

**OAK PARK AND RIVER FOREST HIGH SCHOOL  
201 N. Scoville  
Oak Park, IL 60302**

**Strategic Plan Operations Committee (SPOC)  
February 17, 2015**

A Strategic Plan Operations Committee meeting was held on February 17, 2015. Mr. Weissglass called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members present were Dr. Steven Gevinson, Dr. Ralph Lee, and Jeff Weissglass. Also present were Dr. Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum & Instruction; Sheila Hardin, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Visitors included Tod Altenburg, Chief School Business Officer; and David Ruhland, Director of Human Resources.

**Public Comments**

None

**Committee Role**

Discussion ensued about the role of the committee. A suggestion from one member for committee work was the immediate concentration on long-range planning, as the belief was that enrollment will continue to increase just as the residential density of the community will continue to increase. Presently, the school is at 65% efficiency/utilization, albeit higher in the science department and lower in other areas. At this point in considering the building of a pool according to this member, the Board of Education will take action that will have an effect on the ability to gain classroom space going out 10 years. Another member concurred stating that the economic development strategy being pursued by the Village of Oak Park could have an impact on the school's enrollment.

**Workflow**

The Committee reviewed the workflow chart that was included in the packet. The Oversight Committee at its all-day meeting used this chart to discuss its responsibilities, including when ideas should be brought to the Board of Education to vet and to release funding if the cost is over \$25,000. Whether an idea should go to a division head, to the Instruction Committee, or to another Board of Education committee for vetting would be determined on a case-by-case basis. The Implementation Teams are expected to generate ideas for school-wide implementation over the next five years. The members of the Oversight Committee are:

Tod Altenburg  
Joseph Beard  
Toni Biasiello  
Michael Byars

Jason Dennis  
Julie Frey  
Chala Holland  
Ronald Johnson

Fawn Joyce  
Nancy Heezen  
Matt Kirkpatrick  
Craig Larson

Avi Lessing  
Dana Limberg  
Melinda Novotny  
Eleanor O'Keefe  
Phil Prale

Sarah Roodhouse  
Nathaniel Rouse  
Claudia Sahagun  
Sheila Hardin  
Steve Isoye

Andrea Neuman  
Alysia Wallace  
Lee Williams

Administrators, too, are assigned as active participants to the Implementation Teams.

A preliminary list of school initiatives was prepared relative to the budget process last year and it would need to be broader. One member wondered how those initiatives could be evaluated and linked to the Strategic Plan, rather than creating something new.

One member felt the implementation of the Strategic Plan was the responsibility of the Superintendent. The charge of the SPOC is to help organize, vet, and shepherd the bigger pieces which need the Board of Education's involvement. The Board of Education has already adopted the plan, which might be viewed as a strategic framework, as a guiding document.

Consideration was given to the District's aggregate commitment to implementing the Strategic Plan. People are now creating plans without a budget. How will they evaluate success? How will the Board of Education know to do "A" versus "B"? What is the prioritization of different price tags? What criteria needs to be developed when looking at the ideas? Some suggestions for criteria to help that conversation included:

- 1) What is the program?
- 2) What are the qualitative goals it wants to accomplish?
- 3) How does it fit with the overall goal area of the implementation team?
- 4) How does it fit with the overall Strategic Plan?
- 5) What will the work entail and who will do it?
- 6) What can be measured?
- 7) What can be piloted?
- 8) What are the start-up costs?
- 9) What are the ongoing costs?
- 10) Are there funding sources other than fund balance and tax revenue that should be part of the vetting process?
- 11) Are there savings to be had?
- 12) Who will report what and when?
- 13) How will it be decided when a pilot should become permanent?

The Finance Advisory Committee, in its projections, put aside \$20 million for investment in capital or one-time strategic investments. No funds were specifically budgeted for ongoing programs, but significant room was included to handle new initiatives. The Strategic Plan is not a budget line item. If expenditures were to increase by a million dollars that number would have to be put through a financial model to determine what it would do for the projected timeline for a referendum. At this time, the amount needed for Strategic Planning is unknown. How does one find that amount? One suggestion was to ask the Implementation Teams how they saw what the school will look like in 4 ½ years. What types of things need to be in place to make that vision

happen? The District then can anticipate the types of costs because this is about curriculum. This work is above and beyond the work of the members of the Implementation Teams. If a thread were seen across 3 goals, a task force could begin to look at that. Because the result has not been discussed, this is a realistic approach. Discussions have occurred about the Board of Education goals that are specific to this year: Next year the focus should be on the goals' action. It, then, becomes whatever happens in that year. That is why this Committee should learn about the scope of the work in relation to a 5-year sequence. The Implementation Teams should answer that question so that the Board of Education can govern in a bigger framework. Over time, the reports could be an overview of the Strategic Plan goal. The Implementation Teams need a framework and they need to determine how to distribute their ideas to help with budgeting and the bigger picture.

One member noted that this was a model of decision making and responsibilities that implied a balance between the board, the administration, the staff, Implementation Teams. A factor being overlooked was the time and energy that has been spent on matters not addressed in the plan such as the issue of drug use on campus, the swimming pool, and the fund balance. Another member reflected that little of the recommendations from the previous Strategic Plan were carried out, but that OPRFHS now has more financial independence than then and that the external forces would take care of themselves and not influence the framework. Another member concurred explaining that the fund balance came to the Board of Education via the members who ran election campaigns about the issue of trust in the community, as the community was upset. While significant time has been spent on the fund balance and the pool, the focus is now on the Strategic Plan and education.

Dr. Isoye added that the District should have a proposal framework, a targeted group, a connection to the Strategic Plan, and focus on racial equity. The ideas from the Implementation Teams should be restatements of the District's vision, the ideas, the actions, the measures, the indicators of progress, and the resources. The Oversight Committee has more people with a greater understanding of finances and can fill out the incremental resources form. The District wants to be more deliberate in asking about racial equity. At the all-day session, much time was spent on the survey completed on Institute Day and the presentations, as well as some ideas. The Oversight Committee plans to meet again. Time is a precious commodity for the team members and they are volunteering before and after school on a weekly basis to work on this. Some of the committee's confusion is also their confusion. In order to alleviate the questions, some of the process has changed. Even though the budget process is fast approaching and decisions would need to be made within that timeframe, the Implementation Teams are hesitant to come forward with ideas that are in the "messy" phase, even to the Oversight Committee. Time, resources and leaders are yet to be determined. As such, Dr. Isoye was unsure if any proposals would be forthcoming this year. BLT and DLT have been asked to provide their preliminary budgets by March 27, but ultimately the proposed budget is not presented until June, the tentative budget is August, and the final budget in September. While budgeting and hiring are different processes, with different timeframes, progress is being made.

Mr. Weissglass reflected that the Committee's future work should be about refining proposals and the approval process, which includes moving to a 5-year perspective and more discussion

about how to do budgeting. Should consideration be given to setting a deadline with regard to budgeting and hiring for next year?

### **Future Agenda Items**

Possible future agenda items were suggested, including.

- Is there an enrollment bubble?
- How will the Strategic Plan goals be connected to the Board of Education goals, as well as how to move into the Board of Education formation question.
- Hiring
- How does the work of PEG and MSAN come into play, as much was based on what the Board of Education had said?

### **Adjournment**

Dr. Lee moved to adjourn the Strategic Plan Operations Committee meeting at 5:06 p.m.; seconded by Dr. Gevinson. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

Submitted by Gail Kalmerton  
Clerk of the Board