

July 18, 2013

A special meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on Thursday, July 18, 2013 in the Board Room of the high school.

Call to Order

President Phelan called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. A roll call indicated the following members were present: Thomas F. Cofsky, Dr. Steven Gevinson, Dr. Ralph H. Lee, Dr. Jackie Moore, Sharon Patchak-Layman, John Phelan and Jeff Weissglass. Also in attendance was Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; Tod Altenburg, Chief Financial Officer; Michael Carioscio, Chief Information Officer; Amy Hill, Director of Assessment and Research; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; Karin Sullivan, Community Relations and Communications; Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Consent

Mr. Phelan moved to approve the following consent items:

- Contract with P. Woytek for Social Work Services
- Contract with T. Kinsey for PT Services
- Video Management System Contract to Eagle Security
- Check Distribution List dated July 18, 2013

seconded by Dr. Lee.

The changes to contracts for social work and physical training (PT) services from those submitted at the Finance Committee reflected references to appendixes. Either more clarity was given, or the reference was removed. The contracts now list only hourly rates, but the budgeted amounts are \$50,000 for social work services and \$36,000 for PT services.

Why was Eagle Security recommended for the Video Management System even though Precision Control's price was lower and would use a third party contract to perform the integration with Salient System. The Business Office will explore: Was that part of the RFP? Why was a price change and negotiations held with Eagle Security? Why did the high school not go with the lowest bid?

A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Policies

No comments were received as to the amendments of these policies.

Mr. Phelan moved to approve Policy 4:15, Identity Protection, as amended; seconded Dr. Moore. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Mr. Phelan moved to approve the amendments in the following policies: 4:140, Waiver of Student Fees; 4:170, Safety; 5:50, Drug and Alcohol Free Workplace, Tobacco Prohibition; 5:260, Student Teachers; 6:170, Title I Programs; 6:240, Student Travel; 7:190, Student Discipline; 7:305, Student Athlete Concussions and Head Injuries; seconded by Mr. Weissglass.

Discussion ensued about whether Policy 7:305, Concussions, included intramurals. Note that while intramurals are not governed by IHSA or extracurriculars, the high school follows the same rules and regulations related to concussions. The IASB provided this policy, and it suggested in the footnote that the school board may want to add/confirm that it is intended for IHSA sports. This policy allows the superintendent to develop procedures that will “comply with the auspices” of state law. Any additional intent would need to be brought forward to the Board of Education at another time, such as adding the suggested definition “A student athlete is a student who has participated in one or more practices and/or athletic contests in any sport offered by or under the auspices of a high.”

Discussion ensued about the sticky note as the language was optional, and it was the official language of IHSA as to the definition of student athlete.

Mr. Phelan moved to remove the language of the sticky note and rely on the intent of the Board of Education as the superintendent understands from the discussion, to use the definition of student athlete from the IHSA and by law; seconded by Dr. Gevinson. The footnote does not require putting in the definition. A roll call vote resulted in five nays and two ayes. Ms. Patchak-Layman and Mr. Phelan voted aye. Motion failed.

Ms. Patchak-Layman said that the policy language suggests intramurals are covered, and the programs put together would affect students and guardians as part of intramurals. Mr. Phelan preferred it by reference as there was a history of IHSA. The IASB created this policy for the many school districts in order to comply with state law. He wanted the Superintendent to determine if it should include intramurals. Mr. Phelan advised any Board of Education member who wanted to discuss further whether intramurals were covered should ask the Policy Chair to add it to the Policy Committee agenda. Dr. Moore concurred. The District has a form that it uses with regard to concussions, and it includes notifying the families.

Mr. Phelan moved to add Para 4, section 4 back into the policy; seconded by Ms. Patchak-Layman. The statement directs the Superintendent to develop procedures. A roll call vote resulted in 4 nays, 2 ayes and one pass. Ms. Patchak-Layman and Mr. Phelan voted Yea. Dr. Lee passed. Motion failed.

