

December 18, 2017

A special meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on December 18, 2017, in the Board Room of the high school.

**Call to Order**

Dr. Moore called the meeting to order at 6:33 p.m. A roll call indicated the following members were present: Fred Arkin, Matt Baron, Jennifer Cassell, Thomas F. Cofsky, Craig Iseli, Dr. Jackie Moore, Sara Dixon Spivy. Also in attendance was Dr. Joylynn Pruitt-Adams, Superintendent; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Tod Altenburg, Chief Financial Officer; Michael Carioscio, Chief Information Officer; Nathaniel Rouse, Principal; Dr. Gwen Walker-Qualls, Director of Pupil Support Services; Amy Hill, Director of Assessment and Research; Greg Johnson, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Karin Sullivan, Director of Communications and Community Relations;

**Visitors**

Stacey Gibson consultant; Jason Dennis and Devon Alexander, OPRFHS Faculty and Staff; S. Stephens, Rene Dixon, Burcy Hines, Mary Bird, Karin Grimes, and Terry Keleher, community members.

**Public Comments**

Burcy Hines stated that previous boards of education have talked about the same thing—race, equity, and equality. A definition of race is needed and about equal rights. Her concern is that at one time, the Board had taken the position on equality and on the African-Americans. Half of the Board supported it and the other half felt that it violated the rights of other ethnic groups. African-Americans are the drivers of the educational problems. A clear definition of race and equity, especially for the teachers, is needed because otherwise, this same conversation will reoccur in five years. Race needs to be defined or redefined. What are what equity and equal rights? She also asked why so much money was being spent on the HR director's salary because division heads make most of the hiring decisions.

Mary Bird understood that this was a heartfelt meeting and was sad to have to leave early. She read the following comments on behalf John Duffy and the Committee for Equity and Excellence in Education.

“On behalf of CEEE, we want to thank Dr. Pruitt-Adams and the District Equity Leadership Team for their responsiveness and collaboration with us in ensuring that the search for a new Director of Human Resources reflects District 200’s commitment to racial equity. As the administration considers the additions we have suggested for the responsibilities of the Director of Human Resources, we request that any Human Resources candidate, who is seriously considered by D200, should have demonstrated experience of moving a racially diverse school toward greater racial equity.

“Most Importantly, We Are Here To Call The Board’s Attention To The Pressing Need To Adopt A Formal Racial Equity Lens Policy.

“During the past 15 months a general, but not yet formalized commitment to a

racial equity lens has been presented and discussed as a worthy decision-making framework by the community and by the administration.

“In fact, on the very same day, September 29, 2016, that CEEE, APPLE, and SUA proposed a Racial Equity Lens to the Board, Dr. Pruitt-Adams presented the idea of a racial equity lens to the Board and community.

In the approved final draft of the 2017-22 Strategic Plan, on page 12, in setting forth the Plan’s goals and strategies, the introduction raises key questions usually incorporated in racial equity lens protocols. Yet, the Strategic Plan fails To Establish Any Formal Mechanism, Procedures Or Accountability For Following A Racial Equity Lens Policy.

More recently, on October 22, 2017, the District Equity Leadership Team shared with CEEE and APPLE that it was using a racial equity lens as it proceeded with all new work and decisions to implement the Strategic Plan and other initiatives.

At this time, that commitment, as explained thoroughly by the administration, is guided only by the DELT’s best personal intentions.

In short, there is no clear policy guidelines or protocols in place to ensure that racial equity considerations in all decisions take place within a consistent, institutionalized procedure that provides a predictable set of expectations, actions and some form of administrative accountability.

“We strongly believe that a formal Racial Equity Lens Policy is necessary to fully and faithfully carry out the goals of the Strategic Plan.

“Such a policy would strictly define the values, philosophy and exact protocols that are required to move a racial equity lens from individual interpretation to an explicitly stated policy. That policy, when adopted, can then transcend current board and administrative leadership and more certainly support racial equity as a central belief and practice throughout District 200.

