

BOARD OF EDUCATION  
COMMUNITY CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL DISTRICT 64

Minutes of the Committee-of-the-Whole on Strategic Planning  
held at 6:00 p.m. April 25, 2011  
Hendee Educational Service Center  
164 S. Prospect Ave., Park Ridge, IL 60068

President John Heyde called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. Other Board members present were Genie Taddeo, Eric Uhlig, Pat Fioretto, Sharon Lawson, Ted Smart, and Scott Zimmerman. Also present were Superintendent Philip Bender, Assistant Superintendents Diane Betts and Sandra Stringer, Business Manager Becky Allard, Director of EIS/RtI Lynne Farmer, Director of Pupil Services Kathleen Nelson, Director of Technology Terri Bresnahan, Director of Facility Management Scott Mackall, Public Information Coordinator Bernadette Tramm, Roosevelt Principal Kevin Dwyer, Washington Principal Kim Nasshan, Lincoln Assistant Principal Tim Gleason and 35 members of the staff and public.

Mr. Heyde stated the purpose of the meeting was to receive a recommendation on the 2011-12 implementation activities and budget for the District's Strategic Plan.

Dr. Bender stated that at its core, the Strategic Plan is intended to help accelerate the positive changes that will help District 64 do more for students: by improving classroom instruction through the advanced use of technology and focusing on priority standards, by helping every student set personally challenging goals, and by strengthening connections within its partnership through authentic service learning tied to the District's civil behavior initiatives. He noted that the plan offers an unparalleled opportunity for District 64 to focus staff expertise and resources on the strategies that will have the greatest benefit to improving education for students.

Dr. Bender reviewed the District's mission included in the Strategic Plan: "The mission of District 64, a vital partnership of staff, families and community, is to inspire all students to embrace learning, discover their strengths and achieve personal excellence in order to thrive in and contribute to a rapidly changing world by providing a rich, rigorous and innovative curriculum integrating civil behavior and fostering resilience." He further noted that all District 64 certified teachers, curriculum specialists and administrators – about 400 employees in total – have been fully engaged in Strategic Plan implementation activities in 2010-11, and that administration recommends that this approach be continued for 2011-12. He stated that the plan had been named a "Journey of Excellence" to reflect that the District already has an excellent foundation and that the plan builds upon these strengths in order to fulfill the District's unique mission.

Ms. Tramm then provided an overview of the Strategic Plan process from its inception in 2008, draft stage, adoption by the Board last year, and first year implementation. She noted that more than 120 volunteers representing all stakeholders had participated either on the Strategic Planning Team or one of five Action Teams to create the plan. She stated that the plan was built around five strategies, and that each strategy has specific action plans that describe the steps that must be accomplished if the strategy is to be achieved. She noted that the Board each spring is asked to approve the implementation plan and budget for the upcoming school year. A five-year implementation schedule also is prepared to track each action plan as well as the other initiatives that will impact teaching staff as well as building and District administrators. She added that many of those additional initiatives are tied to

specific parameters within the Strategic Plan. Ms. Tramm referred to the comprehensive written report provided to the Board and noted that overall, the District recommended work in the coming year on 21 of the 26 action plans, and had requested a budget of \$325,990 in total for these plans.

Ms. Betts then provided detailed information about the recommended activities in Strategy IV: “We will define and clarify expectations for student learning, ensure all staff effectively differentiate instruction, and use assessment data to support students in meeting or exceeding the District’s targeted benchmarks.” She stated that activities for 2011-12 would continue focusing on priority standards and assessments contained in action plans 1, 6 and 9, and described the specific steps to be accomplished. Ms. Betts noted that work would begin on action plans 3 and 4 to prepare for the third component of this strategy, differentiated instruction. She described the steps in Action Plan 11 on use of data to meet student needs, and action plan 2 to focus on differentiation skills in new teacher selection for 2011-12. Overall, she stated that Strategy IV would involve the continuing work of about 215 staff members participating on 10 different subject area committees, and requested a budget of \$38,200.

