

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

**POLICY, EVALUATION, AND GOALS (PEG) COMMITTEE MEETING  
December 9, 2008**

A Policy Committee meeting was held on Tuesday, December 9, 2008, in the Board Room of the Oak Park and River Forest High School. Dr. Lee called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m. Committee members present were 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

**Minutes of November 12, 2008 Policy, Evaluation and Goals Committee Meeting**

The minutes of the November 12, 2008 Policy, Evaluation, and Goals Committee Meeting were accepted, as presented by the Committee members.

**Consideration of Policies for First Reading and Action**

Policy 3361, Petty Cash (Revisions)

It was the consensus of the PEG Committee members to recommend to the Board of Education that it approve Policy 3361, Petty Cash, for first reading at its regular December Board of Education meeting with the following enhancements.

Para 1, Line 1: Delete dollar amount

Para 1, Line 2: Add "Special Education" after Bookstore

Para 1, Line 3: Delete dollar amounts for Health Services, Science Division and Buildings and Grounds.

Para 1, Line 4: Delete sentence "The Chief Financial Officer is designated as the bonded custodian for all petty cash funds."

Para 2, Line 3: Change the dollar amount to \$8,000.

Ms. Witham reported that the school uses the company Brinks to transportation cash to the bank. The purpose of amending this policy is to improve internal controls.

**Superintendent, Evaluation and Goals and Instrument**

Dr. Weninger presented the PEG Committee members with a memorandum explaining that he had incorporated the changes the Committee members had suggested at the November 12 meeting and made additional edits to the Superintendent Evaluation Instrument (attached to and made a part of the minutes of this meeting). He stressed the importance of completing this document as soon as possible in order that it be used in the March-April timeframe for the 2008-

2009 contract year evaluation. Mr. Conway reported that this was an excellent start in the evaluation process and that the Board of Education should be able to complete this in February so that it can be used in a timely fashion.

Dr. Millard concurred with Mr. Conway on the evaluation instrument and suggested paring down the number of indicators and Dr. Lee suggested having four of five under each domain. He continued that everyone understands that the description of any job done well can always involve thousands of descriptors. Being superintendent involves enormous complications. When he asked the Committee members if the evaluation process would be handicapped if there were only four or five descriptors under each category, Dr. Millard responded that Board of Education members could write a statement in the comment section about something not listed if they so choose.

Ms. Patchak-Layman suggested that these were the indicators of success in the broader term of leadership and relationships. The broader question that is part of this under Relationship is that the leader is to have positive relationships with staff, faculty, students, parents, and community. This is what the Board of Education would have expected to influence whether or not the relationship involving leadership had been achieved; it is a definition of what leadership would be. She felt that the descriptors read more as quality criteria that is a known basic job activity. She questioned how one would know what criteria would be for giving a rating of excellent or superior and if that level had been reached. Dr. Lee stated that each Board of Education member would have his or her own perception of this; this is a collection of the perception of eight people. Ms. Fisher added that it was an opportunity for the evaluator to weigh in on that standard; no form could elicit that. The real work comes from the evaluators' perspective and anything set forth in the document can elicit a variety of responses.

Dr. Lee stated that she is comparing the evaluation of a teacher vs. the evaluation of a superintendent by the board member. If she were a teacher, she would have to evaluate each student fairly in that class. She would not be asked to show how many evaluations of a student in this class compared to another student in a different class at a different level. If she had to evaluate a group of 15 to 20 superintendents, then she would have to be able to show that this superintendent is fairly compared to another superintendent. However, she has only one to evaluate. Ms. Fisher responded that the Board of Education could calibrate the form if it wanted to, although she did not recommend it. All seven people would have to spend 40 to 50 hours agreeing on the kinds of things Ms. Patchak-Layman was talking about, e.g., what are the rubrics for an essay question, etc. This is a very laborious process. She was very happy about this evaluation form, but if another one were chosen, it would be acceptable to her as well. Ms. Patchak-Layman reminded the Board of Education that she had shared information with the Board of Education on other models.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked what the measure of success would be used for Goal 1, Indicator 1, relative to having a multiyear plan to raise student achievement roughly by February 1. Does that mean that the goal will be achieved if the Board of Education is presented with a plan by February 1? There is nothing to indicate the quality of the plan. She suggested putting qualifiers such as the District has moved student achievement by X percent. She felt that the dates in the indicators needed discussion.

Dr. Weninger addressed the question of whether the superintendent's evaluation was different from that of students and teachers. There is only one superintendent and the nature and function of that job is different from any other, including those in the area of Human Resources, Curriculum and Instruction, Finance, etc. In his view, and in his reading of the literature, it is difficult to evaluate the educational setting of the superintendent but the best attempts are to place objectivity or narrative by the employers. This document then attempts to do that.

He understood Ms. Patchak-Layman's point about percentage in terms of raising student achievement. Those are goals and targets that the school should be careful about setting for the superintendent. No matter how influential or powerful the superintendent, he or she cannot control all of the elements of student achievement. There are differences from a superintendent's performance with regard to student achievement versus minority hiring and certified staff. There is control over that more than student achievement. The District achieved the percentages it set because there were factors they could and could not control.

It was the consensus of the Committee Dr. Lee and Dr. Weninger would work on collapsing the indicators and present the product at the next Policy Committee meeting.

**Adjournment**

At 10:40 a.m., on Tuesday, December 9, 2008, the Policy, Evaluation, and Goals Committee adjourned.