“Given the essential and vital connections between the Strategic Plan, racial equity, the role and responsibilities of the Director of Human Resources, and the ongoing work of the District Equity Leadership Team, we are asking the Board and Administration to immediately begin discussion around the adoption of a formal Racial Equity Lens Policy.

Terry Keleher read the following comments: “Good evening. My name is Terry Keleher. I’m an Oak Park resident and parent of an incoming OPRF student who’s currently an 8<sup>th</sup> grader at Julian. In my professional work, I conduct racial justice trainings and consulting with organizations and government institutions around the country. I’m here to urge you to keep race in the forefront of your work to advance equity at OPRF.

“As you do that work, an important question arises: Do we primarily focus on *race* or do we address *equity* more broadly?

“There’s a way to do both. You can focus on race *explicitly*, but not *exclusively*. You can prioritize racial equity and pay attention to the ways that racism interacts with other power dynamics related to gender identity and expression, class, disability, immigrant status and other factors.

“Why “lead with race?” District 200’s stark disparity data is enough to warrant our full attention. Racial identities and inequities have a major impact on our students’ daily lives and academic outcomes. This was made painfully clear by many OPRF students at the recent public forum on “The Intersection of Race and Education.”

“We, as a society, don’t like to talk about race—especially systemic racism. It can reveal patterns of power and privilege that many people would rather avoid or conceal. There’s a popular preference for “color-blindness” – which is actually a false pretense for downplaying the significance of race, denying the existence of racism, and diminishing the experiences of people of color. When we’re race-silent, we’re complicit with racism.

“We also know that racism doesn’t operate in isolation from other types of “isms.” Various power dynamics operate in intersectional and compounding ways. But when things get lumped together under a general banner of “equity,” the focus on race often becomes diluted or lost. I’ve seen well-intentioned, so-called “equity” efforts that ignore race. And the racial disparities just persist or grow. Let’s not do that.

“If you address race effectively, there are useful tools and strategies that will be highly instructive for addressing other types of equity. The mindset and skillset needed to address racial equity have a lot of transferability to addressing other matters of equity.

“School districts at the cutting edge of addressing equity are explicitly addressing institutional racism. The Minneapolis Public School District has a policy in which they commit to “identifying and correcting practices and policies that perpetuate the achievement gap and institutional racism in all forms in order to provide all of its students the opportunity to succeed.” Their policy authorizes the use of racial impact assessments “for policies that have a significant impact on student learning and resource allocation.”

“The Seattle Public Schools has a policy to “Ensure Educational and Racial Equity” stating that: “The district shall review existing policies, programs, professional development and procedures to ensure the promotion of racial equity, and all applicable new policies programs and procedures will be developed using a racial equity analysis tool.” The policy also authorizes the differentiation of resource allocation “to meet the needs of students who need more supports and opportunities to succeed academically.”

“If our equity framework explicitly prioritizes a focus on race, then we can operationalize it with the same race-explicitness. It begins with setting *race-explicit* goals, then *race-explicit* strategies and evaluation benchmarks. If you have *race-silent* goals, or if you use proxies for race such as “socioeconomic

status,” or if your framework is too general, then you’re less likely to implement the targeted strategies needed to actually change racial outcomes.

“We have some great schools in Oak Park—but they’re not great for everyone. To uphold the values of excellence and equity highlighted in the District’s mission and vision, we must be willing to directly address the big elephant of racism that’s in the classrooms, culture, curriculum, corridors, and cafeteria at OPRF. I believe we can do this.

“When we’re not consciously and actively addressing racial equity, we’re unconsciously and passively perpetuating racism. Let’s choose to be actively part of the solution, instead of passively part of the problem. Let’s make racial equity the center of all of our equity work. Thank you for your consideration.

**Building Capacity, Building Momentum, Building Equity at OPRF** Dr. Pruitt-Adams introduced Educational consultant Stacey Gibson of Transform the Collective to lead the discussion on Building Capacity, Building Momentum, and Building Equity at OPRF.

