

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

**An Instruction Committee of the Whole Board
January 15, 2009**

An Instruction Committee meeting of the Whole Board was held on Thursday, January 15, 2009 in the Board Room. Dr. Millard opened the meeting at 9:14 a.m. Committee members present were Jacques A. Conway, Valerie J. Fisher, Dr. Ralph H. Lee, Dr. Dietra D. Millard, and Sharon Patchak Layman (arrived at 7:59 a.m.). Also present were: Dr. Attila J. Weninger, Superintendent; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Amy Hill, Director of Research and Assessment; Cheryl Witham, Chief Financial Officer; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Visitors included Kay Foran, OPRFHS Community Relations and Communications Coordinator; James Hunter, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair, Dale Craft, PE Division Head, and Amy McCormack, parent.

Acceptance of Instruction Committee Minutes of December 11, 2008

It was the consensus of the Instruction Committee members to accept the minutes of the December 11, 2008, Instruction Committee meeting. Dr. Millard applauded Ms. Kalmerton for her thorough reporting of the meetings.

Summer School Session

Mr. Craft reported that the 2009 Summer Session would consist of twenty-seven (27) instructional days beginning Wednesday, June 17, 2009 and ending Friday, July 24, 2009. Three sessions will be offered each day with the last session devoted to the summer musical. No school will be held on Friday, July 3, 2009. He provided budgets from recent years and projects for the coming year. No significant changes were projected for this year's course offerings and the District continues to offer a wide selection of regular, elective, and remedial classes.

He recommended no increase in the tuition cost for each section, as the current tuition fee per class was \$180. He did recommend an increase of \$5 for the class supply fee for classes like Art Foundations. He also recommended a \$50 increase for teacher compensation per section, representing a 2.2 per cent increase for a total compensation of \$2,400 per section taught. When asked if the compensation was a detriment to having OPRFHS teachers teach the classes, Mr. Craft replied there had not been any complaints, as generally OPRFHS teachers teach classes that are for students who have failed or who are trying to catch up on their coursework. Approximately 10 to 15 percent of the summer school teachers are out-of-district teachers and teach such courses as keyboarding, art foundations, etc.

Mr. Prale complimented Mr. Craft on his leadership and demonstrating more fiscal accountability in order to attempt to have a balanced budget. He has made tough decisions to cut some programs when there were not enough registrations.

In response to Dr. Millard's question, Mr. Prale stated that District 97 and OPRFHS Title I Funds pay for the tuition of students for the 8 to 9 Connection Program. Two teachers from District 97 and two teachers from District 200 participate in this program. There were distinctions between this program and that of summer school. Mr. Craft monitors the 8 to 9 Program and Kris Johnson, the Director of the 8 to 9 Connection Program, is available for other summer school students.

Requested Information

Ms. Patchak-Layman at a previous Finance Committee requested information as to how instruction related to the phase-in dollars of 2005. From the information in the packet, Dr. Weninger highlighted the fact that 16 FTE positions had been funded with phase-in money to address Special Education mandates, additional graduation requirements mandated by the Governor, etc. These positions totaled 82.7 percent of the total of the \$1.5 million or \$1.3 million. Mr. Prale explained that in 2005, the Board of Education and the administration had made a commitment as to what the phase-in dollars would support. A structure was created to keep internal accountability and the chart presented showed that the District kept its word in how it used those dollars.

When Dr. Lee asked if the Board of Education had an obligation to use these funds for these programs in the future, he was told that no timeline had been placed on them by the then sitting Board of Education. Dr. Lee felt it was inevitable that someone could in the future say that these dollars belong to these specific programs and that the dollars would not be allowed to be removed from the programs. Dr. Weninger stated that the programs are reviewed internally and strategic decisions are made from year to year. He spoke of the example when money had been set aside for something specific and yet the funds were not used last year for that purpose. As a result, the funds were used to fund a resource manager this year.

Dr. Millard commented on the tremendous debate by the Board of Education in taking the phase-in money and there had been opposition to it. As the programs that would benefit students were debated, there was a consensus in the discussion that there was a specific purpose for taking this money, which was to focus on programs for students with specific needs that, perhaps, had not been addressed appropriately. The Board of Education asked the administrators to remain vigilant about how the money was spent so that the Board of Education would feel comfortable asking the community for more of the phase-in dollars. She left with the feeling that the funds would be designated for these programs, and that she could not place it into any program that she wanted.

