

Thursday, July 10, 2014

A special meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on Thursday, July 10, 2014 in the Second Floor Library of the high school.

Call to Order President Phelan called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m. on Thursday, July 10, 2014. A roll call indicated the following members were present: Thomas F. Cofsky, Dr. Steven Gevinson, Dr. Ralph Lee, Dr. Jackie Moore, John Phelan and Jeff Weissglass. Also in attendance was Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; Amy Hill, Director of Assessment and Research; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; Tod Altenburg, Chief School Business Official; David Ruhland, Director of Human Resources; Gwen Walker Qualls, Interim Director of Special Education; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Visitors Karin Sullivan, Director of Communications and Community Relations; Kathleen Brand White, chair of Citizens Council.

Public Comments None

Check Distribution List Mr. Phelan moved to approve the Check Distribution List dated July 10, 2014, as presented; seconded by Dr. Lee. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Personnel Recommendations Mr. Phelan moved to approve the personnel recommendations including new hires, status changes, and resignations, as presented; seconded by Dr. Gevinson. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Citizens' Council Appointments Mr. Phelan moved to approve the appointment of the Citizens' Council members for the 2014-15 school year, as presented; seconded by Mr. Weissglass. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

The Board of Education recessed its meeting at 7:37 p.m. and resumed at 7:44 p.m.

Board of Education Goals Mr. Phelan moved to approve the Board of Education goals for the 2014-15 school year, as presented; seconded by Dr. Gevinson. Discussion ensued.

The discussion from the June Board of Education meeting was mapped into the Strategic Plan's goals and a theme of building relationships emerged for the first year of the 5-year Strategic Plan. Mr. Phelan and Dr. Isoye will use the theme of relationships to set the vision at the August Institute Day for the faculty and staff.

Dr. Lee noted his disappointment with the goals presented because they were similar to the goals adopted in the previous seven years and he now believed them to be platitudes. Two or three years ago, the majority Triton College's OPRFHS students were not able to take college courses without remediation in reading or math or both. He believed the proposed goals only reflected those students were on the graduation dais and had received all A's. He asked the Board of

Education to reconsider a continuation of the same type of goals. If fewer than half can go to Triton without taking remedial courses, it may be that the District is not doing anything wrong, but it should find out whether it can do better, i.e., 1) asking the administration to determine within the next few months what it believes the District would have to do to raise the number of students who do not have to take remedial English up to 35%, so that only 65% would have to take remedial English when they go to Triton, by first developing a baseline. The administration has enough experience in its reading and math programs to make a judgment as to just what kinds of input it would have to make in the life of a high school student. He was not speaking about raising the number of students at Triton to 75% next year, as the students next year are already juniors. What is reasonable would be to find out what can be done and how much would it cost for the incoming freshman class to not have to take remedial courses by year four. He asked the Board of Education to adopt such a goal, along with the platitudes. Unless reasons can be determined as to the extent relationships had improved, he was not willing to accept the relationship venue.

Mr. Cofsky felt it was critical to get the goals to the faculty and administration and transition them into something substantive and measured. He had a certain discomfort with something that was not specific and measured. These are one-year goals, not strategic five-year goals. At the end of one year, the newspaper should be able to write an article listing what happened at OPRFHS. He did not believe the Board of Education needed to be that specific. He believed that it would take 225 or more people to make things happen and, thus, their engagement and involvement in the process is critical. The Board of Education needs to push some of the goals to the administration and the faculty and to have measurability. Some of the work is related to Finance Advisory Committee (FAC) and the fund balance. He believed the Board of Education should specify where it wants to be in a year. A second year of execution of the recommendation exists and the Board of Education can specify the goal of putting into place the next steps of the fund balance/policy execution. With facilities, the goal is the pool. One must come to a decision and begin execution of that part of the facilities plan. It sets the expectation in the other goals. Criticism in the building exists relative to the transformational leadership goal. Where does the Board of Education want to be in the Strategic Plan, as the process is emerging? While it wants to be able to execute certain aspects, it is also about doing a first pass over the entire plan. The other pieces have to do with some type of scorecard, which related to Dr. Lee's statements. What measures does the Board of Education desire now? What is the District doing with the Strategic Plan? What are the financial issues involved? A process needs to be in place to be able to take the activities of the Strategic Plan that need funding and put them into the budget. He liked the theme of relationships and he looked forward to getting that input and seeing how they translated into specific elements. However, other critical things were absent and they also needed to be accomplished.