Dr. Pruitt-Adams said as the District moves forward more aggressively, there will be pushback. DELT has been more aggressive this year, including herself, on racial equity. A common understanding of what is meant when talking about racial equity is needed as well as a commitment to standing up to that pushback.

She read Ms. Gibson’s biography. Stacey A. Gibson is an educator, consultant, and writer working in Chicago and supporting those who have a vested interest in moving beyond diversity conversations’ to exploring and articulating how patterns of race-based oppression shape interactions, institutions, and opportunity. Since 2007 Gibson has presented on a variety of topics at numerous conferences including UIC’s (University of Illinois at Chicago) Un-settling Feminisms Un-Conference, National Association of Multicultural Educators Conference (NAME), the People of Color Conference, the National Council for Teachers of English, and the White Privilege Conference. Her evolving work around pedagogy as colonization and liberation is influenced by the anti-oppression curricula she created and designed for Teaching Tolerance for the award-winning documentary *American Promise*. Her upcoming writing on interracial friendships will appear in the 2017 anthology *Uncommon Bonds* and her writing has been featured multiple times in ASCD Express. Gibson’s essay, *Sourcing the Imagination: -Nehisi Coates Work as a Praxis of Decolonization* appeared in English Journal in March 2017

Dr. Moore had spoken about the need for this Board of Education to have an honest reflection on race and education and this meeting is an opportunity to do that. It is a Board- level endeavor. She noted that nothing can happen without the work of the administration, students etc., and the Board needs to be less on the receiving end of the conversation and more actively engaged in it. Dr. Moore had met Ms. Gibson’s this summer and through Ms. Gibson’s countenance and approach to this work gave Dr. Moore hope.

After hearing the public comments, Ms. Gibson noted that race is always in the room, no matter what the situation. It constantly demands that everyone play a role. It is like being drafted and being positioned to play certain positions. It

does not need permission and the rules are live and always changing. This is where it gets tricky. What does it mean to hold these tensions at all times?

Members at the table were asked to give their name/preferred pronoun, years of service in education, what their racial identity meant to them at this time and what they entered thinking and also what needs they recognized.

Dr. Moore stated her name, Jackie Moore, her preferred pronoun is she. Her years of service are her entire life as a student, a tutor, a professor, a board member and a mother to 4 children who know the importance of education. She identified as a black woman and that means having to stay on guard and not always being comfortable in most spaces. She is ready to work and she recognizes that she needs to tamp down her enthusiasm and make room for the hesitancy of others.

Ms. Dixon Spivy stated her name, Sara Spivy, her preferred pronoun is she, her years of service are 3 years as a board member, a student and she is a white female who is trying to parse out how as a white woman she can best support African-Americans, especially women. She thought she would be an empty vessel at this meeting, but she realized that she must engage more.

Dr. Pruitt-Adams stated her name, Joylynn Pruitt-Adams, her preferred pronouns are she/her, Ms. and Mrs. She has been in education for 40 years and has identified as a Negro, colored person, African-American, a woman of color and a black female. She is and, therefore, she is and she must model what she wants for others. She came in asking what difference if any, could she make, and now she realized that she need to interrupt it.

Ms. Cassell stated her name, Jennifer Cassell, her preferred pronouns are she/her. She has been a board member for 3 years, she is the parent of a college student and little one and she taught legal writing before joining this board. She is a biracial woman. She came in thinking that her experiences and expertise was being questioned by others who are not like her. She entered this evening thinking she was frustrated by talking about this again, but she realized she needed more common understanding.

Mr. Johnson stated his name, Greg Johnson, his preferred pronouns are he/him and he has 21 years of experience in education. He had been unaware of whiteness and its privilege. He entered this year thinking about his actions as an educator and what he would do to push racial equity, i.e., achievement gap systems. Working at OPRFHS has pushed him to have conversations and think in ways he had not done for a long time, which means turning the conversation to himself. He continues to think about it.