Dr. Lee was concerned about how the District would react if it were hit with a financial disaster, e.g., the explosion of the field house, etc. When dollars are attached to specific programs in this way, these programs can be thought of as the programs that were funded with this "extra" money. Now that the school is in a financial pinch, it would be logical

that these things might be removed from the budget because they were funded with extra money, signifying that they were less important than the rest of the school's program; he considered that invalid thinking. Mr. Prale concurred, noting that not everything on the page held the same weight. Some areas were reflected as requirements, e.g., state mandates to have additional math, English and science, etc. Other items such as the summer school transition programs might have more flexibility. Originally, the summer programs were projected to be larger and more money had been proposed for them. Since then, efficiencies were found and it lowered the budget. The idea for the behavior interventionist position came from the buy-in for PBIS activities in that program, so the priority shifted within another area. Thus, there was discussion about possibilities within the established budget. Dr. Lee still saw this as a danger. While at least two categories were listed, he did not see listed additional sections of Advanced Placement Physics or an additional assistant football coach as having flexibility, as they were thought of as ongoing costs with no flexibility. When identified in this way, these programs are most likely to be eliminated, unless someone continues to raise the point he is raising. He reminded the Board of Education that the ability to list can easily be taken as an assignment of lower priority, when that is not the case. He wanted the administration and the Board of Education to keep these factors in mind and not to think of them as lower priorities because they had been increased with these funds. He simply wanted the Board of Education and the administrators to be aware of this fact.

Ms. Fisher noted that because there is no legal requirement to make these lists, it would be up to the Board of Education at the time of an emergency to make decisions about what needed elimination. The fact that these programs were highlighted on a list would not make them any more or less available to the Board of Education for preserving or dismantling over any others. The other side of that is, at the time the Board of Education was determining the phase in and the amount of the phase in, which was considerable, some Board of Education members were not comfortable with taking huge amounts of tax dollars without giving a reason. The Board of Education charged the administration with developing programs that were prioritized for student needs, specifically with respect to the academic achievement gap. It has given the Board of Education members who supported the phase-in comfort in knowing how those dollars were to be used and it provided accountability. The District lived up to its commitment to use the dollars as it said at that time. This does not bind any future Board of Education in terms of making hard or necessary economic decisions. It should not be a concern. One can decide that they are programs of priority at the time when something needs cutting. Dr. Lee continued that the logic that was used in justifying additional expenditures was not valid in the first place. He did not believe it was logical to say that the additional money is going to these programs. He believed that the additional money was going to the totality of all programs of the District and these were new priorities. An increase in taxation is always for the entire program, including the latest priorities, and not just for those things that are the newest.

Dr. Millard stated that anyone listening to the discussions at the time when the Board of Education was debating the taking of those dollars knew it was a tough debate for those Board of Education members as to how the money would be used. It was not to have an

improved building and it was not to stretch out the dollars so that the District did not have to go for a referendum. It was used for a top priority. She would not have voted for the phase-in dollars if she thought the money would not have been used for very specific needs for specific students. Dr. Lee asked if those dollars had not been available, would the Board of Education have cut something else out in order to fund these programs. Mr. Prale stated that the administration might have done that and Dr. Millard concurred. Dr. Millard reiterated that OPRFHS is a comprehensive high school. It has to meet the needs of all students. She wanted to maintain as many programs as possible and the intention of this money was to expand and focus on the programs that needed more attention. Dr. Lee stated that when programs are identified as not getting enough attention, one does not have to have new tax dollars for that. Priorities might be rearranged. That is a part of the later discussion of future financial planning. Dr. Lee felt it is a matter of shifting priorities.

Ms. Fisher noted both ways are true; they are not mutually exclusive. One can set priorities as monies are needed to operate, but at the time of the debate on the phase in, the Board of Education had a legal right to take those dollars and had to make a decision whether to take any money, to take no additional money or an amount in between. It was a one-time decision to phase-in those dollars. That does not mean that future boards of education could not prioritize; however, at that time, the sitting Board of Education had the ability to obtain additional dollars. The money could have been taken for untagged dollars.

Dr. Lee clarified that he was not trying to change the mind of the Board of Education in the past circumstances, but he was trying to influence the frame of mind of the present Board of Education in future circumstances.

Ms. Patchak-Layman learned that the total amount of the phase-in was \$5 million and the District uses \$1.5 for these programs.