Mr. Gleason offered an overview of recommended activities in Strategy II: “We will develop and implement a system for setting, measuring and achieving personally challenging goals for each student related to academics, civil behavior, talents, and interests.” He stated that work would continue with the three grade band committees: grades K-2, 3-5 and 6-8. In 2011-12, Mr. Gleason stated that goal-setting activities would be piloted primarily by committee members at each grade level band, and that the committee would be looking at age-appropriate formats, “SMART” goals, and how to incorporate technology to share student goals and portfolios among teachers, staff and parents. He reported that about 80 staff members would continue working in this goal area, and requested a budget of \$14,000.

Dr. Dwyer presented the recommended activities for Strategy III: “We will develop and implement plans to ensure all members of our vital partnership (staff, families, community members and organizations) are working collaboratively to help us achieve our mission.” He stated that as scheduled, implementation activities on this plan were just getting underway, and that administrators were currently organizing the efforts for action plan 1 to provide a rich, more powerful and diverse student learning experience. For 2011-12, he stated the focus would be to conduct outreach, build understanding and support for service learning, connect with other Strategic Plan committees to incorporate service learning, and foster current authentic service learning efforts already underway in the District. He also noted that action plan 3 would include more outreach to families who do not speak English. Dr. Dwyer said the budget requested was \$10,500.

Ms. Bresnahan then introduced the recommendations for Strategy I: “We will accelerate the use of advanced technology as an integral component of the educational program and to effectively manage our system.” She reviewed the work in Action Plan 1 focusing on technology curriculum incorporating the National Education Technology Standards (NETS) for students and assessments aligned with Strategy IV. She also noted that Action Plan 2 would focus on staff development and technology proficiency for staff utilizing the NETS for teachers. Action plans 4-6 focus on using advanced technology to manage schools more efficiently and effectively, inform and communicate, and provide a robust network infrastructure. She also reported that the Technology Implementation Committee (TIC) in Action Plan 7 would continue its vital work, and that the Board Advanced Technology Committee identified in Action Plan 8 would be formed in 2012.

Ms. Bresnahan then turned to recommendations for Action Plan 3 to provide resources to assist educators, focusing on professional growth opportunities and independent online learning. She provided an in-depth review of a technology coaching pilot program, encompassing the history of professional development in technology in District 64 and the genesis of the coaching pilot recommendation, research on peer coaching as an effective form of professional development for teachers, the TIC's one-year pilot recommendation for three coaches and their distribution. She also reviewed proposed roles and responsibilities for coaches, qualifications, needed District support, program evaluation, and budget of \$210,540 for the coach pilot. Overall, Ms. Bresnahan stated that about 95 staff members would continue working on Strategy I activities in 2011-12, and that the budget requested was \$257,290 including the coach pilot.

The final strategy presentation was made by Ms. Nasshan, who reported on implementation of Strategy V: "We will develop and implement a protocol to ensure staff and community members understand, are committed to, and have the tools to carry out changes within the system that are needed to achieve our mission and objectives." She stated that this strategy had only one action plan, which is the protocol that identifies eight steps that are critical to the successful implementation of change. She stated the protocol is being used by all the strategy teams and administrators when thinking about changes emanating from the Strategic Plan as well as for school and existing District initiatives. Ms. Nasshan reported that in 2011-12, the focus would be on developing capacity to use the protocol and to prepare the District for the changes that lie ahead as action plans move toward full implementation.

President Heyde then led the Board through a lengthy discussion period to review the details of each strategy in turn. Board members had the opportunity to clarify the thinking behind the action plans and steps, and the budget implications for each plan. Strategy leaders responded to questions in their areas; the majority of questions focused on the technology coach pilot recommendation. Among the topics raised were: amount of time available on staff development Wednesdays and Institute Days for Strategic Plan work; need for a file-sharing mechanism such as a District intranet; electronic portfolios for the goal-setting strategy for sharing student materials and possible cost; use of technology coaches in other comparable districts; the District's hiring practices to include technology as well as differentiation experience; minimum technology usage guidelines for staff and support for staff; professional evaluation of coaches; qualifications and experience for coaches; distribution of technology hardware among schools; current technology professional development options; role of technologists at buildings; budget for technology purchases particularly smart boards; use of release time for professional development and Strategic Plan activities; and, possible budget offsets for Strategic Plan activities in relation to the District 64 budget overall.

When all Board member questions had been addressed, Mr. Heyde concluded the Committee-of-the-Whole on Finance meeting at 8:10 p.m., which was followed by a brief recess before the regular Board of Education meeting.

---

President

---

Secretary