Mr. Cofsky stated his name, Tom Cofsky, his preferred pronoun is he. He has 5 years of board service and 27 years of parenting which is an educational role. He is a white, Catholic male who married outside of faith, it is a position of privilege. The big picture is that people need to own their climb. He recognized that he needs to own it and people need to help.

At this point, Ms. Gibson asked the participants to write one thing down that resonated with them as people spoke.

Mr. Rouse stated his name, Nathaniel Rouse, his preferred pronouns are he/his and he has 17 years in education. He is a black male and while racially fatigued, he knew he had to meet people where they were and continue the urgency regarding racial inequity and inhibitors that impact students and this building.

Mr. Iseli stated his name, Craig Iseli, his preferred pronoun was he or Craig. He has 10 years in education. Within the last 3 or 4 years, he has realized that being a white male and his size had many privileges. He realizes that he needs to determine how to help others solve this problem. He entered thinking he needed to listen because he was afraid of making a mistake in speaking or having conversations about race. He recognized that he needs to do his best to speak and avoid making mistakes.

Ms. Hill stated her name, Amy Hill, and her preferred pronouns were she/her. She has 24 years in education, is white, a majority group, and she is subject to its privileges the advantages of being white. She is responsible for interrupting racism in herself and thus elsewhere. She had thought this work was about people of color but she knows she needs to work on herself as a beginning point.

Mr. Arkin stated his name as Frederick, Fred, and Freddie Arkin and his preferred pronouns are he/his. He has worked with kids all of his life (56 years). He is a white, Jewish male who grew up in 1950, 1960, and 1970 and he has come to understand the privilege that comes along with that. His wife and stepdaughter are Chinese. He entered being frustrated with the lack of movement and he recognized the difficulty of the work to be done. He was there to listen, push, and provide leadership as best he could.

Mr. Carioscio stated his name, Mike Carioscio, and his preferred pronoun is he. His educational experience is 9 years as an administrator. He is a white male and he recognized he is part of the dominate. He realized he must stay engaged.

Dr. Walker-Qualls stated her name, Gwen Walker-Qualls, and she has 35 years of educational experience. She is African-American and that means always being on. She is frustrated and fatigued by the conservation and she recognized that she needs to remain engaged.

Mr. Altenburg stated his name, Tod Altenburg, and his preferred pronouns were he/him. He has 25 years of educational experience. Five or 6 years ago he would never have been asked his racial identity. However, coming to OPRF, and because of its diversity, this is the first time he has had to think about it. It is hard work and he did not realize the privileges. He needs to listen, to be open-minded and he needs collegial support.

Ms. Sullivan stated her name, Karin Sullivan, and her preferred pronouns were she/her. She has been in education 8 years and she identified as a white woman which mean she can move easily in the world without being questioned about abilities, intent, and/or background. She entered this work around the time she started this job, thinking that she had not been affected by race and now she

recognizes she had been. Her job is to figure out where whiteness shows up in her and around her and in her community.

Mr. Baron stated his name, Matt Baron, and his preferred pronoun was he. He has been in education for 20 years as he has mentored children in math and he saw the great disparity. He was a custodian and administrative assistant to a homeschool where his wife was the superintendent. He joined the Board of Education in May. He was a newspaper reporter and he tried to educate people. He is privileged and he has an opportunity to take it beyond words and into actions. This is something that can be done every day. More bold actions are needed in achieving equity and now he believes more allies are needed as this takes empathy, teamwork, etc. He did not think about privilege until 3 years ago and it had a profound effect on how he saw his role.