Dr. Weninger addressed the administrative dollars. He stated that the District gives itself the maximum flexibility to respond to challenges and the administration has done that for this year. The amount of money earmarked for six of these programs for the 2008-09 was reduced and three new items were added which specifically responded to the current priorities. He felt the administration has responded to the needs internally. Dr. Lee reiterated that he was not criticizing what had been done, as his focus was on the future, not the past.

Ms. Patchak-Layman stated that the mandated programs had to be implemented whether there were phase-in dollars or not. She liked Dr. Lee's look at this as a different categorization of the dollars being spent, because of the way it was phased in. These were new initiatives to her; when new ones are implemented, one looks at them. She interpreted that while these programs would be last in and first out, mandates cannot be removed and they would affect the regular budget. Other models can be used to classify the amount of the dollars spent, rather than the line item budgets. As one looks at the dollars in the instruction program and activities and does the next step of figuring out the

per capita per students, one knows how many dollars are being allocated to the program and they can be matched or compared to statewide dollars. This would be another measure.

Ms. Witham reported that in the budget document, these were categorized and reflected by objectives, salaries, etc. This is a communication to direct the administration. The Board of Education just needs to direct the administration as to what would be most beneficial communication.

Dr. Millard reported that it was the responsibility of the Board of Education to oversee this. Ms. Patchak-Layman continued that this could be part of the discussion of the restructuring plan based on the AYP. The subgroups in need attention had been identified and the Board of Education could look at putting dollars into those educational services. She stated that some of the evaluation is having the data that supports the program. Are students having better success when these programs are in place? If not, there needs to be a reorganization and evaluation of where the dollars are being successful. It was that the Behavior Interventionist was an addition as a direct correlation to the data. The District looked at the special needs of certain students and it has tracked the dollars allotted to them. Special Education is an area where money was allocated to help students read better and as a result, they are meeting AYP in reading. However, Committee members were reminded that AYP is only a one-day snapshot; the high school is working on the broader indicators of student success and there have been some successes. Dr. Lee stated that changing priorities within the school is very difficult.

Dr. Weninger stated that there was some legitimacy to see if these initiatives/programs were having an impact on student achievement; however, some programs were not intended to be a direct strategy to raise student achievement, e.g., the incorporation of resource managers has to do with the social/emotional behavior and climate in the building for this year where the work was done last year, etc. In many instances in the discipline system, an impact has been made with the funds that were attributed to informational consulting services, hardware, software, etc. Care must be taken to make the correlation with student achievement and some programs did not. Programs must be looked at individually, rather than with a broad-brush stroke.

Board Financial Resolution

Dr. Lee submitted Draft 4 of the Financial Resolution to the Instruction Committee members, per the discussion at the Finance Committee meeting. He asked for further comment.

Dr. Millard felt the resolution was too long and suggested making it more reasonable for the citizens, e.g., the last WHEREAS was something that would come up in a discussion, etc. She did not know whether the voters in 2018 would agree to the fourth WHEREAS. She wanted to be as judicious as possible in understanding the revenues and expenses and to keeping those as equal as possible, so that the District does not have to ask for more money. She also suggested combining Items 3 and 5, but she was concerned about over extending the new administration and the work in which it is engaged. Dr. Lee stated that

until now, the Board of Education had not been visibly keeping up with the status of Senate Bill revisions to H.B. 750. It surprised him that a new Senate Bill had become a greater focus than H.B. 750 on the revision of educational funding in the State. The Board of Education has not kept abreast of where different things were occurring or how it may have been of help to move that Bill somewhere else. It also has not taken a position as to whether the Board of Education agreed with H.B. 750, or its revision. If the Board of Education can keep up with the Illinois legislature, it can focus its own actions based on what is going on in Springfield. While Dr. Lee felt the No. 3 might not be worth the trouble, he wanted it considered. He felt the Board of Education or the administration should be more involved in legislative issues in order to try to influence the outcome. He felt this Board of Education was capable of doing that. Ms. Patchak-Layman added that it was common for boards of education to have legislative committees. She felt the Board of Education should take the active role, rather than the administration, because it might spread itself too thin. Dr. Weninger informed the Committee that a group of fifteen superintendents meets four times per year with the legislators, state senators and the general assembly legislators. He felt this might provide some motivation with the legislators to lead that charge. For example, one superintendent pushed for looking at special education funding and, as a result, a statewide task force was formed on this issue. The superintendents could get into the specifics. Dr. Millard had asked Mr. Conway to reassign the Board of Education's liaison to ED-RED, as she can no longer participate because of her professional obligations. ED-RED is an organization to which the District is a member and it does keep up with legislative issues. While Dr. Millard did not object to Dr. Weninger pursuing this endeavor, she did not want him to lose the focus of what needs to be accomplished at the District. However, having split the role of superintendent/ principal, the Board of Education could charge the superintendent to be more involved.