Dr. Gevinson responded to Mr. Cofsky and Dr. Lee. His memory was that OPRFHS had the lowest percentage of students in remedial classes of the schools that fed into Triton. From an Instruction Committee standpoint, he believed that it was reasonable to do an assessment of the percentages of students who have to take remedial courses and to determine how to improve those percentages. He assumed that the Strategic Plan Implementation Teams would then make that their

goal/goals for the year and create an instrument to measure whether they had been successful. He did not believe that could be built into the Board of Education's goals. He liked goals listed for 1, 2, 5, and 6. He suggested two of the three sub goals for goal 3, i.e., No. 1. Promote a learning environment where every student feels known and supported by at least one adult in the school community, and No. 3 Provide social-emotional and academic supports so that each student experiences academic challenge and success. They are both relationship oriented. He believed No. 2 was similar to the sub goal 1 under #4, Transformational Teaching. He believed it was a relationship-related goal and much work was occurring on this. He recommended going in the direction of social emotional and connecting students with adults for changes with the sub goals. He expected the Implementation Teams to get more specific in measurement and elaborate on the next steps.

Dr. Moore agreed with Dr. Gevinson in terms of relationship-oriented goals as they can be implemented and measured. With regard to Dr. Lee's initial statement about the issue of the academic rigor under Goal 4, #4, action 4, "Establish clear and explicit knowledge and skill targets for all courses, increasing academic challenge, consistency, and rigor in all classrooms and at all levels," she was uncomfortable saying that any student graduating from the high school would be college ready, but they may have to take remedial courses. OPRFHS has a relationship with Triton and data can be attained readily. It is not the stereotypical faces when one thinks remedial in other colleges or universities. She wanted to see a goal of rigor or challenge with the intention of preparing college bound students who do not need remedial classes. Comparing OPRFHS to other schools is dangerous, because it reminded her of parents who said they didn't care what other schools were doing. It is OPRFHS's bar, its expectation, its goal, its students, and its community. It is not a quick fix, but if that is the intention, it can be done. The implementation team could come up with a goal with the intention of making a statement about challenge and rigor for the purpose of making sure the students have the intention of being prepared for post-secondary education. The use of the term "college prep" is a misnomer, as many students are not prepared for college. It is a curriculum, instruction, and communication issue. Students are disappointed when they learn in their junior year that they have not taken the correct courses to enter college. The onus is on the District. She desired a long-term goal/standard that says when students leave OPRFHS they are prepared to apply to any state university. It will require work and a mindset shift on everyone's part. Students need to be aware that they need to work and they need to ask for help. The school has to provide the resources, and make them known so that students get what they need so that the expectations can be grounded.

Mr. Weissglass felt a tension between planning, patience, urgency and completing the job. OPRFHS has a Strategic Plan for the first time in 20 years. When the Board of Education came to its goal conversation, he started with the Strategic Plan. He was confused with what the Board of Education goals were before and after the Strategic Plan. The first goal is to get the implementation plans completed. He felt it would then make sense to use that because the implementation plans are not yet in place and, in collaboration with the Board and

the Superintendent, what would the priority items be for this year. He believed taking an action item from the Strategic Plan goal made sense.

Mr. Weissglass thought SEL could be found in Goal 3 or 4, but he liked the “all levels” presented under Goal 4, “student-entered learning at all levels.” The question will be what is meant by student-centered learning. It can have the student agency piece or not, the personalized piece, and the competency based (moving a student from where he/she is to a higher place). He was unsure if everyone understood it to mean the same. Should the Board of Education be setting more specific measurable goals? There are process and outcomes goals, i.e., scorecards, implementation plans, and implication of budgets. Outcome goals to determine specific measure would be impossible for the Board of Education to do. Dr. Moore wanted to rely on the Strategic Plan, put the implementation teams in place, and hold them accountable for measurable goals. Mr. Weissglass felt that at the end of the year, Dr. Isoye should be able to say implementation plans have been made for each of the six Strategic Plan goals.