Ms. Gibson stated her name, Stacey Gibson, and her preferred pronouns were she/her. She currently is teaching at Francis Parker School and she was at District 219 for 14 years. Her daughter goes to District 202, Evanston Township High school and that given her a perspective on what happens when equity plans are engaged and disengaged. Despite the best intentions, Why were plans not taking form? She has a keen eye because she has learned what she needs to practice to make people comfortable and then she realized that was not the work for her. When people step outside of whiteness, they will be reprimanded quickly. All of this is playing out in this room. How much of herself should she bring to this discussion? She started thinking about racial equity work in 2002/03 when Niles began looking at its data and it was crushing. It did not match with the mission of the school. She was drafted to start thinking about this. She added that all brown and black people are supposed to lend their extra labor, emotional labor, when talking about racial equity. She began thinking she would be heard because she had graduated from there and she had been chosen to teach there. She was stunned that somehow they could not hear her. She thought it must be her, but learned later that it had nothing to do with her. She now recognizes that she has to be global as to how she is being viewed. The shadow narrative of equity plans is eating the equity initiatives. Why? Will there be a complete story about how these initiatives are and are not working? The earlier comments helped her with their footprint. Many people think the work goes one way and others think goes another way.

She asked the participants, after listening to the introductory comments, to write down 1) what was not being said and 2) what is still being communicated. Even though something is not said, it does not mean it is not active. Many people continually start over with equity initiatives. Or, also see the idea of going up into the head and lots of data and lots of conversation about the documentary coming out, a story on NPR, etc. so what is it being talked about? One of the “goals” is to figure out what the Board will talk about and how it can even respond to what it is talking about.

Ms. Gibson reviewed the proposed agenda. While several tensions should be acknowledged, she had no answers for them. Several people do long-term, sustained work. Today she would only attempt step 1. In terms of agreements and considerations, she was cautious about using the term “agreement.” Because people come from different backgrounds, they may not know what the agreement

is. Therefore, she asked them to think about “considerations” and being “responsible.” So much is erupting in the United States and people are questioning what is happening. Thus, she hesitated to call any space “safe.” She asked them to commit to this being a transformational space and to speak about oneself responsibly. She said that body language and race was playing out for herself as well during this discussion. Racism and its effects are real. Everyone in the room is operating on the assumption that they have a baseline knowledge. She asked them to be aware when they checked out (not paying attention or are tired) and to when they are tuned in. Boards have stamina about racial equity as well. She asked what it meant to be pushed by different sides. Members of the community may pushback in a different way. It will be competitive.

Ms. Gibson then asked that people write down what was scary about talking about race and what was healthy in about talking about race? How does one know a conversation on race has gone “off the rails” in the school or in other spaces? Comments included:

- 1) When people dump so much baggage that it goes beyond the purpose of the dialogue;
- 2) When people stop listening to one another;
- 3) When people stop listening and check out and become more argumentative and interrupt;
- 4) When I speak about my experience and someone, who has not lived her experience, tells her that she does not understand;
- 5) Agree, and the conversation shifts to something more general and less scary;
- 6) White woman hardness;
- 7) Denial, proximities, and white fragility;
- 8) The discussion is off target and generic;
- 9) When one is harder on the person rather than the problem;
- 10) Angry people get defensive;
- 11) Anger is present and parties withdraw from the conversation;
- 12) One is uncomfortable in setting, people are not listening and become combative;
- 13) Resort to a memorized script;
- 14) Total shutdown; leave the room;
- 15) Lack of engagement, talking off topic; and
- 16) No words to say.

Ms. Gibson then asked the participants to write down 1) their answers to the question, “where, in their opinion, was OPRF with its equity plan, and 2) where should the District be with its equity plan? and to place their answers on the sticky wall.

From the responses that were posted to the wall, Ms. Gibson concluded that the tenure of the room says the equity plan is valuable. She also observed that there was an urgency and that sometimes the talk goes one way and the walk goes another. She also observed the emotions of worried, frustrated, and eager. Equity work is some of the messiest work she has seen but many places have streamlined it.

Is the conversation about the gap an internal conversation? Perhaps. Also, there is content/process work in the pyramid and equity work (content) stays at the top of the pyramid as that is where the data is collected. The processes, which are at the bottom of the pyramid, are not gaining traction. The processes must be named as much as the content is named.

