakeholders in this process hear the same information; 2) make clear to the groups that the Board of Education has a responsibility to the greater community; and 3) bring greater awareness to others.

Ms. Patchak-Layman commented that the Board of Education has a policy that says when the Board of Education seeks information from the broad community it will allow ample opportunity for that to occur. Thus, whatever decisions are made would be through the policy process and in order for the Board of Education to prepare for that, it would need to gather information. Mr. Rouse added that students have the opportunity to participate in an on-going survey relative to open campus. Data relative to how often students leave the building, where they go, and what they do, is being sought, in addition to attendance issues. Educating students and bringing a different level of awareness as to how they should act as young adults upon leaving the campus is part of this process. Dr. Millard asked for staff input as well.

As a courtesy to the other Board of Education members, Dr. Lee reported that when he was asked his opinion about drugs in the school by the student newspaper *Trapeze*, he said that the Board of Education has the responsibility to enforce the law and to help students gain the ability to make decisions that are in their best interests, and that he would continue to support that fact. His personal belief is, however, that the ultimate solution to the drug problem will be to eliminate the private drug trade and to transfer the responsibility for staying off drugs from law enforcement and the communities to those who abuse them. Users then must be prepared for that responsibility.

Ms. Patchak-Layman suggested 1) using the advisory period to discuss this subject with students or administering a questionnaire about any solutions proposed and other ways to address substance abuse, and 2) using the parent/teacher conference time to speak with more community members.

It was the consensus of the majority of the Committee members to support holding the February 15 forum, noting that student and staff involvement in the discussion was important. It was reiterated that this was a starting point and nothing would be finalized at that forum.

Organizational Needs Assessment

Dr. Isoye read the attorney's advice about whether the contract with Blueprint Education Group needed to be formally amended due to the changes that had occurred with the process. The Board of Education did not need to take formal action but it could send an email with the following statement would suffice. "The District agrees that the non-Baldrige assessment as shown in the work update, dated 11/19/10, is to be completed instead of the Baldrige assessment."

In addition, Dr. Isoye referred to the information provided by Blueprint itemizing the areas that it would address. When Blueprint was asked if there was value to the Baldrige model as it is designed to work with the internal process, the response was that by speaking with different constituents it would triangulate its information, adding value and would confirm or disaffirm what was said. Blueprint will also conduct another day of interviews.

Ms. Patchak-Layman expressed continued concern that the internal conversations would not occur as they would have under the Baldrige structure. Presently, it is being treated as a consultant hired to make a report and that is different from the internal people working on such a project. Dr. Millard acknowledged that the District's leadership had changed since the beginning of this process but she supported the alteration. She acknowledged the disappointment of some Board of Education members and she applauded those members who brought this idea forward. Dr. Isoye apologized and recognized the changes in terms and for the lack of communication but he is working to get the information as to where the District is now best informed.

Mr. Allen told of an exercise in which he participated when his work went through the Baldrige process. Seven people were placed in a circle and given a ball. They were to figure out the rules of the games, what they were to try, and what they were to accomplish. The purpose of the exercise was to teach the participants how one gets to the end game as quickly as possible. If someone refused to touch the ball, he was to stand in the center. During the process, not all stakeholders choose to participate for a multitude of reasons, i.e., important considerations. The end game however was the resulting report. If all of the parties involved talked bluntly about their areas, then the end game was attained. He continued that criterion groups were not necessarily the only way to go through this process. Ms. Patchak-Layman reported that the report was not her end game; it was the process which requires education, format, and a facilitator who takes one through that. Hearing other people's thoughts is important.

Dr. Millard will send an email to Blueprint using the attorney's language.

Board Policy Manual Evaluation

It was the consensus of the majority of the PEG Committee members to invite representatives of the IASB and NEOLA to explain their services relative to policy manuals at a future committee meeting. The information that is learned from these presentations may assist the Board of Education in determining how much time would be necessary to revise the manual. Some Board of Education members were hesitant to take this on at this time because of the Board of Education's other priorities. Ms. Patchak-Layman suggested that each of their presentations include an apples-to-apples comparison of a present Board of Education policy to one of their policies.

Superintendent Goals and Indicators

It was the consensus of the PEG Committee members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve the Superintendent's Goals and Indicators as an amendment to Appendix B of the contract dated April 15, 2010 and amended September 23, 2010, as presented. The goals were written broadly so that any change that might occur would fall under these goals.

Dr. Isoye also presented the Board of Education with an update on the administrative work being conducted relative to the goals using a Gantt chart. He explained that he used an online program titled "Viewpoint" to input this information, that it was a living document and might be used in future planning and in reporting to the Board of Education. Both Drs. Millard and Lee applauded him on this work. Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that some areas were difficult to follow, e.g., the timing and gathering of information and whether the item had been completed, etc. She also suggested that evidence of the goals and action plans be determined by the Board of Education for the year with regard to process and content and how one makes the three-year performance goals apply year to year and what constitutes evidence of achieving the goal. She felt this was a transition year and she did not want this seen as the Board of Education moving forward without a discussion about the format of the evidence of the goal and what constitutes an action plan for this goal. Dr. Lee concurred with Ms. Patchak-Layman, noting that each Board of Education member has items he/she would want to see as evidence, but it would be difficult to list them in this document. Mr. Allen suggested using different colors in the Gantt chart. He also suggested that outlining the indicator and using evidence to support the indicator would be more meaningful. He also felt that this was interesting information but bar graphs do not indicate what else needs to be completed.

Future Retreats

Discussion ensued about a future Board of Education retreat to discuss the topics of governance, establishing policy, time management, and, possibly, goals. Dr. Lee wanted to add the topic of election of new Board of Education members. Ms. McCormack noted that she was beginning to embrace the idea of strategic plan and wanted to discuss what the Board of Education needs to do to embark on it. Ms. Patchak-Layman felt all plans needed to be reviewed at one time, e.g., SIP, Technology, Facility, Finance, etc.

It was the consensus of the consensus of majority of the PEG Committee members to schedule a retreat. Dr. Isoye will contact Linda Hanson and Allan Alson.

Adjournment

The Policy Evaluation and Goals Committee adjourned at 11:47 a.m.