

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

**POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING
November 12, 2008**

A Policy Committee meeting was held on Wednesday, November 12, 2008, in the Board Room of the Oak Park and River Forest High School. Dr. Lee called the meeting to order at 8:40 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; 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

Introduction

Dr. Lee reminded the Board of Education of the consensus it came to at the October 23 Board of Education meeting to change the name from the Board Policy Committee to Board Policy, Evaluation and Goals Committee (PEG) so that the discussion can encompass discussion of the evaluation of the superintendent, the Board of Education goals process, and the instrument to be used.

He offered to have further discussion regarding the name of the committee change or the procedures to be followed by the committee at the end of the day's agenda. He hoped to make the agenda itself a tool by which the Committee manages its time and thus it was his intention to adjourn the meeting by 10:00 a.m.

Minutes of October 14, 2008 Policy Committee Meeting

The minutes of the October 14, 2008 Policy Committee Meeting were accepted as presented by the Committee members.

Policy Preview

Dr. Lee noted that Policy 3551, District Policy, was being presented but there would be no discussion at this time. Dr. Weninger provided the background on why this policy was being presented. Dr. Lee invited any PEG members to address their questions to the superintendent after the meeting.

Superintendent, Evaluation and Goals and Instrument

Dr. Weninger provided the Committee members with a memo explaining that at the October Board of Education meeting, the Board of Education decided to devote time in the November and March Policy, Evaluation and Goals Committee meetings for discussion and decision regarding the evaluation process and instrument for the Superintendent. As such, he developed a draft process and instrument. He also gathered sample instruments and processes from

superintendents in Illinois, Georgia, and Tennessee, reviewed his position description, and gathered information the IASA and IASB, as well as some of the process and format the DLT developed for all District administrators' evaluations.

The evaluation process and draft instrument he proposed were divided into two main parts 1) Performance Goals; and 2) Performance Evaluation. While there are separate processes and documents for each, the process of evaluating the Superintendent is conducted at the same time and in the same way. He envisioned the process to include:

- 1) The Superintendent and the Board of Education developing goals and indicators of success. At the end of the year, the performance goals would be documented using the indicators of success chosen.
- 2) Each Board of Education member would complete an evaluation and submit it and the information would be summarized for them.
- 3) The Board of Education members and the Superintendent would discuss the document and determine whether the indicators of success had been met.
- 4) The Board of Education would meet without the Superintendent for further discussion; and
- 5) The Board of Education president would meet with the Superintendent.

The same process would be used for the goals in the performance evaluation except that it would be a much broader evaluation. He provided a sample of what the evaluation form might look like (attached to and made a part of the minutes of the meeting). While unsure how many performance objectives to list, he will seek Board of Education input. Dr. Weninger also provided sample rating scales.

Dr. Lee affirmed for the Committee that it was being asked to make decisions on 1) should there be an evaluation with two components, one based on specific goals and the second based on the entire array of domains in which the superintendent would be evaluated and then 2) the approving or modifying of the individual components.

Discussion ensued regarding the Superintendent Evaluation and the process involved. Dr. Weninger outlined a general process:

- 1) The president would distribute the evaluation form to the entire Board of Education members in early May,
- 2) The Board of Education would meet with the Superintendent in June, and
- 3) The President and the Superintendent would have a final meeting before June 30. followed by a meeting of the president and the superintendent before June 30

Mr. Rigas and Mr. Conway were concerned that some sitting Board of Education members would not be involved if this timeline were followed. There was no opposition to moving up this timeline.

Dr. Weninger references the Board of Education self-evaluation in the goal form. If they were not kept separate, he would strongly insist on the Board of Education doing a separate self-evaluation. If they were merged, then there was a separate process for that.

Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that the Board of Education conversation in the spring referenced in the contract included both the performance goals as well as the every-day job description. Because the discussion of the District goals is a public discussion and the job description activity would be handled separately, she concurred with the division and she had some specific suggestions. Dr. Lee stated that if they were not split then everything would be lumped into one document and that would be more cumbersome. Mr. Rigas, Mr. Conway, Mr. Allen, and Dr. Lee concurred that the two-prong step was appropriate. Ms. Fisher felt the thought that went into the filling out the form was more important than the form itself. She deferred to those who felt more strongly about the structure of the process. The key will be making the time and developing a public response when the time comes. Dr. Lee felt that coming to agreement on the details was important. Dr. Millard concurred with Ms. Fisher that the benefit of this would be how much effort is put into it. When she asked who would evaluate the Board of Education, Dr. Weninger responded that he presumed it would be a Board of Education self-evaluation.

Discussion ensued. It was the consensus of the Committee members to agree on the document with the following enhancements:

Philosophy and Guidelines:

Sentence 1, line 2: Add “a superior education so that they may” after the word “students” and delete the word “to” before the word “achieve”

While Ms. Patchak-Layman felt that this section should become Board of Education policy so that the philosophy can be in place, and the procedures would be recognized in the , other Committee members questioned whether this should come before the Policy Committee, only that on which the Board of Education concurs and what to modify. While a performance evaluation complies with state law, the process used may vary from district to district.

Section II, Process

- | | |
|--|---|
| Section II, Section A, item a: | Reverse the order of items the sentences under item a. |
| Section II, Section A, item a, line 1: | Delete the words “Through this process” and add “The” before the word “Board” |
| Section II, Section A, new item b, line 1: | Replace “develops” with “submits” after the word Superintendent; |
| Section II, Section A, new item b, line 2: | Delete the words “submits them” |

While there was significant discussion regarding whether it should be the Board of Education or the Superintendent to initiate the development of the District’s goals as reflected in Board of Education policy, state law says the Board of Education will develop the goals. However, the committee members felt that significant initial discussion would occur with the Superintendent

and it was clarified that the Superintendent would not be prohibited from providing the Board of Education with information from DLT as a resource in the formation of the goals.

While Ms. Patchak-Layman suggested deleting Item b under II. Process, A. Performance, so that the Board of Education might have the flexibility of discussing the performance goals earlier than August, it was not supported by the rest of the Committee at this time. Ms. Fisher commented that it only made sense to review the performance goals to see if they needed modification for the future and that it was a statement of common sense. Dr. Lee noted that the timeline was not being addressed at this time.

Annual Performance Goals Form

Committee members agreed that the Goals would be the four goals approved at the August Board of Education meeting.

As requested, the indicators of success would be part of the next month's discussion.

Discussion of Procedures

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked that the information she had previously distributed in the spring regarding performance domains be re-read in preparation for the discussion on indicators of success. Dr. Lee asked Ms. Kalmerton to email that information to the committee members in a PDF format.

Dr. Weninger reiterated that he would adjust the document, include the discussion of the day, and send it to the Board of Education for the discussion next month. While the Board of Education had agreed upon a March completion date, he suggested that the Committee complete this in February.

Committee members had no other concerns regarding procedures. Dr. Lee stated if anyone had any suggestions to provide them to Ms. Kalmerton so that she can distribute them in advance of the Committee meeting on December 9, 2008.

Adjournment

At 10:00 a.m., the Policy, Evaluation, and Goals Committee adjourned.