She then asked the participants to the partner with one another. She asked them then to consider some emerging ideas and questions with regarding the District's Equity and Excellence statement, i.e., outcomes, distractions, belief/disbelief, impacts, alignments, concerns, shifts, eruptions, success, dissonance, and assurance.

The Board of Education recessed at 8:10 p.m. and resumed at 8:20 p.m.

Ms. Gibson continued that race is personal, public, private and woven in the pedagogies. All of these areas play a role with or without one's permission. The District is living with sophisticated racism and the District needs to respond with sophistication. Race is constantly shifting, it is beneficial to uphold racism and schools are spending lots of money on racism. She was appreciative of this conversation. Some of the participants were aware of the shadow dynamics and some know the things that have already been and they need to be called in lovingly. Some people are fatigued. What does it mean to call each other in lovingly? The most radical love ever is needed. She had said to her daughter that she had not met the first generation of people to lock arms and put racism down. While some white people were willing to stand up, she had not met the first group of whites who have said they would not invest in it. This breaks the race room. She is not supposed to say many things. Sophistication is not just in the curriculum or who gets hired in HR. Unfortunately what keeps getting inherited is this psychosis. Such much is invested in all disappearing from this. For those who are standing in it and for new arrivals, Ms. Gibson offered congratulations. It is difficult to pretend this is not a thing.

Participants were asked to review what was written down and asked to think about what surprised them or what was interesting to them about the statements. Responses included:

- 1) They looked like a collection of separate entities as opposed to a whole.
- 2) How can outcomes be measured if there is no alignment?
- 2) The statements were defensive or not bold enough; they were hedging or striving for a language that struggles
- 3) Too many words in the mission statement.
- 4) The words "sounds good," "sounds really good," but nothing has changed.
- 5) Intellectualized words, but no action was implied in any of things being discussed.
- 6) language about outcomes was included as well as language about different initiatives. How those things worked purposely together to achieve outcomes was not articulated. This is not about being an organized collection of things to do in school but it is unclear as to what their relationships is to the outcomes.
- 7) References were made to a "culture" of individualism versus a "unified" culture.

Ms. Gibson asked them to write down their feelings about these statements and post to the board. What is the reason for the gap and what is needed? Before a clear articulation to the next steps is made, people need to be fortified as a team or they will ultimately fail. A narrative is embodied and a shadow is occurring all of the time. She asked which need would each of them be committed to. She asked them to write the need and then attach their names to it.

Ms. Gibson continued that people will need to be deployed to one room in the equity house and others to other rooms in the equity house. The participants need to determine who they would be in concert with and what it means to amplify and delegate as to where they are and where they might not be.

When asked if this work reminded them of any other work they had done, the responses were 1) data equity workshop, 2) board goals, 3) long-term facility plan, 4) strategic plan. Discussion ensued.

One member asked what the District could do to move forward, as something concrete was hoped for. One member was not sure about each other intensity, compassion, and intent. A clearer understanding of each other's intent and desires was necessary in order to partner. Ms. Gibson was unsure whether people knew their capacity around equity work. If that is not known, some will be in the front of a firing squad and it will become personal, private, and tender. This is back-of-the heart work. The more capacity that one gains, the less reward for it there is. Moreover, backlash as the equilibrium happens. Many people won't want that. Then what will be done? While some things have not been said in the room, they are still being communicated.

Next, Ms. Gibson asked what was getting in the way of moving forward?  
Responses included:

- 1) Fear. The better one gets at it, the more nasty emails and capacity. So much happens in the building. There is a need to build that capacity to engage in the work while juggling other things.
- 2) The fear which goes to the expectation that change is going to result in diminished work, make the District look worse instead of better, keeping status quo and not doing the work. Also, direction needs to be given and the Board does not want to be in the weeds, but this about doing the work. The Board must decide how and who will do the work.
- 3) More African American faculty are needed to reflect the demographics of the student population. Presently 85% of the teachers are white and 9% are black. With a turnover factor of 7%, it will take awhile to get to that percentage.
- 4) People want to hold on to privilege in a variety of ways, i.e., not wanting to detract classes, having fear of students of color entering into AP classes and not being supported. Some faculty members want individualism and autonomy in their classrooms. Community members are worried about their students getting what they need, etc.

