

**OAK PARK AND RIVER FOREST HIGH SCHOOL**  
**201 North Scoville Avenue**  
**Oak Park, IL 60302**

**Committee of the Whole**  
**October 17, 2017**

A Committee of the Whole Committee meeting was held on October 17, 2017. Dr. Moore called the meeting called to order at 6:30 p.m. in Room 293. Committee members present were Fred Arkin, Matt Baron, Jennifer Cassell, Thomas F. Cofsky (attended telephonically), Craig Iseli, Dr. Jackie Moore, and Sara Dixon Spivy, as well as Dr. Joylynn Pruitt-Adams, Superintendent, and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board of Education and FOIA Officer.

Also present were Tod Altenburg, Chief School Business Officer; Amy Hill, Director of Assessment and Research; Brenda Horton, Director of Human Resources; Greg Johnson, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Michael Carioscio, Chief Information Officer; Karin Sullivan, Director of Communications and Community Relations; and Dr. Gwen Walker-Qualls, Director of Pupil Support Services.

Visitors: OPRFHS Faculty and Staff Jason Dennis, Assistant Principal for Instruction, Jason Spoor Harvey, Claudia Sahagun, Naomi Hildner, Kristen McKee Sarah Scriber and Heather Claxton Douglas, John Duffy, Maureen Kleinman, Michael Romain of the *Wednesday Journal* and Steve Schering of the *Oak Leaves*.

**Public Comments**

John Duffy, read the following statement

“I am here to speak as an individual regarding recent developments involving an OPRFHS student, and then the District’s suspension of teacher Anthony Clark. I will speak about *what I think I know*, *what I believe* and *what I deeply believe* about these matters.

“What I think I know is that one of our children acted in a racially hostile way, came to an understanding of the harm and outrage his action caused, and then offered an apology and the desire to learn from his mistake.

“In intervening with the student, I believe teacher Anthony Clark acted in pursuing a vision members of this administration and board have professed a newly found belief in—a philosophy, and commitment to the process and protocols of restorative justice and positive behavioral interventions as a substitute for our traditional lockstep punitive approaches to student infractions of school rules and policies—a belief that bad decisions, actions, minor and major infractions should be opportunities to open a community dialogue about what happened, who was harmed, why the offender acted as they did and what might be done to redeem the individual, and heal this person as well as the community.

“I believe these principles guided Teacher Anthony Clark. There are other aspects of recent developments that I deeply believe. First, and foremost, I deeply believe Anthony Clark is a teacher of rare dedication, courage, and vision. He is a young man in pursuit of a life I have tried to live as a teacher of 48 years—to be a nurturer of my student’s learning and growth in all ways; but just as important to be a citizen teacher—a community activist dedicated to a better, more just world.

“James Baldwin years ago offered Americans of all races sage advice over and over—among his challenges was one that has guided my work—Baldwin counseled all of us saying “it is your responsibility to change society if you think of yourself as an educated person.”

“Anthony has taken up Baldwin’s principle, modeled it and inspired large numbers of people across our communities to do the same. As a teacher, Anthony has also acted in the proud tradition of African American teachers and students in the early days of the Civil Rights Movement. Like them, Anthony knows that his classroom is larger than a room in this beautiful building—he understands and acts on the principle that it includes the world beyond this school.

“In living this ideal Anthony has lead and inspired us to join with our Latino brothers and Latina sisters from Chicago and across the Western suburbs in defending our undocumented neighbors and students. He has joined others in reaching across the artificial boundary of Austin Boulevard to work with our Chicago neighbors in confronting violence and making our communities safer places to live.

“Most importantly for me as a member of CEEE, Anthony has lead SUA in joining with APPLE and CEEE in working for curriculum changes that expand opportunities to learn for all OPRFHS students. He has also joined us in advocating for an Equity Policy Lens that would guide this board and administration in making decisions to ensure they cause no harm to any group of students by race, gender, sexual orientation or ability.

“Of course, tonight as you move to make possible additional decisions regarding Anthony Clark, you may believe you have to impose further penalties. I hope this is not the case. You have a higher standard to uphold—a moral standard—recognizing, appreciating and respecting Anthony as a unique and honored member of this school and community. Together we have an opportunity to learn from these recent, disturbing events in our school. I urge you to take the right step forward and join with those here tonight in the learning and healing process we all need.”