Mr. Phelan thought what an organization needs from its leadership is a compelling vision so that people will follow it. The Board of Education is here for a confluence of events. He did not think the goals were the same as they had been in the last three years he has been a Board of Education member because the District has a Strategic Plan for the first time in 20 years. When he had asked what the Board of Education wanted to accomplish, he did not get an answer. In his first 3 years as a Board of Education member, the Board of Education came up with goals because it was supposed to do so. The administration would come back with action steps and it carried them out as best it could. He was encouraged by the Strategic Plan and he appreciated the Board of Education’s discussion. Also critical to him and an area that he personally worked on was building trust outside of the building, i.e., the fund balance, TIF litigation, etc. The next step to him was engaging people within the building and that started with trusting the administration to do their jobs and then the hundreds of other people in the building. He distinguished between the Board of Education goals and the work. He saw the goals from Strategic Plan, grow in the same direction. He felt ideas would come from all areas, i.e., math, the bookstore, etc. They can come to the Board of Education with their measurement and buy-in because they said they wanted to do so and request the resources, and provide assessments.

The Board of Education has to engage the people who do not come to the Board of Education meetings all of time and those who are involved with students. The Board of Education will only get so far and it can only do so much. It is urgent for the current students not have to take remedial courses at college, and correcting that cannot be done without inviting people to get involved. The Board of Education has decided what to do in five years and the vision needs to be set in the first year. While ensuring that every student has a relationship with an adult is good, he believed people were starving for direction and wanted to be involved. He believed by the Board of Education telling people that their ideas are wanted and championing them, hundreds of ideas will move forward, rather than just the Board of Education’s goals. He wanted the goals to be direction for the hundreds of people in the building. Because the contract with the faculty, the contract with the superintendent, the Strategic Plan, and the fact that this was a relatively new board, this is an opportunity to do something transformational in the building.

Dr. Moore appreciated the clarification and felt that it was not the role of the Board of Education to do the implementation, but to give direction/vision.

Mr. Cofsky supported and agreed in general with taking the Strategic Plan and using it as the beacon. He believe that was occurring with the execution of the Strategic Plan. He agreed that the majority of the work is to engage and involve those that are part of this institution. He did feel that emphasis should be placed on connection of community both inside and outside the building. He referred to Goal 6, Item 3, "Create, sustain and promote responsible and transparent financial planning and decision-making, continuously communicating with and soliciting input from school and community stakeholders." This is part of the execution of the work of FAC, which has a high level of interest. Discussion ensued as to whether the goals should be identified as District or Board of Education goals and whether the Board of Education wanted input into the structure of the implementation teams. One member felt to do so would stifle creativity and honesty. Dr. Moore felt that students and parents might have to attend weekly implementation team meetings to get the work done and she suggested that getting students, parent, and community input to inform the implementation teams.

Dr. Gevinson preferred seeing a draft of the composition of the ITs and the rationale for choosing them. He favored having students on at least 5 or of the 6 teams, but noted that which students participated was very important. The students need to be well selected and, if so, they could make a tremendous contribution. Dr. Moore agreed that the students' voices are powerful and their experiences and expectations are missing in many conversations. She hoped that the students selected represented all aspects of school community.

Dr. Isoye reported that DLT had agreed that once the chair of the IT was selected, he/she should have input into his/her committee. Consideration had been given to the size of the committee. A couple of students would be asked to participate on each of the ITs, so that they would feel comfortable. Community representation will be sought for the Holistic Community Education Team as well as for buy-in on electives and non-electives under Transformational Teaching and Learning. Every team may not have the same components. A sounding board of parents would be important and there are vehicles for that. Mr. Phelan believed the Board of Education should be setting rules for people, but the responsibility will rest with the ITs. The administration must be trusted that they can be energized to have people get involved in the direction the Board of Education is sending. He believed the Board of Education had micromanaged too often.

It was suggested that the Board of Education come to a consensus on each of the goals to focus on, one at a time. Dr. Lee noted that the Board of Education had not made distinctions between major policy directions, as opposed to these various teams. Mr. Weissglass had been calling them Implementation Teams and he felt they were an administrative level of responsibility. The board adopted the Strategic Plan and broad level goals and they are the responsibility of Dr. Isoye and his team. He did not see the Board of Education having a role other than being available as a sounding board and getting periodic reports. He cautioned not to view the implementation process as writing a new Strategic Plan; the goals and the action steps already there. He appreciated Mr. Phelan's comments and energy, and he knew that the issue of trust was a very important issue. He

admired Mr. Phelan's leadership so far, trusted his instincts, and was willing to support as the main trust going forward. He liked Dr. Moore's anchor of setting a high standard and then supporting people to accomplish it, i.e., "each and every student in the building moving to a higher level."