Ms. Gibson said this was coded rhetoric. Action steps need to be taken. The board has different arms. What things can the Board members release to narrow these down to three things? Responses included:

- 1) Release the reluctance to define bold equity initiatives that need to happen in a given timeframe as opposed to broad, over-generalized Board of Education goals.
- 2) Release the fear as to how others will resist, community, staff, etc.
- 3) release the concern and just begin.
- 4) Release distrust of the dynamics between the Board of Education and the staff.
- 5) Release autonomy; the illusion that anyone with an idea played out with expertise will find success.
- 6) Release from being customer service to be public service.
- 7) release of complacency.
- 8) Release of not being responsive to people who wield power, release reactions.
- 9) Release the fear of saying no to the loudest voices
- 10) Release the fact that some people dominate conversations and others are not comfortable or trusting their truth.
- 11) Release the need for numerically measurable goals before plunging into the pool.
- 12) A personal release would be that there is not enough time to dedicate to this work and a Board release to be deep in the weeds and to make space for these conversations.
- 13) Release the desire to make everyone happy and comfortable.
- 14) Release the need to always be heard.

Ms. Gibson hoped that they could do what is most valuable to them so that the next time they have that to offer. That opportunity is valuable. There is much vulnerability in the room.

Ms. Gibson distributed an evaluation form and thanked the participants for being in the space and willing to be flexible. While she had another presentation she could have pursued, she did not because of the momentum of what was happening in the room. The other presentation was heady and would have made them more comfortable. Something happened when they were working with partners on the equity and excellent statements that she wanted to keep them open. She trusted the conversation and will be in contacted regarding next steps.

One word checkouts were:

- |               |                  |
|---------------|------------------|
| 1) Encourage  | 8) Teachers      |
| 2) Hopeful    | 9) Students      |
| 3) Solidarity | 10) Ownership    |
| 4) Commitment | 11) Discomfort   |
| 5) Trust      | 12) Uncertain    |
| 6) Exhaustion | 13) Reservations |
| 7) Courage    | 14) revealing    |

**Adjournment**

At 9:31 p.m., Dr. Moore moved to adjourn the Special Board Meeting; seconded by Mr. Cofsky. A voice vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Dr. Jackie Moore  
President

Jennifer Cassell  
Secretary

## Discussion from Sticky Wall activity

12.18.2017

In your opinion, where is OPRF's Equity Plan?	Reason for the gap is...  <b>One need is...</b>	In your opinion, where <i>should</i> OPRF's Equity Plan be?
We are stuck – some progress but we've stalled out. I feel good about the possibility of getting unstuck	Too many other things are focused on rather than equity  A clear vision	We should have a faculty that mirrors student demographics  We should be seeing gaps narrow not widen
OPRF is overthinking the work instead of acting	Have disjointed processes not focused outcomes without common expectations  Develop alignment amongst all groups and activities ( <b>Greg</b> )	OPRF student success should not be predicated by race
The OPRF Equity Plan is ice skating uphill	Dys-conscious racism/white satisfaction w/the status quo  -Agreement on what the work is -Willingness to pursue and enhance racial consciousness among all members of the team ( <b>Jackie &amp; Tod</b> )	OPRF should have a well established Equity Plan
Struggling to find traction beyond core group of equity leaders  Occasionally caught cycle of responding to a criticism rather than moving forward	Bold leadership with willingness & ability to act in unifying the entire organization  Alignment of actions to goal ( <b>Mike</b> )	Should be at a point where our work as educator, whether individual or systemic, is consistently viewed through a racial equity lens
OPRF should be at a point where we have identified obstacles to growth & planned action steps to eradicate those barriers	Holding on to privilege  Focus on student, <u>not</u> adults ( <b>Sara, Tom</b> )	Getting focus on the things we can understand and move forward quickly