Responding to Dr. Millard's concerns, Dr. Lee stated that the term "foreseeable future" meant that the Board of Education could not see everything. He took the position that some things cannot be anticipated and some things can be seen reasonably clear. Presently, the District can see that without any actions, it is headed for a brick wall in 2018. By that time, the District will have spent all of its reserves and its costs will have continued to escalate. The Board of Education will have to ask for another tax increase in 2018. While that is not a guarantee, it is a best estimate of what will happen if the District does nothing else different. Dr. Millard challenged him by saying that the school would start to deficit spend in 2014. There is a projected budget model that suggests that it is likely that the District will have to go for a referendum in 2018, but not necessarily. Dr. Lee agreed but asked if it mattered when the District asked for a tax increase.

Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that the key was in No. 2 where the District will look at the educational priorities in terms of spending priorities rather than getting tax revenue. Dr. Millard noted that it was critical to look at both No. 2 and No. 4. If the District has to make priorities, and it has to sacrifice the quality of education of some students to the value of the others, she asked if that were fair. Ms. Patchak-Layman did not believe that would happen. Dr. Millard countered that it was an unknown. Dr. Millard wants to

protect that the high school maintains the highest quality for everyone as priorities are reviewed. Ms. Patchak-Layman stated that was part of the school's mission.

Dr. Weninger reflected that there were three parts to the resolution 1) cost containment, 2) establishing educational priorities; and 3) capping the amount of money taxpayers must pay. Dr. Lee suggested that it was difficult to separate them from each other because they were so interconnected. As he saw it now, this resolution was a descriptor of the whole package. To remove any part, regardless of how it was reworded, would do substantial damage to the whole thing.

Ms. Witham noted that the reality of the brick wall was that in 2018 the school would deficit spend \$8 million and in 2019, \$10 million. The Board of Education and the administration needs to do cost containment. The sooner that is done, the softer the landing will be. It would be dangerous to think that the school can continue as it is and that it would find \$8 to 10 million in the budget. In 2018, the budget will be \$70 million and it should have six months reserves in the bank. She stated that a referendum would need to pass before the money was actually needed. If it would not pass, then the District would be looking at \$10 million in cuts or 15 percent of its budget and those savings would have to be found every year. Ms. Witham continued that the District will begin to deficit spend in 2014. In the State of Illinois, there is a structural imbalance for school districts.

Dr. Millard stated that the biggest threat to OPRFHS is the new proposed funding solution. Ms. Witham concurred noting that any time income tax is swapped for property tax, more will be paid in income taxes, and the State will turn back less to this community. It will have higher taxes and less money. She suggested that the Committee members compute their own personal income and property tax as she had done; they will determine for themselves that they will pay more taxes. Ms. Patchak-Layman stated that it would be an even swap for those in the community. In terms of what comes to the school, the amount of money the school would not change. It is revenue neutral for the school. Ms. Witham disagreed and stated that while that was the intent, the per pupil allotment that would come back to the District would not be the same. Dr. Weninger concurred. Dr. Lee stated that the District has ten years to straighten things out and that is a wonderful position in which to be. OPRFHS is in one of the best financial shape in the state and he did not want to squander that position. Dr. Millard concurred but she wanted this stated as clearly as possible. Dr. Lee felt that there would be those that will still misunderstand. Mr. Allen supported the general meaning, but he did not like the fourth WHEREAS. Dr. Millard, Ms. Patchak-Layman, and Ms. Fisher concurred. Ms. Fisher concurred, as she did not think that taxpayers would not vote because they would not have the money.

Dr. Millard suggested combining No. 3 and No. 5, as she believed this District had made an effort to be financially responsible in the years she served on the Board of Education and she felt efforts were being made. When phase-in dollars were discussed at the public meetings, the intention was to do something for the students. As this resolution goes

forward, that point needs to be made. She did not want the citizenry thinking that the Board of Education had been financially irresponsible. Dr. Lee stated that to become more responsible is not an accusation of past irresponsibility. It is not a message that one has spent his/her life foolishly. Ms. Patchak-Layman suggested eliminating the fourth WHEREAS.