Dr. Gevinson too liked and appreciated Mr. Phelan's comments and vision and the idea of voting on an action goal under each of the larger goals. He questioned whether the Board of Education wanted to set a goal such as reducing a percentage of students having to take remedial courses when they go to Triton. Mr. Phelan felt that the goal of the IT would be to say to the Board of Education what would be good and how it will be measured. To do something different would be precedent setting, divert from the Strategic Plan, and it would demonstrate lack of trust for the teams.

Dr. Gevinson spoke about the misnomer of college prep. He noted that the names of the tracks were changed in the 1980's from basic, regular, and honors to transitional, college prep, and honors. It was not systemic and rhetorical in a way that was not reflective, as college prep never reflected college readiness. The Board of Education should be realistic about the goals being set and what can be accomplished. Dr. Moore did not believe the District should have a college prep track, but if that is what it is being called, then that is what it should be, otherwise it is confusing to students and families. Mr. Phelan added that if the IT said it should be renamed, it would be doing a good service.

Mr. Cofsky noted that the Board of Education had not agreed on what the Board was supposed to accomplish nor agreed on a distinction between Board of Education goals and Strategic Plan goals and that it was important to do so. He believed the Board of Education needs to set some priorities, decide on the greatest needs of the organization, what it should focus on for 3 or 4 or 5 years, and depend upon on the rest of the organization to take care of the thousands of other things the Board of Education did not cover. The Board of Education should focus on urgency and policy directions. If the Board of Education believes that financial management is terrible, then it focus on that. Hundreds of things that the organization has to do and the Board of Education cannot be in charge. The Board of Education has to be specific about policy direction.

Mr. Weissglass believed that is what it did when it adopted the Strategic Plan and to adopt separate goals would do incredible harm. The Strategic Plan are the big six policy goals that were developed after a year of community involvement. This Board of Education worked hard to get them right and to agree upon them. A Strategic Plan has not existed for 20 years. This Board of Education has changed direction in a powerful way. This Strategic Plan has embedded in it Transformational Leadership, and if that is taken seriously, it can be done. And, that is what he was here to do.

The Board of Education then reviewed the Strategic Plan goals and the goals in Appendix C.

It was the consensus of the majority of the Board of Education members to accept Goal 1: Holistic Community Education, Action 3 as a District goal: Foster

effective communication and trusting relationships between and among the staff and families, as well as other stakeholders of the schools and communities.

It was the consensus of the majority of the Board of Education members to accept Goal 2: Equity, Action 2, as a District goal: Create a school community where all students feel welcome and experience a sense of belonging.

Mr. Phelan's vision for this action would be to announce to the IT that the Board of Education wants to focus on this activity and its responsibility will be to develop how to do that. If resources are needed that are not in the budget, they will be requested. Suggestions could include having a DLT member as a greeter at the door, a survey could be administered at the end of the year as to how well people knew their administrators, etc. The Board of Education has said that it will provide the expertise that there is an evaluative component to the problems so that it is not just an idea that can be measured. Mr. Cofsky noted it required training, coaching, and support.

It was the consensus of the majority of the Board of Education members to Goal 3: Supportive Learning Environment, Actions 1 (as a District goal) and Action 4, as a Board of Education goal. Dr. Lee did not support this action.

Action 1: Promote a learning environment where every student feels known and supported by at least one adult in the school community.

Action 4: Establish fair and just processes and practices that set clear, meaningful expectations to create a safe environment while recognizing the humanity of all students and adults.

Originally, Dr. Gevinson suggested Actions 1 and 3, as he felt Action 3 was consistent with Goal 4, Action 1 and they would dovetail. Dr. Moore that Action 4 had some mechanism for talking about discipline and social justice issues and thinking that Goal 1 was social emotional and it was important to keep social justice as a goal. It was noted that choosing one did not mean the other would not be accomplished; it could be adopted in a future year.

It was the consensus of the majority of Board of Education members to accept Goal 4: Transformational Teaching and Learning, Action 1 as a District Goal: Provide social-emotional and academic supports so that each student experiences academic challenge and success.

