

**Oak Park and River Forest High School
201 North Scoville Avenue
Oak Park, IL 60302**

**POLICY, EVALUATION, AND GOALS (PEG) COMMITTEE MEETING
February 17, 2009**

A Policy Committee meeting was held on Tuesday, February 17, 2009, in the Board Room of the Oak Park and River Forest High School. Dr. Lee called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. Committee members present were John C. Allen, Jacques A. Conway, Dr. Ralph H. Lee, Valerie J. Fisher, Dr. Dietra D. Millard, Sharon Patchak-Layman, and John P. Rigas. Also, present were Dr. Attila J. Weninger, Superintendent; Jason Edgecombe, Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources; Nathaniel R. Rouse, Principal; Cheryl L. Witham, Chief Financial Officer; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

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

Additional Policy Matters for Committee Information

Dr. Lee asked that the discussion of budgeting the Board of Education time be placed on the Thursday, February 26, 2009 Board of Education meeting agenda.

Agenda

Dr. Lee reordered the agenda as follows:

1. Board of Education Self Evaluation and Instrument
2. Specific timing of the Superintendent
3. Consideration Policies 2120 and 20 for second reading
4. Policy 3550, Reimbursement of Board of Education Expenses
5. Whatever else possible

Dr. Lee reminded the Committee members of the protocol for bringing significant changes to the policies being discussed. Suggestions are to be submitted to Dr. Lee or Mr. Edgecombe so that they can be provided to the committee for their review prior to the meeting.

Board of Education Self-Evaluation and Instrument

Dr. Lee recommended the adoption of the Board of Education Self-Evaluation Instrument. Dr. Weninger explained that his intention in developing this document with Dr. Lee was not to solve a short-term problem. His intention was to have a process and timeline in place that every Board of Education could use to evaluate its work, similar to the evaluation form used in evaluating the superintendent. After reviewing the IASB's instrument and other publications, he combined some of their pragmatic elements. Boards of education should evaluate themselves to determine if they were functioning, how well they were functioning, etc. Dr. Weninger wanted legal clarification about whether the Board of Education could hold a self-evaluation in closed session without the IASB present. It was noted that one of the exceptions to the Open Meetings Act was the "Self-evaluation, practices and procedures, or professional ethics, when meeting with a representative of a

statewide association of which the District is a member.” Dr. Weninger asked whether the IASB could facilitate the meeting, rather than be in control of the meeting. He reiterated that he was not recommending a particular format, only that the Board of Education members adopt something with which they felt comfortable. The Board of Education self-evaluation was a separate entity to the Superintendent’s evaluation. While doing a Board of Education self-evaluation was good practice, the evaluation of the superintendent is a legal requirement.

Ms. Patchak-Layman felt there was value in this being a two-pronged approach: 1) A discussion of the goals for the following year, and 2) at the end of the year, an evaluation of those goals. A self-evaluation of the sitting Board of Education would not provide them with anything to compare, as there was no starting point. The sequence of this would be that at the time the Board of Education was setting goals for the District, it would set goals for itself that would facilitate the school’s improvement and the Board of Education’s procedural improvements. She felt the acknowledgement of the performance goals based on the District goals was missing from this document. She did not know the value of the form as presently configured.

Dr. Lee wanted to acknowledge formally the impact of the election cycle on what the Board of Education does and to capture what is done in the election cycle, as opposed to a fiscal year cycle. A Board of Education self-evaluation should take place before a change in its makeup. He agreed with Ms. Patchak-Layman that immediately following the Board of Education elections, the Board of Education should set goals for the coming year. That should be a part of the evaluation process that takes place over the next two years until April 2011.

Mr. Rigas asked the reason for conducting a Board of Education self-evaluation before the election. He agreed that the Board of Education should meet after the new Board of Education members were elected and to only do a self-evaluation prior to that to see if there were ideas to be brought forward to the new Board of Education. He also felt that scheduling a Board of Education self-evaluation meeting before the end of April would be a challenge. While Dr. Millard was interested in participating in a self-evaluation with the present Board of Education, her timeline was even more limited as she was going to India with OPRFHS students during spring break and would be leaving March 26, 2009.