Discussion ensued regarding the word “the” versus “a” long-range plan in No. 1, as there was no model to be referred to at this point.

A lengthy discussion about the fourth WHEREAS and the revised statement is at the end of this section. Dr. Millard noted the majority of the Board of Education members had general support for this resolution, but she suggested that this could have been brought to the Finance Committee and the Board of Education could have gone through the budget line by line and determined would what happen if certain things were cut from it. She did not feel passing a resolution was necessary. Independent of a resolution, the Board of Education could have made a public statement that it would be a responsible entity whether the resolution passed or not. Ms. Patchak-Layman did not feel it was a matter of eliminating programs in the future. She felt another type of program could be engaged in that would cover the same activities. If OPRFHS were a dual language school, and a teacher could teach math in Spanish, would there be a need for a special Spanish teacher or a special class. One could affect change by having a re-organization. One would be achieving math and a language at the same time. Dr. Millard was concerned how a Spanish teacher could teach math. Ms. Patchak-Layman responded that often people could do double duty. If everyone were technology literate and could fix machines, there would be no need for someone to fix machines. Dr. Millard remarked that the Board of Education will have to do the hard part after the resolution is passed, i.e., look at the numbers, what is provided to the students, and listen to the taxpayers. Ms. Patchak-Layman stated that the State of Illinois is telling the schools that this goes hand in hand and OPRFHS is involved in a restructuring plan. Mr. Prale added that DLT is involved in these kinds of discussions annually and on a global basis. Both Dr. Weninger and Ms. Witham, as the Chief Financial Officer, demand that of everyone in the building.

It was explained that the Urban Consumer Price Index (CPIU) was for the school as a whole and, the Department of Congress had established an additional parameter for the consumer price index for the urban area—CPI-U. It is a fraction of a difference higher than the CPI for the entire United States.

It was the consensus of the Instruction Committee members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve the Financial Resolution at the regular January Board of Education meeting with the following amendments:

4th WHEREAS, line 2: Replace the words “ that the anticipated referendum in 2018 to support the required expenditure rate may result in a taxing level that would not be sustainable by the taxpayers residing in the District at that time” with “that future referendum for a higher taxing level would not be supported by our taxpayers”

No. 1, line 1: Replace the word “this” with “a”

No. 3: Replace it entirely with “The District taking an active role in seeking to change the public school funding mechanism and structure in the State of Illinois; and”

No. 4, line 4: Delete “; and”

Textbook

It was the consensus of the Instruction Committee members to recommend that the Board of Education approve the textbook, *Geometry*, for the Mathematics Division, at the regular January Board of Education meeting.

Ms. Hill informed the Committee members that the last geometry text was adopted in 1993. Because most math textbooks are part of the state-loan program, this might also be included in that category. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if this book were on CD. She continued that using books on CD should be a high priority so that the students can use them instead of carting around their books. It was noted that this book was available on line. Could students have online access only and the teacher keep a set of books in the classroom so that the students would not have to buy this book? Ms. Hill was unsure of the publisher’s requirements. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if other categories fit in the top priority with the state. Mr. Prale stated such classes as algebra, consumer education, biology, have been in the past. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if the school influences the state by making requests of it. Mr. Prale affirmed that the school works with the state to use state loan dollars most efficiently. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked whether the state questioned what the books cost.

Additional information

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked for more information on the required restructuring plan. Mr. Prale stated that the state requires a restructuring plan to be submitted in February; it is a matter of gathering existing information and deciding on the best procedure. The information will be presented SIP, IC, the faculty, BLT, DLT, and various groups already in place. He hoped a draft the plan would be available in the next few weeks on the information available. This document will also be presented to the Board of Education. When in final form, it will also be posted on the website. The restructuring plan is different from the School Improvement Plan, as it does not focus on AYP, but on a different set of guidelines determined by the state. Ms. Patchak-Layman suggested that the act of putting everything into one package was not restructuring; it was not something new. Mr. Prale stated that the ISBE gives the word “restructuring” and what it is looking for is a plan that will comply with the law that asks schools to identify corrective actions for a change in the governance, staffing, contracting with an outside organization to run the school, etc. The way in which one thinks about the definition of the term restructuring may not be one of State’s options. The District is looking at administrative governance changes that have been made, i.e., the creation of assistant principal positions, the set of achievement initiatives, the SIP Plan, changes to the PSS Team models, etc. These show a change in governance, staffing, and curriculum. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked whether these changes were intended to improve score results and not move OPRFHS into the sixth year with the same status. Mr. Prale answered that the goal is for student achievement, teacher performance, and the overall performance of the