Action 2 was originally proposed. In addition, Action 4 was recommended. One member felt that it was premature to tackle action 4 in the first year. With regard to Action 2, it would difficult to expect the definition that includes all 3 aspects without micromanaging. Dr. Gevinson preferred the social emotional focus in Action 1 because it fit into the relationship theme better than Action 4 and work was occurring on this in divisions. Making each course uniform would be dangerous. Dr. Moore also supported Action 1 with regard to academic challenge and success. The Board of Education wants to engage and set the tone of the expectations. While both Actions 1 and 4 contain commonality about academic challenge and success, Action 4 is about rigor and Action 1 is about support. Mr. Weissglass supported Action 1, as academic challenge is important, Action 4 is premature, and student center teaching and learning may be longer term.

It was the consensus of the majority of Board of Education members to accept Goal 5, Transformational Leadership, Action 3, as a District goal: Ensure an engaged, collaborative, trusting adult community characterized by shared leadership and open communication.

It was the consensus of the majority of Board of Education members to accept Goal 6, Facilities and Finances, Action 1. Allocate resources to support the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

While the Board of Education would determine the criteria for how the goal was met, the Implementation Team is responsible. Action 1 is a Board of Education goal and a District goal because it was not budgeted for each year out of respect for the budget variance. Consideration was given to adopting Actions 1 and 3 because Action 1 was about supporting the IT with resources and Action 3 is current and urgent. Discussion ensued about the Long-term Facilities Plan, noting that when it was referred to previously, it did not include the pool. It was anticipated that the implementation of a long-term facilities plan would start next year.

Administrative feedback was solicited on the above. Comments received were:

- 1) The Finance Committee is doing a good job of creating, sustaining and promoting responsibility. The allocation resources would be exciting for people and it would take on a new meaning for amending the budget. Focus on Action 1.
- 2) What will be IT's power? Is it advisory? These groups need to be empowered.
- 3) Good that the foundation of relationships was affirmed. Lots of good work to be done and strong relationships already exist. Many of the other components of the action depend on strengthening those relationships before the next actions can be taken.
- 4) With regard to Holistic Community Education, it is important to have those relationships to help students as this lays the foundation for them to feel this is possible. Priorities are in aligned with how to proceed.
- 5) Allowing the IT chair to identify the members will create bandwidth. They want to know what their power is and that needs to be balanced. Hearing from the Board of Education that they are empowered will be important.
- 6) Support of parents and students is important.
- 7) The goals are challenging and move in different directions. A concern and hope was to get the daily work done along with these additional responsibilities. Mr. Phelan noted that if there are no failures then there are no successes. The District does not need to slow down to make sure everything is perfect. He believed it would be surprising the number of ideas that come forth and their assessments.

Dr. Isoye echoed the other administrators' thoughts and believed that the relationships with students with teachers, parents with teachers, teachers with teachers, administrators with teachers, and administrators will administrators will inform how curriculum should be designed. He saw how important relationships were in achieving full potential and it is a matter of getting better at it and then improving the systems of support, i.e., SEL, curriculum, assessment, etc. At the

same time, barriers and things that are not working have to be dismantled in order to meet the needs of the stakeholders because of societal changes. That is why he believes this is an ever-improving model. Without relationships, the other pieces will happen, but they will be scattered. The District needs to be brave to implement things and then pull the plug if it is not working. This is an exciting and hopeful path.

Mr. Cofsky noted that because the Board of Education is accountable to a community that has expectations that the Board of Education lead through an FAC process. If the work is to be done, it must be done through transparency with the community. Mr. Phelan noted that even if it were not selected, the process can still be transparent.

Discussion also ensued about more clearly stating that the Board of Education commits to a goal, given its work with IGAs and civic engagement. Mr. Phelan thought about the beginning of the work with the Collaboration of Early Childhood Care and Education. That work is just beginning and the IGA gave it two years to set metrics, which seemed to be an action that the Board of Education might want to focus after metrics have been adopted. Mr. Phelan felt that post-secondary education and civic engagement were outside of the building's focus. Mr. Weissglass felt the Board of Education could say that the primary responsibilities that all 8 of the actions were being adopted the board, but he was not sure it would be helpful to separate and he opposed adopting 8 action statements as the goals for next year. Mr. Cofsky believed the 8 were identified and could be adopted and the interpretation would be that five will be released immediately to ITs. The remaining 3 will continue to be worked on, i.e., the Board of Education must do work on discipline before it is released to the implementation team. Mr. Cofsky felt the Board of Education/District distinction made sense. Dr. Gevinson stated that the Board of Education did not talk about who would do Action 3 under Goal 6. It should be a committee of the Board of Education and it should include administration, faculty, and community, so the distinction between a Board of Education goal and a District goal is muddy. Mr. Phelan moved to remove goal 6, action 3; seconded by Dr. Gevinson.