A roll call vote as to the approval of the policies in the motion resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Policy 6:190

Ms. Patchak-Layman moved to adopt 6:190 Extra Curricular and Co-curricular Activities as presented; seconded by Mr. Phelan.

Discussion ensued. Ms. Patchak-Layman supported adding IHSA for clarity to the fourth sentence. A question was raised as to the definition of “overall 2.0 GPA”. It was clarified that it meant the “current grading period” while the student is participating in the sport. The District has a C-Pass-to-Play policy. Grade reports are run weekly, and those students in IHSA activities must have a 2.0 GPA and/or are not failing their classes. Students, not in IHSA sports do not have this same restriction. The Assistant Athletic Director spends significant time making sure teachers of athletes provide the grades in a timely manner. A failing grade is less than a D.

This has been the practice in the past, and the addition clarifies and aligns what was included in the old policy. Mr. Phelan noted that the Board of Education can set outside parameters, and the administration could add a failing grade. The old policy identified the procedures.

Cumulative GPA means from the start of the high school career to present. Overall GPA means all of the classes being taken at the time.

A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Policy 8:25

Dr. Gevinson moved to approve Policy 8:25, Advertising and Distribution in Schools Provided by Non-School Related Entities; seconded by Mr. Weissglass.

Discussion ensued. Dr. Gevinson preferred that non-school related entities not be allowed to make announcements in the school bulletin, as the District has the right to disallow it. Policy 7:330, Student Use of Buildings—Equal Access, addresses non-school sponsored groups. Because further discussion would require legal advice, and Dr. Lee moved to remove this policy from the agenda pending a recommendation from the administration; seconded by Dr. Moore. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

**Personnel
Recommendations**

Mr. Phelan moved to approve the personnel recommendations, including new hires, retirements, and resignation, and stipends, as amended; seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried. Ms. Spiccuza will teach Italian, not Latin.

Mr. Cofsky noted that personnel recommendations need to be aligned with the Strategic Plan and the District’s resources and that it is critical that a compensation philosophy be created.

Mr. Rouse stated that the District was attempting to mirror the student population in its hiring of teachers. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked for a report about where the District was making change in its hiring process. It was suggested that the discussion of monitoring would be during the discussion of the Strategic Plan, what and when reports should come to the Board of Education.

Board Retreat Debrief

Board of Education members were asked for their feedback/comments. With regard to the Board of Education's discussion of its own procedures at the July 17 retreat the following comments were made:

- 1) One member requested having a compilation of the agreements, comments, and suggestions before scheduling another retreat with a facilitator.
- 2) More conversation was needed about Board of Education operations, but it does not need to be a facilitated conversation.
- 3) An open session would have allowed information to be shared and the opportunity to have a fuller conversation to occur. The questions about goals or priorities would have been a natural extension to that conversation.
- 4) The meeting had significant free flowing discussion and discussion of the items will be facilitated by that retreat.

With regard to the retreat on Strategic Planning, Mr. Phelan asked if the Board of Education members were comfortable with the framework of three additional sessions with Dr. Alson. Comments/questions/suggestions followed:

- 1) This is a general discussion of the goals so that the administration has direction for the goals at the next Policy Committee meeting.
- 2) The retreat was valuable and subsequent meetings were welcome.
- 3) When will the Board of Education discuss the committee structure? Should its goals include a review of the committee structure?
- 4) The committees need a philosophy of mission.

Board Goals

The Board of Education then discussed the end-of-year summary of the 2012-13 Board of Education goals and the detailed report with chevrons. Colors were used on the summary page to indicate the status of the goal. Proposed goals for next year were in orange. Dr. Isoye believed the Board of Education goals set direction for the Board of Education and the District. Confusion has existed about the wording of the goals when parsing them out to the Board of Education, the District, and the Superintendent.

