

OAK PARK AND RIVER FOREST HIGH SCHOOL
201 North Scoville Avenue
Oak Park, IL 60302

Policy, Evaluation, and Goals Meeting
Tuesday, April 15, 2014

A Policy Evaluation & Goals Committee meeting was held on Tuesday, April 15, 2014. Dr. Moore called the meeting to order at 8:05 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members present were Thomas F. Cofsky, Dr. Jackie Moore, and Sharon Patchak-Layman. Also present were Dr. Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction, and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Visitors

None.

Visitor Comments

None.

Minutes

Mr. Cofsky moved to approve the minutes of the February 18, 2014 Policy, Evaluation and Goals committee; seconded by Dr. Moore. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

Policies for First Reading

It was the consensus of the PEG Committee members to move forward for to the Board of Education for approval of first reading of the following policies at its regular April Board of Education meeting.

2:30 School District Elections	The policy is updated to comply with new legislation in regards to nomination petitions. Changes from PRESS are recommended along with the addition of “or designee” in the last sentence as follows: The Board Secretary <i>or designee</i> serves as the local.....
2:110 Qualifications, Term, and Duties of Board Officers	Similar to 2:30, this policy has been updated to comply with new legislation.
4:30 Revenue and Investments	The PRESS update is due to P.A. 98-297 that now allows school districts to invest public funds in interest-bearing bonds of any local government. In sections D and E, language was provided from the Risk Management Team at PMA. These changes have been hand corrected.
5:10 Equal Employment Opportunity and Minority Recruitment	PRESS policy added a new protected status due to legislation.
5:30 Hiring Process Criteria	Two changes from PRESS were provided. The first is an update due to the Facebook Password Law. Details are provided at the end of the policy for your reference. The second is language in regards to signing the mandated reporter status form.
5:125 Personal Technology and Social Media: Usage and Conduct	The PRESS policy updates the list of personal technology devices.
5:190 Teacher Qualifications	The changes to the term “certificate” to “license” are consistent with a recent change in the law.

5:240 Suspension	PRESS updated this policy to allow the superintendent or designee authority to begin proceedings to suspend a professional staff member without pay.
7:70 Attendance and Truancy	The PRESS policy changes language to reflect legislation in regards to compulsory attendance ages for students.
7:140 Search and Seizure	The PRESS policy is updated in response to the Right to Privacy in the School Setting Act. This is a required notification law. Discussion ensued about whether this language related to egregious behavior only. Clarity will be sought from the IASB.

Dr. Isoye noted that the administrative rules were in progress. It was noted that the first policy to be discussed outside of PRESS would be the student discipline policy.

Data Equity

Dr. Moore moved to forward the Data Equity Letter on to the full Board of Education for approval and endorsement at its regular April Board of Education meeting; seconded by Mr. Cofsky. A voice vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Below is a broad outline of some possible components of a data equity bill:

The bill would allow, but not require, districts to enter into “data equity” Intergovernmental Agreements (IGAs). This would be 100 percent voluntary, which would enhance local control and prevent it from being categorized as an unfunded mandated.

The districts would only be allowed to share data about students who are currently or were previously enrolled in their schools. For example, District 200 could share data with District 97 about students who were previously enrolled in District 97, but could NOT share data with District 97 about students who were previously enrolled in District 90 or other districts. Similarly, District 97 and District 90 could only provide data to District 200 for students currently enrolled in eighth grade in District 97 and District 90 and not, for example, those that have moved out of town prior to eighth grade.

High school and elementary school districts could only enter into “data equity” IGAs if they have overlapping attendance boundaries. This would narrow the scope of the legislation to make it clear that it only applies to high school and elementary school districts that jurisdictionally share children, as opposed to adjacent districts that accept transfer students from each other. So, for example, District 90 and District 97 would not be allowed to enter into a “data equity” IGA.

The “data equity” IGAs could grant reciprocal data sharing up to and including what is allowed between schools of a unit district, but could also be restricted if the community believes certain data should not be shared. This component not only promotes the concepts of local control and community standards, it helps avoid the creation of one-size-fits-none legislation.

Dr. Isoye will provide the following Committee feedback to District 97:

- 1) Add language about what would be an example under “for example”, i.e., multiple measures over time, etc.
- 2) Add something that would include data used by unit districts.
- 3) Consider a parent signoff regarding the sharing of information, instead of an IGA.

A list of information to be shared has yet to be determined. Both Chappell Hill and Montgomery County are both districts that have been heralded as to what data is collected and how it is shared and used. It

was noted that the State of Illinois provides each student in the state with an ID number. This is about taking advantage of access to information.

Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that this was going to the legislature and it is intended to have state legislation. One must be firm in terms of expectations as to what is to be collected regarding students because much information is available at the state level. Dr. Isoye felt that delineation could be included in the IGA.