Discussion ensued. Dr. Lee believed that the single largest deficiency of OPRFHS was its inability to care as much about those people who spend most of their time experiencing the dark side of human nature. While the bubble of optimism can result in good things, the problem is that along with that optimism comes the empty promises that are made to each other, specifically, that of having measurable goals next year. He felt that the Board of Education was thrusting too much responsibility to the various committees with people who will not be held accountable for their decisions. He saw the Finance Committee of the Board of Education taking on greater responsibility and that is why he felt good being a part of it. He hoped the Board of Education would not wait another year to start measuring what is being accomplished.

Dr. Gevinson preferred focusing on Action #1 for Goal 6. He believed the Board of Education would continue to move on Action 3 whether or not it was a goal.

Mr. Weissglass noted that because Goal 1 Holistic Community Education includes transparency and community relationships and Mr. Cofsky was leading the

Finance Committee very well in its work, he felt Goal 6, Action 1 was sufficient. The Board of Education adopted the Strategic Plan and although a blank check does not exist for resources, it is what the Board of Education will focus on. Mr. Cofsky noted that Holistic Community Education will be out to a task force versus being a Board of Education goal.

Dr. Lee did not support eliminating Goal 6, Action 3, as he did not want to be as trusting as other Board of Education members appear to be. Mr. Phelan felt the opposite as this would not work without trust and optimistic and he trusted that Mr. Cofsky would take on Goal 6, Action 3 as his own goal. The administration has said that this would make a difference within the building if the Board of Education focuses on one thing. He will honor that and vote in favor.

Mr. Phelan continued that the Board of Education goals are still the basis for the evaluation of superintendent. However, it will take leadership qualities to facilitate what needs to be done, more so than in the past. Dr. Gevinson noted that the Board of Education goals were being used in a different ways. This is an attempt to distinguish whether it was going to be carried out by the Board of Education or the District. As to whom will be responsible, it seemed similar to prior years, i.e., the Board of Education goals, some of which were more the responsibility of the Superintendent. Last year there was a blend and the Board of Education will have to do certain things.

Mr. Phelan amended the motion to read: adopt the following Strategic Plan action items as Board of Education goals for the 2014-15 school year.

Goal 1, Holistic Community Education,

Action 3: Foster effective communication and trusting relationships between and among the staff and families, as well as other stakeholders of the school and communities.

Goal 2, Equity,

Action 2: Create a school community where all students feel welcome and experience a sense of belonging.

Goal 3, Supporting Leaving Environment,

Action 1: Promote a learning environment where every student feels known and supported by at least one adult in the school community

Action 4: Establish fair and just processes and practices that set clear, meaningful expectations to create a safe environment while recognizing the humanity of all students and adults.

Goal 4, Transformational Teaching and Learning

Action 1: Provide social-emotional and academic supports so that each student experiences academic challenge and success

Goal 5, Transformational Leadership

Action 3: Ensure an engaged, collaborative, trusting adult community characterized by shared leadership and open communication.

Goal 6, Facilities and Finances

Action 1: Allocate resources to support the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

seconded by Dr. Moore. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

It was the consensus of the Board of Education that Karin Sullivan and others would develop some communication about these being the Strategic Plan goals so that they have some context. Time and effort will be devoted to reaching the specified means to evaluate the result of the goal in August.

Mr. Cofsky thanked the administration for listening to this deliberation, as it will be important as the Board of Education passes the responsibility.

Mr. Phelan moved to amend his original motion and moved to approve the Strategic Plan Action Items as Board of Education goals for the 2014-15 school year; seconded by Dr. Moore. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Adjournment

At 10:30 p.m., Mr. Phelan moved to adjourn the Special Board Meeting; seconded by Dr. Moore. A voice vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

John Phelan
President

Dr. Jackie Moore
Secretary

Submitted by Gail Kalmerton
Clerk of the Board