Discussion ensued about the process, scope, and timeline of the goals. Should the Board of Education develop its goals for which it can be accountable and then develop the goals for the District? The Board of Education and the Superintendent act as a team to move the District and the Board of Education

goals give the Superintendent direction and help the Board establish governance and policies.

Discussion ensued about fitting the Board of Education goals in with the Strategic Plan's goals. The Strategic Plan sets up a vision that has multi-year goals and actions that by the fifth year should be complete. Each year, the Board of Education will look to see 1) what progress has been made, 2) what are the next steps in implementation and activities, 3) how students and staff are being affected and making adjustments, and 4) what new things should be brought forward, i.e., addressing a new group of students that had not been included in the Strategic Plan. It was suggested that the action steps should be the District's goals for that year. Each year the District's goals would be monitored and evaluated.

Discussion ensued about the equity goal, noting that last year's goal was to show evidence of any change that had taken place in the achievement gap which was officially acknowledged in 1993. Neither positive nor negative evidence had been submitted. Dr. Lee feared that if the Board of Education did not set aside time to define the achievement gap or to choose criteria that would determine what progress had been made would lead to the same data being presented next year.

One Board of Education member liked the distinction between Board of Education goals and District goals. Mr. Phelan had reviewed the Board of Education goals for the last several years and he concluded that was the norm that was accepted and how the superintendents were evaluated. The subject areas have been racial equity, student engagement, achievement, learning environment and school culture, finance operations and board governance.

A question was asked if Strength Weakness Opportunity Threat (SWOT) goals would be utilized as they were used in the creating of the Strategic Plan in reviewing the data and determining where the District might go and in completing the worksheets. The Board of Education used them in the past as well.

Mr. Weissglass offered goals having to do with Board of Education governance such as adopting the Strategic Plan, developing a consistent means for monitoring the Strategic Plan, developing committee and working group structure, developing a fund balance policy, evaluating the administrative compensation structure and developing the superintendent and administrative goals.

The Board of Education was asked to help build a framework for next month's discussion on the goals as to what progress has been made, the next steps in implementation and activities, 3) how students and staff were being affected and

making adjustments, and 4) what new things should be brought forward. One member affirmed that the categories used by the Board of Education before were stellar and should be continued. Dr. Isoye asked that the Board of Education to talk with the administration before committing to any final goals in order to be realistic about time, resources, etc.

One member asked for a report as to whether the goal was complete or not and what the district learned from it and should it be kept. There should be continuity in the goals and that is the reason for having a strategic plan. In lieu of that, the same topics have good value.

Mr. Phelan noted a tension between the Board and the administration and responsibility and accountability. He believed responsibility should not be separate from accountability. The level to which the Board of Education gets involved in running the school it then becomes responsible for the school. To the extent as to where the Board of Education wants energies focused and the administration commits to the results, then the administration is accountable. The extent to which the Board of Education gets involved, then the Board of Education becomes equally accountable for the results. The Board of Education has to determine what model works the best. In the corporate world, one either does or does not attain the goal

Ms. Patchak-Layman stated that part of the public responsibility is to be a conduit and report on the community's ideas to the Board of Education. It is the balance between the Board of Education and the community that is part of the formula. When a public system has lots of "publics" involved, e.g., students, families and community, and because of the school is tax-supported, more discussion is important. The Board of Education must bring that communication forward, voice the concerns and have it be part of the discussion. Discussion ensued about whether when the Board of Education brings ideas to the administration, does it the administration make the decision or does the Board of Education direct the administration to do something. Should the Board of Education learn of software that could improve math scores help and directed the administration to implement it, who would be held accountable? Or, should the Board of Education say that math scores should be improved by 2% and give the school the resources. If the goal was not reached, the Board of Education could hold the administration accountable. It is the Board of Education's responsibility to determine what is best. One member wanted the administration to make recommendations outside of governance. This needs to be a collaborative effort to determine the operational/educational goals.