school district and that the law says the District will file a plan annually; there is no remedy or follow-up. The current requirement of the law is only the filing of the plan.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked whether the school would be notified that it would have to implement school restructuring after year five. Something suggests that whatever the school is doing, there should be results that will show that the District will not get to year six or year seven. Mr. Prale noted that a number of districts are a year or two ahead of OPRFHS and the ISBE has not been following the remedies available to it. OPRFHS is hoping not to be in year six or year seven. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked a question regarding SIP, but Mr. Prale was unsure to what she was referring. He suggested that this be brought forward at another time. Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that if there were an addendum to the SIP, she would like a copy of it. She had two conversations with residents who are following what happens at the high school, who have looked at the school improvement plan, the ISBE monitoring, and who know the District has to put a restructuring plan together. She asked if the necessary changes would come to the Board of Education for consideration and review before implementation and when the general community would have the opportunity to give their input. Mr. Prale noted that any interested citizens were invited to participate in the committee. Previously Ms. Patchak-Layman asked for permission to listen to the discussion of the SIP Committee. Mr. Prale noted that he would pass the information on to the Principal.

Dr. Weninger stated that while the spirit of NCLB is honorable, the letter of the law is onerous, unpractical, and will never come to fruition. The quality of a school's achievement cannot be based on snapshot scores unrelated in time. While OPRFHS tries to adhere to the compliance issues, the work at OPRFHS and the work in which Board of Education has been involved, is the defining of institutional excellence.

Dr. Millard asked that if any Committee members had agenda items for March or April meetings, in anticipation on the Board of Education elections of which the Board of Education wants to make the community aware, to send them to either Mr. Prale or she.

Dr. Millard reported that Tim Wise, the author of *White Like Me*, would present at the downtown campus of Northwestern at Thorn Auditorium.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked when there would be an update on the Baldrige proposal. Mr. Allen informed her that Mr. Bloom's consulting firm focuses on schools, an element of the Baldrige Process. The proposal was created by Mr. Bloom, Dr. Weninger, and Mr. Allen attempted to cover all of the details, including a steering committee structure with six criterion workshops. Each working group, composed of a Board of Education member, a faculty member, a staff member, parents, and students, will focus on certain elements. Baldrige is not a specific way of doing things; it is the development of a school improvement plan to work with what the school is doing based on its criterion. Once an assessment is completed, a three or four month project, a process will be determined.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked why this proposal was not going out for an RFQ and the pros and cons of the other models considered. Mr. Allen offered to show her the process of

development and the other institutions contacted about this endeavor. Mr. Bloom had come with great credentials and he was committed to maintaining the Baldrige process. Dr. Weninger noted that the process itself does not change from group to group. Mr. Allen reported that The Lincoln Foundation was the resource that the State of Illinois used in the child-support enforcement area and it turned that area around. The state assigned a full-time staff person to this endeavor. The Lincoln Foundation stressed using its evaluative testing programs, a revenue-generating system for it. He wanted the evaluation done before the tool was in place, so he felt that process was backwards system for this school. In addition, someone was needed to initiate a system within the school and it was not feasible for OPRFHS to hire a fulltime staff person for this purpose as the State of Illinois had done.

Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that there were electronic surveys offered as a beginning step that were not part of this proposal. She asked why the school was not including this part in the process to secure more feedback and develop a baseline in the school community. Mr. Allen explained that the Baldrige method typically would only cover DLT and BLT; the OPRFHS proposal included a broad representation of stakeholders from the school that Baldrige does not. Mr. Bloom's presentation to the Board of Education next month will include some of these points.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if the District would use the same vetting process to check references, etc., that it uses when it goes out to bid. Ms. Patchak-Layman's concerns were about the amount of experience Mr. Bloom has had in working specifically boards of education and procedures and the number of times he has done the Baldrige plan. While he has lots of technology background and human relations experience, she was unsure of his experience in working with school boards of education and board protocols. Mr. Allen, in reviewing the proposal, noted that Mr. Bloom has worked with twelve schools and with a variety of school leadership teams and that Dr. Weninger had contacted six of them. She asked that references be checked.

Adjournment

The Instruction Committee adjourned at 10:03 a.m.