Dr. Moore read the following statement:

“As you may know, the District has been investigating the circumstances of an inappropriate social media posting by a student. The District is limited with respect to its ability to comment on student and/or personnel matters. However, we do wish to assure the community that the District is taking all appropriate safeguards to protect the rights of all those concerned. In addition, we wish to make clear that as a part of the District's investigation, we have placed a staff member on a paid administrative leave pending the investigation. This is not a disciplinary suspension, but rather a measure to ensure that the rights of all parties are protected while the District is reviewing this incident. Please know that securing a safe and healthy learning environment for its students is the District's highest priority.”

Heather Claxton Douglas stated that a school board is in charge of raising future citizens and it should act with much passion and forgiveness. While she did not know all of the details, she did know that few people mean to hurt someone. She herself has said things that offended others and it had caused drama when it was not intended to do so. She was thankful that people had forgiven her for these. She said that the Board of Education is dealing with children and sometimes the best leadership is to lead with compassion.

The meeting recessed at 6:44 and resumed at 6:53 pm. in the Board Room

### **Minutes**

Ms. Spivy moved to approve the minutes of September 19, 2017, Committee of the Whole meeting; seconded by Mr. Arkin. A voice vote resulted in a motion carried.

## **Course Proposals for the 2018-19 School Year**

It was the consensus of the Committee members to recommend that the full Board of Education approve the course proposals at its regular October meeting, as presented in the packet. The Committee had received a draft of the course proposals at its September meeting. Following that meeting, a variety of constituents were asked for their feedback on them. The proposals being brought forward at this meeting included 5 additions, 31 revisions, and 6 deletions in the English, Fine and Applied Arts, History, Math, Science and Technology and Special Education divisions. How these courses proposals would affect FTE was a discussion throughout the conversations. The overall FTE of the building will not increase as a result of these proposals. As a result of stakeholder input, a few of the proposals originally presented in September have been deleted. These deletions include the course proposals for Leadership Launch, Songwriting, Linear Algebra, and AP calculus II. The specific reasons for omitting each of these courses differ, but all four courses have in common that additional data and/or other information was needed before a recommendation could be submitted to the Board of Education, as well as enrollment trends. However, these courses may be presented in future years.

Discussion ensued. It was noted that the Leadership and Launch Program was not being expanded next year because not all of the data had been analyzed. Individual students and student groups will be surveyed as to how they are adjusting to high school life as a result of this program, understanding that it is hard to draw a cause and effect correlation because of these programs. At this time, it is unknown if the program is being effective for freshman students, but it is well liked. Originally, this pilot was scheduled for one semester. Then, it was expanded to two-thirds of the school year. Before the program is implemented fully, it was the Board of Education's understanding that a full evaluation would be conducted.

Additional questions should be sent to Ms. Kalmerton.

## **Intervention Report**

It was the consensus of the Committee members to recommend that the Intervention Report be moved to the full Board of Education as an informational item at its regular October meeting. This report provides an overview of the strategic use of student-level data to identify needs, implement interventions and supports, and monitor progress in the context of a multi-tiered system of supports. An analysis of tiered support data will be presented in November. The Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) includes Response to Intervention, or RTI) provides both academic and behavioral supports for students. Its framework assumes that a large majority of students will be successful in the core academic program with the general supports that are available from teachers, counselors, and other staff. The level of instruction and supports are as follows:

Tier 1: Students have enhanced support tailored to their specific needs.

Tier 2: Students have enhanced support tailored to their specific needs (Literacy Seminar, Extended Algebra, and Academic Enrichment)

Tier 3: The most intensive level of instruction and support, beyond those presented in Tier 1 and Tier 2. (Elements of Reading, Algebra Block 10, and the MENTA program.)

Students are assessed in their freshman year as to their reading and math abilities by the division heads, the MTSS/Reading Program Coordinator Kristen McKee, Special Educators, and other available academic data (8th-grade courses/grades; MAP scores). Local and national norms are used to determine cut scores between levels of support. The staff then triangulates these multiple data points to recommend courses aligned to the student's academic strengths and needs. A student's recommendations may reflect one level of support in math and a different level of support in reading, depending upon the combination of available data. While many students enroll in the recommended course(s), families have the final say in the decision regarding course selections, and some choose courses other than those recommended.