<p>Year 0 prepping for year 1 (2018-19) When care teams will be implemented in the first year of a six year plan</p>	<p>Fear ..... The teachers and staff to join is in the work- we cannot be operating w/multiple voices (<b>Matt</b>)</p>	<p>Clear on goals, talking about what to start, what to stop and what to continue to get us there</p>
<p>OPRF says it wants equity for all students, has tried a myriad of programs but lacks a plan</p>	<p>The gap exists because we are afraid to change. This fear keeps us from collectively defining outcomes and without outcomes we cant take meaningful action</p>	<p>We should be at a point of time where our equity plan is defined concretely and each person's role/part is articulated</p>
<p>We can't be other than where we are. We are where we need to be to enact the equity plan beginning next year</p>	<p>Faculty does not buy into the change that is needed to successfully launch and Equity Plan ..... Start small w/a dedicated core group of faculty members willing to change. Target certain populations w/ targeted interventions (<b>Gwen, Jennifer</b>)</p>	<p>OPRF should have an equity plan that is embedded in its operations</p>
<p>Struggling to get focus n a complex environment</p>	<p>Fear! ..... Ownership/Commitment (<b>N8, Craig</b>)</p>	<p>We should be on the leading edge of equity work</p>
<p>OPRF, w/ its equity plan is making real strides that need to be honored and celebrated, and publicized, especially because there is so much more improvement that's imperative. We need to make a big deal about incremental progress!</p>	<p>We aren't organized (structurally or ideologically) to systemically enact ..... -To trust one another allowing for risks, hard conversations, hope  -Organize ourselves to affect change at multiple levels of the organization  -The will to hold ourselves accountable to our ideas</p>	<p>We should have restorative practices in places de-tracking of 9<sup>th</sup> &amp; 10<sup>th</sup> grade curriculum, strong equity policy that increases minority faculty hiring</p>

<p>OPRF is on its journey towards racial equity. That said we are at the beginning stages of rallying the troops. We are developing common language, beginning to internalize a protocol to have courageous conversations about race</p>	<p>Because we are operating in whiteness and not changing maintains a structure that is comfortable for the majority ..... The will and the skill to interrupt whiteness and the commitment to continue interrupting when the white community fights change (<b>Karin, Amy</b>)</p>	<p>Insistent on hiring more African American teachers  Zero tolerance on racially charged/racist remarks by staff</p>
<p>Ordered by optimism...</p> <p>OPRF is in its very early stages of development of its equity plan.</p> <p>OPRF is stalled at its early stage of developing an equity plan. OPRF is going through the motions of development of an equity plan</p>	<p>"I got mine mentality" mentality, a too tiny view of what is meant by "community" ..... Bountiful grace towards ourselves and one another. space to fail!</p>	
<p>In my opinion OPRFHS is on a tangent in a quagmire with regards to its equity plan</p>	<p>"Fear" Risk Averse ..... Be ready to face naysayers charging the door?  What does "ready look like?"  Stand together on agreed upon principle and direction</p>	
<p>Despite many attempts OPRF is not near having an equity plan in place</p>	<p>Lack of will driven by lack of understanding ..... Leadership—Top down and bottom up to model desired behaviors</p>	

<p>OPRF has a strategic plan with an equity goal that has implementation steps that need to be implanted</p>	<p>We aren't organized (structurally or ideologically) to systemically enact change</p> <p>.....</p> <p>-To trust one another allowing for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>--risks</li> <li>--hard conversations</li> <li>--hope</li> </ul> <p>-Organize ourselves to affect change at multiple levels of the organization</p> <p>-The will to hold ourselves accountable to our ideas</p>	
	<p>The gap exists because we are afraid to change, this fear keep[s] us from collectively defining outcomes and without outcomes we can't take meaningful action</p>	