Dr. Moore felt that the community's put was important but the Board of Education's responsibility to provide feedback as to whether there was follow through and what the District is doing is also important. The Board of

Education is responsible for being collaborative and in setting policy and it must be informed by all stakeholders as to what the District is already doing. However, it is the Board of Education that will be blamed if something is not successful. Therefore, it is important to look at policy seriously, to get all of the voices to make the decisions, but to realize that the Board of Education is the decision maker. In certain areas, voices of other entities are absent and that has created mistrust and suspicion.

It was explained that the goal regarding the scorecard was the result of the Board of Education wanting to monitor the progress of the District and for it to be a piece of communication. Each component of the scorecard can be used in student achievement, climate and operations, etc. Discussion and debate as to which data should be selected occurred over a one and one-half year time frame. This was the first trial and it goes to what the public wants to know.

Dr. Gevinson suggested reviewing the recommendations from the GMOS report of several years ago to see what was completed and effective.

Regarding timelines for the implementation committees, Dr. Isoye stated that it would take time to determine what time and resources would be recommended. He felt the teams would start in earnest the following year. It was suggested that some money be put aside for the implementation teams kick offs.

The Board of Education asked for the administration's input on the goals.

Comments included:

- 1) The goals should be consistent as the District's work is tied to the Board of Education goals.
- 2) Divisions use the goals in their departments to develop their own goals. If there is a change or if they are unavailable at the beginning of the year, it is problematic. The District needs a common vision. It is critical to be able to talk about the goals in August and be as consistent as possible.
- 3) Start with the goals from last year.
- 4) SMART goals should be District goals. Board of Education goals need to be specific, measurable, meaningful, consistent and coherent.
- 5) The District's work is underway and continues along the trajectory identified in goals from last year and the goals coming forward in the strategic plan. Many areas of overlap, particularly the statistics in chevrons and action steps as likely to be approved as part of Strategic Plan in the fall. The forward motion as a result of those things will continue and provide enough guidance to move forward unless something radically different.

Ms. Patchak-Layman cautioned that the goals need to be clear versus the actions. The Board of Education has recommendations for the present five goals. The Board of Education can look at its present goals, which are broad. The action steps are how the Board and District work with them. Dr. Isoye's

recommendation is for the goals to stay the same and the action continuing. Ms. Patchak-Layman felt the goals were broad enough to carry the Board of Education forward for many years, but it is the action statements that would change. The goal statements help inform the faculty and staff as they read them. The action statements have more mobility. Board of Education members should make a distinction about changing the boarder statements or having different action steps. Mr. Phelan stated that carrying over the same Board of Education goals might provide the consistency desired and allow the work to be completed. Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that the Board of Education had dropped the broad sentences that had accompanied the goals which included their philosophical intent, i.e., the vision and goal statement made from the vision. A goal would be the development of performance compensation. Is the Board of Education looking at bigger goals or the action steps?

The goals were written by Mr. Phelan and the administration from a generated list from all the board members.

Mr. Weissglass acknowledged that it would be difficult to write goals before the Strategic Plan is complete. He believed that the Strategic Plan was consistent and it honed this tremendously. As Mr. Weissglass will not be at the August 13 meeting, he will provide his comments about the goals in advance.

It was the consensus of the Board of Education members to focus on District goals at the August PEG Meeting beginning with last year's goals and the governance goals at the September PEG meeting. It is the intent for the Board of Education to approve the Board's goals at its Special Board meeting August 13 and to make them available for the August 15 Institute Day.

Closed Session

At 9:55 p.m., Mr. Phelan moved to enter closed session for the purpose of discussing collective negotiating matters between the District and its employees or their representatives or deliberations concerning salary schedules for one or more classes of employees. 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(2); seconded by Dr. Moore. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

The Board of Education resumed open session at 10:37 p.m.

Adjournment

At 10:38 p.m., on Thursday, July 18, 2013, Mr. Phelan moved to adjourn the Special Board Meeting; seconded by Dr. Lee. A voice vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

John Phelan
President

Dr. Jackie Moore
Secretary