Ms. McKee uses a set of evidence-based academic and behavioral data points that collectively serve as an early warning system, or EWS (number of D's, number of F's, number, and type of absences, number of disciplinary

referrals other than Failure to Serve). She reviews this data 5 times per year with the Pupil Support Service Teams to identify students needing enhanced support. In some cases, the counselor, social worker, or student intervention director determines that no additional support is needed (e.g. when a student's absences were due to a family trip, and grades/behavior have not been flagged). The teams and Ms. McKee meet weekly to confer about students identified for support and to assign interventions to meet the students' needs.

- Progress-monitoring helps educators analyze how a student's knowledge, skills, and/or behaviors have grown since the beginning of an intervention and allows staff to make timely adjustments to an individual student's instruction and supports. We are currently monitoring students' progress in the following ways:
- All freshmen are benchmarked at least three times per year in reading and math using the STAR Reading and STAR Math assessments.
- All students in a reading or math intervention program are assessed two additional times with STAR (for a total of five STAR assessments over the course of the year).
- Students in Tier 3 reading support are also assessed as needed with the one-minute AIMSweb tool
- Students in the Academic Enrichment (AE) program are assessed and monitored quarterly in a variety of ways:
  - The Social Academic Emotional Behavior Risk Screener (SAEBRS), a four-point rating scale for key behaviors in each of the Social, Academic, and Emotional domains 1 comprised of three counselors, a social worker, and a student intervention director Academic Enrichment Evaluation Rubric (assessing students' goal setting, time management, materials management, study strategies, and social-emotional learning)
  - GPA
  - AE staff also meet with Ms. McKee to review EWS data five times per year
- Progress monitoring of students identified by EWS data is both qualitative and quantitative in nature. On the quantitative side, their attendance, grades, and behavior are monitored by regular review of the EWS data. The qualitative component occurs during the weekly PSS team meetings. Following each review of the data, subsequent meetings allow PSS team members to refer students for intervention when their conversations with the students have indicated the need for additional support. The referral process and subsequent monitoring engage the team in a conversation about each referred student, which provides a complete context for understanding the student's circumstances; it may include discussion of any of the following:
  - What is happening academically? What are the grades? What are teachers reporting about the student?
  - What is happening socially? How is the student relating to peers?
  - Have there been physical or mental health concerns?
  - Are there family dynamics that are important to note?
  - Have there been disciplinary infractions?
  - What prior interventions have been used, and to what effect?

Progress-monitoring data from the assessments and processes listed above are used in a strategic framework. Each intervention has clear entrance and exit criteria that have been built with a specific understanding of when students will benefit from the intervention and when they will no longer need it. For all levels of intervention, course-wide data meetings are held after each benchmark period. Ms. McKee also has frequent data consultations with individual teachers. Consideration of multiple data points that are both qualitative and quantitative in nature makes it possible to create a curriculum that targets supports to accelerate students' growth so that they can move out of interventions and be successful in the core academic program. Movement of this sort is described as diagonal: as students move through the core program, they move to less intensive levels of support. Diagonal movement is in contrast to tracking, wherein a student stays at the same level of support across two or more school years without upward movement.

Ms. McKee developed the website [www.oprfmtss.myfreesites.net](http://www.oprfmtss.myfreesites.net) as a tool to “hold” everything. She demonstrated some of its pages with the Board of Education. In addition to some of the things mentioned above, it linked to various resources that could be useful. Dr. Moore felt that the website was invaluable in terms of helping to understand the trajectory students can take from contextual standpoints and the linking of components.

The PSS Teams determine the need supports of current sophomores who were initially identified as freshmen as struggling in literacy and math. In order to identify these students easily, she created an activity in Skyward called Exciter Club and set up an Early Warning System (EWS). She can run reports at the end of the year and at the end of the semester using the students’ IDs their grades. The Data Warehouse Software was key to running the data. The PSS Team will look at the data from the EWS, intervene, and provide support to those students who continue to struggle. It is believed that this information augmented with case studies will be the richest way to provide an overview of how students fare in an intervention program. The measures of intervention are:

STAR reading - benchmarking and assessment.

More Intensive - skill based, oral reading tests, a San Diego Quick word test.

Students in high school are hard to move, but set goals for those skill sets.

EWS data will be reviewed with PSS Teams 5 times per year. The EWS data is about how many F’s a student has, not the core classes and the classes with F’s may be electives and the student could take another elective. One Board member noted that it is vital to know how the EWS and the PSS Teams connect. One member suggested looking at Freshman on Track rates as well.

### **2017 Summer School Report**

It was the consensus of the Committee of the Whole members to recommend that this report be moved to the full Board of Education as an informational item at its regular October meeting.