Board of Education Meeting Dates

Mr. Cofsky moved to forward the regular meeting dates for the 2014-15 school below on to the Board of Education for approval at its regular April meeting; seconded by Ms. Patchak-Layman. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

Thursday, August 28, 2014	Thursday, February 26, 2015
Tuesday, September 23, 2014	Thursday, March 26, 2015
Thursday, October 23, 2014	Thursday, April 23, 2015
Thursday, November 20, 2014	Thursday, May 28, 2015
Thursday, December 18, 2014	Thursday, June 25, 2015
Thursday, January 22, 2015	

Parent Teacher Advisory Committee

Dr. Isoye reported that two additional committee meetings are scheduled of the Parent Teacher Advisory Committee Meeting. Eight subcommittees morphed into six and they will explore PlascoTrack, Period 1 Tardy Procedures, Unexcused Absence Drop Process, Restorative Justice and Use of Peace Circles, Advisory Period/Freshman Mentor Program, Community Service, Suspension Reduction Program, and Cell Phones. The Board of Education will be asked to approve its recommendations in May.

Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that the PlascoTrack Committee provide several recommendations, the committee of the whole addressed and asked questions about the recommendations, and it was asked for a consensus as to which things would come forward to the Board of Education.

Board of Education Discussion on Student Discipline

Dr. Moore had wanted to wait for the report from PTAC before the Board of Education had a facilitated discussion on student discipline at a retreat. She felt the two attorneys who presented at the Instruction Committee on the new federal guidelines should be invited to present at this meeting. Ms. Patchak-Layman suggested having more parameters around the retreat, i.e. will administrative rules be complete on discipline, etc.? How will that relate to policy at the time of the retreat, as it is about the policies and their procedures? Dr. Isoye suggested having those procedures reviewed and available by that time. Ms. Patchak-Layman reviewed the policies, and the Board of Education's conversations about discipline, and wondered if the implementers of discipline interpreted the Board of Education's conversations in the same way. She was unsure as to how to codify the Board's intent so that it was understood by everyone implementing it. Dr. Isoye suggested starting in an area of interest i.e., the reason a student is expelled, etc. and then moving that process into additional areas, determining a path of transfer from concept to policy. Dr. Moore noted the racial disparities in the discipline reports and the Board of Education had discussed honing in on why. The conversation might be about that and/or adding or revamping some policies, i.e., restorative justice and mentoring, etc. Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that a review of the policy would ask if the current policy gave guidance for the way the Board of Education envisions school being for students who are involved in discipline. What is the school's main goal and how does that reflect with the Strategic Plan for vision, mission and goals. Mr. Cofsky stated that if the implementation of the current policy raises questions, then something in the policy permits different views of interpretation. If the policy is being followed but the results are not what is desired, then 1) it is an

interpretive issue of the policy, or 2) the policy needs to be amended. The administrative rules would tell that tale, i.e., zero tolerance, PlascoTrack, etc. Ms. Patchak-Layman spoke of the conversation at the MSAN Discipline Institute about the research on PBIS, which has a format as to what happens in the school. After discussion, it was discovered that what was written on the paper was not what was happening in the district. Dr. Isoye suggested PEG recommend a topic and the rationale and ask for Board of Education input. It was the consensus of the PEG committee members to send what they saw as highlighted trends in the policies to Dr. Isoye. The Code of Conduct should be able to be tracked back to the Board of Education policy and changes/limitations will then require legal counsel advice. From the Board of Education standpoint, it should be at a certain level. The Board of Education members were recommended to look at the policy. Dr. Isoye will work with Dr. Moore on next steps and what the specific assignment is to be.

Board of Education Self-Evaluation

The Committee reviewed the annual planning and evaluation cycle that it had previously determined. At this time, the Board of Education will have an update on the goals, talk about its processes and effectiveness, and evaluate the superintendent. The question is does the Board of Education want to have a self-evaluation and how would it like to do this. Dr. Moore felt this was a good time to do a retrospective on the Strategic Plan, FAC, and the three-member committees. Ms. Patchak-Layman did not believe this would have to be held in closed session. The options for facilitation would be 1) no facilitator, 2) IASB Field Service Representative, or 3) assign this to the superintendent. Thus, the topics to be suggested to the Board of Education would be:

- 1) Process of the year
- 2) Board and Superintendent Agreements
- 3) Board Goals and Strategic Planning Cycle
- 4) What would committees be looking at? Conduits of communication

The Board of Education could determine if it wanted to have Dr. Alson return to help with the structure of the implementation groups and how they are structured over a 3- or 5-year period.

Superintendent Evaluation

Dr. Moore moved to bring forward the evaluation instrument as presented to the full Board of Education for review at the regular April meeting; seconded by Mr. Cofsky. A voice vote resulted in motion carried. Dr. Isoye reported that this form, as presented, had been used last year. He explained the process. Usually the responses are collected from Board of Education members and the president puts the report together. Because there were four new Board of Education members, it was suggested that a review of the process and reflections be given by longer-term members as to their experience and this process.

Adjournment

At 9:30 p.m., on Tuesday, April 15, 2014, the PEG Committee was adjourned.