Dr. Lee felt that self-evaluation of the present Board of Education and the self-evaluation/goal setting session by the new Board of Education both had value. He also did not believe the new Board of Education members should evaluate the superintendent. He proposed the following:

1. The Board of Education adopt the instrument presented by the superintendent;
2. The sitting Board of Education tie the execution of this instrument with the evaluation of the superintendent;
3. As soon as possible, the newly constituted Board of Education would begin to develop the goals for the coming year.
4. Make the results of the old Board of Education self-evaluation available to the new Board of Education.

Ms. Fisher did not see the value of conducting a Board of Education self-evaluation with the old board nor did she see the value of the old board self-evaluation being given to the new Board, since there would still be sitting Board of Education members who could help steer the new members.

Mr. Allen concurred with Ms. Fisher's comments. He also felt that this process was being rushed. He suggested that because the school was beginning an evaluation process with Blueprint Education Group that the evaluation of the Board of Education be a part of its assessment. He also did not want to do this in closed session and, as such, did not want to do it at all. He had been disappointed with IASB's facilitation of the last meeting. Ms. Patchak-Layman was obliged to fill out the form and that the information be shared with other Board of Education members, but she felt her time could be better spent discussion student achievement issues. Dr. Lee affirmed that there would be a meeting to discuss it with an emphasis as to how the Board of Education had worked together.

There was not a consensus for the sitting Board of Education to complete a self-evaluation.

Evaluation Timing for the Superintendent Evaluation

All PEG members concurred with executing and discussing the evaluation of the Superintendent in the March/April timeline, even though the contract specifies that the Board of Education has until June to complete it. Ms. Patchak-Layman was concerned about the dates involved with the performance measures being used because they were school-year measures as opposed to the yearly schedule that was now being put in place. When the evaluation discussion occurs, will the details of the contract be discussed or would they be a separate discussion? Dr. Lee recommended that the sitting Board of Education make decisions on the contract. Ms. Patchak-Layman disagreed, as this would be an opportunity for the new Board of Education. Dr. Lee reiterated his feeling that new Board of Education members were not in a place to evaluate the superintendent other than what they would read in the newspaper. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if the contract details were up for discussion based on the evaluation. Dr. Lee concurred except for the date of the contract, as the contract expires June 30, 2010. Ms. Fisher thought the Board of Education would be doing an evaluation looking back on the performance of the superintendent on the year just passed. She did not know that they would be looking at the terms of the contract that are in place. Dr. Lee felt it would encompass all possibilities. Dr. Lee saw that they were discreet activities and it would be illogical to make decisions about the contract without taking into consideration the results of the evaluation. One influenced the other. He also believed how each Board of Education members evaluated the superintendent in their minds was more important than what they put down on paper and that would determine the outcome of the decision that is made with the contract. Dr. Millard concurred with doing the superintendent evaluation before the seating of the new Board of Education on April 30.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if other Board of Education members thought the contract discussion was part of the evaluation discussion and whether the current Board of Education would take action related to the contract. Dr. Lee felt the current board could make an action item at the last meeting of the sitting of this Board of Education, as it would not make sense for the evaluation not to have an effect the contract.

Consideration of Policies for Second Reading and Action

Policy 20, Board of Education

It was the consensus of the PEG Committee members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve Policy 20, Board of Education, at its regular February Board of Education meeting, as presented.

Policy 2120, Superintendent/Principal

It was the consensus of the PEG Committee to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve Policy 2120, Superintendent/Principal, for amendment at the regular February Board of Education meeting, as presented.

Ms. Patchak-Layman suggested adding to this policy the language from Policy 3555, Attendance at Conferences and Workshops, relative to the Board of Education's approval of Superintendent travel. There was no support for this suggestion.

Ms. Patchak-Layman also suggested replacing the following wording "makes recommendations to the Board of Education pertaining to District business including matters related to items for which the Board of Education would seek educational/operational counsel " with "mutually develops with the Board of Education a long-range comprehensive education plan that positively impacts students, executes the education plan, and"

Dr. Millard stated that it was implied, as the Board of Education would expect that the superintendent would take the Board of Education's input and use it. There was no support for this suggestion.

Adjournment

At 10:10 a.m., on Tuesday, February 17, 2009, the Policy, Evaluation, and Goals Committee recessed until after the Special Board meeting scheduled to follow this meeting.