

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

Strategic Plan Operations Committee (SPOC)
March 15, 2016

A Strategic Plan Operations Committee meeting was held on March 15, 2016. Chair Dr. Moore called the meeting to order at 5:45 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members present were Dr. Jackie Moore, Tom Cofsky, and Jennifer Cassell. Also present were Dr. Steven T. Isoye, Superintendent; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum & Instruction; David Ruhland, Director of Human Resources, Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; Tod Altenburg, Chief School Business Officer; Sheila Hardin, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Visitors included Board of Education members Fred Arkin and Sara Spivy, OPRFHS faculty members Jason Dennis, Lindy Novotny, Andrea Neumann, and Therese Brennock; Ronald Johnson, Director of Purchasing and Transportation, Christopher Thieme, ET Department.

Public Comments

None

Minutes

Ms. Cassell moved to approve the Strategic Plan Operations Committee (SPOC) minutes of February 16, 2016, as presented; seconded by Mr. Cofsky. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

Implementation Team Feedback and Discussion

Dr. Moore held a meeting with implementation team leaders about the process of implementation team ideas. She shared with the Committee the questions she had asked and the responses she received from them.

Q) What was the experience with the process and what was the understanding of how the pilot programs would be chosen?

A) The themes of the responses were: 1) the building leadership needed to provide more support; 2) very limited time to work on pilot projects; 3) the formation of the committee and the reporting structure was unclear; 3) initially, they were excited about the Board of Education's communication with faculty and staff that the process would be more direct, and it would be an opportunity for shared leadership and innovation; teachers felt they wanted the Board of Education wanted to meet with them; 4) the process/environment was not conducive because of where and when the teams met, and no food or water was provided. Dr. Isoye responded saying that he and Dr. Moore had suggested an implementation team structure of two co-leaders, as

opposed to one, to share the wealth and the burden. Staff signed up for the areas in which they had an interest, and the interests were fairly unbalanced, as finance had the smallest interest and supportive learning environment had the largest interest. Some teams already had ideas formulated, and others already had proposals that the teams worked specifically to support. The teams met on their own time. The feeling was that the process/environment was not conducive because of where and when they were meeting, no food or water was provided. Some felt their time was not valued by the District. The flowchart was seen as unyielding, bureaucratic, and not supportive. A retrospective feeling was that the oversight committee had a rule that only the implementation co-chairs could present to it, regardless of whose proposal it was. Implementation chairs wanted support from the building leaders in innovation, nurturing of student ideas, a transparent vetting process, shared leadership and accountability. A suggestion was made to have support for pilots as many did not know how to set one up. One vehicle whose purpose was the internal website dedicated to teachers and staff where they would be able to log in and present their idea and give feedback. It was not widely used, because of a feeling that a survey that was attached from an Implementation Team; staff did not want to participate in that because of a possible backlash.

Mr. Chandler talked about how to set up an optimal framework for the strategic plan using the pilot process. The teams have been dormant this year, and some are waiting to see what the process will be. He felt oversight committee's membership was made to large in an attempt to make sure all of the bargaining units, implementation leaders and administrators were included. Questions to ask are how do they relate to student instruction? Are there ways to suggest themes; themes so that it is a request for a proposal related to current identified needs or Board of Education goals such as wanting to increase college readiness, etc. What will be the intent going forward to demystify the process to the Board?

Ms. Cassell was disappointed that the oversight committee had not determined a way to be more supportive of teachers. Discussion ensued about whether the proposals should come directly to the Strategic Plan Committee rather than the Oversight Committee and the process for funding. Part of the Oversight Committee's role is to look at the various stakeholder groups that might be impacted, vet the proposal by a group of people who are willing to be critical, supportive, and ask for more information. Dr. Isoye believed the Board of Education's role was to set process and talk about the framework. Dr. Moore referenced Mr. Chandler's work with City Colleges using the task force approach; its implementation teams had asked questions about the process and determined which ones met a rigorous test, collaborated, and then they presented to the larger group. The Oversight Committee's role is to determine how the bargaining units will be affected so that some of the homework is done as opposed to having a committee of the whole reviewing every proposal. Dr. Moore believed in a vetting process but it should focus on the content and expertise and suggested including community members who have the expertise/resources in pointing to evaluation tools, content area, technical assistance, etc. It would be a way to leverage resources in the community as in-kind services to the benefit of the

students. Ms. Cassell did not want things to come directly, but the oversight committee seemed unwilling. Ms. Hardin supported tweaking and reworking the process and the goal of the SPOC Committee, but she was leery of proposals going to a community forum without going internally first. Great ideas have logistical issues that have to be addressed internally.

Mr. Cofsky questioned whether this was about implementation teams or the Strategic Plan. While talking about the specific process of implementation teams, many other paths are being taken. Is the SPOC going to focus on pilots or the whole plan and all of the avenues and initiatives involved in it, because barriers and roadblocks cause the use of other paths to accomplish things? Should SPOC concentrate on the implementation team process or look at the bigger picture.

Discussion ensued about next steps. Dr. Isoye will map out some of the entry points to see the broader picture of support behind ideas. The question is how to maintain and be support of innovation, i.e., professional development, implementation teams, etc. The framework now is one implementation team per goal, but perhaps it should be different in the future. Concerning budget, some things were and were not budgeted this year, and the District needs to determine what should be earmarked for next year. Dr. Moore that the process must include an equitable environment for staff and students to be able to have access to ideas and the ideas have to be able to be systematic or measurable. The question of where someone would go if they have any idea must be answered. Dr. Moore suggested Mr. Chandler's suggestion about collecting report data and linking them to the six elements of the Strategic Plan.

Adjournment

At 6:35 p.m., Dr. Moore moved to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Ms. Cassell. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

Submitted by Gail Kalmerton
Clerk of the Board