The presentation was made by Ms. Sahagun and Mr. Spoor-Harvey. Oak Park and River Forest High School’s Summer School 2017 program consisted of a full 28-day program, offered over a 6-week period in June and July 2017. The courses provided 1,304 students with 1,757 completed academic and enrichment opportunities--an increase of 12 students and 24 more completed courses. The District was successful in increasing enrollment and in course completion.

The most popular offerings were: Financial Literacy, Art Foundations, and Health with 12, 8, and 6 sections running respectively. Health has moved into the PE curriculum for freshmen. Students found the new Pre-AP Strategies and Digital Literacy classes valuable and that the courses satisfied their goals. The District will track these students to see what the long-term implications might be.

The 14-day course offerings continue to be a favorite of parents and students. Teachers outside of the District were required to attend a new teacher orientation session that provided them to gain some familiarity with the systems and physical space. Department chairs, programming coordinators, and division heads ensured that all new teachers to the District were familiar with the content and materials of the courses offered. Frequent monitoring of student progress and an extension of tutoring services helped the District achieve its goal of no course failures in the summer programming. The 14-day course offerings were almost all closed within an hour of registration going live.

A total of 112 students earned 195 credits through the District’s In-school Credit Recovery classes. While a decrease in the number of students, it was an increase in the credits earned from last year.

The AP Bridge program was successful for those students who took it. Mr. Spoor-Harvey developed the curriculum and worked with the teachers in developing it. He is tracking these students and will have information about their AP results at a later date. Research is compelling that freshman students who have an A or B average have a 70% chance of graduating from college. This year the number of adults and peer tutors was

increased in In-school Recovery classes. No students earned an “F” in the summer and no freshman students earned a “D” or an “F”. The charge of A & B remained consistent from 2016. The difference is in the number of passes 201 versus 67. The intervention for students on target to get a “D” or an “F” was to move to a pass/fail grade. That grade does not impact the GPA and the student gets credit for the course. Only one student, in concert with the parent, was dropped because the student would have failed. A pass/fail grade does not impact the student’s GPA and the student has success. The experience of being in the building with friends and familiarization of the building far out ways dismissing them. Before the pass/fail option was used, these students were required to attend tutoring. Students felt relief with this option, especially in the elective classes, i.e., art foundations, photography.

Discussion ensued about tardies during summer. Because the In-School Credit Recovery Program consists of individualized instruction, students feel no urgency to be on-time. What needs to be addressed are the higher number of disciplinary infractions, as those infractions carry over into the school year. Credit recovery models are designed to have a certified teacher in the room, but the content area may not be that teacher’s forte. The District is exploring ways for students to have access to teachers in the content area they need.

A lack of data in APEX makes it difficult to know how many of the students had multiple failures. One member was concerned that students who originally struggled with regular classes being put into self-guided programs. Some students were taking 3 or 4 classes this way. Does their registration indicate how many courses they took this summer? A concern was raised about the room itself as it had no windows.

The students in the 8 to 9 Connection program appreciated getting lunch. A separate report from summer school is usually presented on this program, but there were obstacles with the transition of administrators. It is a separate silo from summer school and was independent of the summer school administrators.

A large number of courses filled immediately and this could be an equity problem. The District may also explore alternate summer hours, i.e., implementing 2-hour per day classes and not having school on Fridays, yet still meet the requirements of the School Code of Illinois. Not having school on Fridays would free time up for families, teachers, and administrators, and it could be beneficial in how the District works with its facility during the summer and construction projects.

Any student enrolling in an AP class for the first time was contacted about participating in the AP Bridge Class, which is separate from the foundation class for EOS. The feedback was positive. Students enjoyed the tour of the library. The main class for enrollment was financial literacy.

A question was raised about how to increase inventory in classes. Using live data relative to courses will allow the District to get better information in order to meet the demand of summer school courses and, hopefully, more OPRFHS teachers will participate.

### **Culture, Climate and Behavior Committee Update**

Ms. Cassell updated the Committee on the Culture, Climate and Behavior Committee (CCB) progress. The CCB started in September. The first meeting of the month is for presentations. In September Devon Alexander and Sheila Hardin presented on equity work. Earlier this month the Students Advocating for Equity (SAFE) students made a presentation. The second meeting of the month is reserved for small group work on 1) student tardies, 2) student and family voice and belonging (last year’s recommendations), 3) faculty and staff voice innovations; 4) community voice and connections (many entities have equity work).

The plan is that once they have met several times, each group will present to the larger group, have talking points for each to work through, i.e., evidence, current programs, current ideas, and then CCB will make recommendations to the Board of Education. The recommendations will be vetted spring semester.

## **Renewal of Medical and Dental Insurance**

The initial projections pointed to a 7.4% increase in premiums. However, as the Insurance Committee comprised of members from Faculty Senate, Food and Nutrition Services, Buildings and Grounds, Classified Personnel Association, Safety and Support, Non-Affiliated Personnel and Administration, continued its work in monitoring the costs of these benefits, it recommended plan changes that decreased the renewal to 5.8%. As such, the Insurance Committee decided to increase the premium for employees 2.0%. The remaining 3.8% or \$298,160 would come from the self-insurance fund balance. The entire 1.5% or \$9,300 increase in dental insurance premium also will come from the insurance fund. The grand total from the self-insurance fund balance for the 2018 Plan Year is \$307,460.

### **The Recommended Plan Changes (Blue Cross/Blue Shield)**

- Increase Emergency Room Co-pay to \$100 on all plans
- Add a Specialist Office Visit copay of \$40 on all plans
- Add \$50 third tier prescription copay for non-formulary brand drugs to all plans
- As a result of making plan, changes, the plans will lose its grandfathered status per ACA mandates
  - Certain wellness services will be payable at 100%, currently, wellness services require a copay
  - This is a positive for members
- Education will be provided to direct membership on how to use their benefits in the most cost-effective manner (ex. Urgent care versus emergency room)

### **Dental Plan Renewal**

- The projected dental plan increase is 1.5% or a \$9,300 overall increase in funding
- No plan changes are recommended at this time.

Open enrollment is scheduled for October 30 and informational sessions on two days during lunch hours will be scheduled to teach employees about how to use their benefits. In addition, employees will also be able to contact the HR Department. Information about these sessions will be sent to the employees' homes and put in the common areas in the building.

Discussion ensued. What were the original design plans? Some insurance pays for wellness services at 100% rather than co-pay, as an incentive to employees. What are the parameters? Do the carriers offer some programming or benefit for those who participate? In the past, the District has picked up the past increases, leaving the premium flat to employees. OPRFHS has not done an audit to determine adequacy. The reason for the 7% increase this year was due to a greater number of stop-loss claims last year, which are more expensive. This year the number of claims has been down. Gallagher has the information as to what claims were made and can delineate PPO and HMO users or whether it was the employee or a dependent using the insurance. It cannot specify the claim, however. How does a spike like this affect the fund balance long term? The 3 largest claims were on the PPO side.

The Insurance Committee will explore further with Gallagher what kinds of wellness programs Blue Cross/Blue Shield might offer that could help reduce premiums, long-term.

The amount of the stop loss was changed due to a number of claims. One member asked if a discussion had occurred about the equalization or comparison of plans, i.e., the PPO versus the VEBA data. Currently, the District pays \$23,000 and the family pays \$3,700 for a PPO plan. However, if the family chooses a VEBA plan, the District would pay \$17,000 and the family would pay \$3700. This way the employer tries to provide a variety of plans with a consistent amount of payment and the employee can choose the risk he/she wants to take via a plan. The Insurance Committee is having discussions about what other schools are doing to equalize plans from a cost perspective. These discussions are being held by the insurance committee. Note: The PPO and VEBA plans both have individual deductibles, but HMO does not. Faculty and staff are allowed a choice. The PPO plan is easy to navigate because it removes the cost of referrals. This discussion will continue.

### **Five-Year Financial Projections**

The Committee of the Whole continued its discussion on the Five-Year Financial Projections that was begun on October 2, 2017, at a Special Meeting. Attached to the report were:

1. Summary of Revenue and Expenditure Assumptions
2. 5-Year Financial Projections
  - A. Educational Fund
  - B. Operations and Maintenance Fund
  - C. Transportation Fund
  - D. IMRF/SS Fund
  - E. Working Cash Fund
  - F. Tort Fund
  - G. All Operating Funds
3. Comparison of the 2013 FAC Recommendations with the 5-year Financial Projections. Mr. Altenburg presented a status report on the December 2013 FAC recommendations.
  - A. 2013 and 2014 Tax Levy Reductions  
Completed
  - B. Pre-pay outstanding debt certificates in December 2013  
Completed
  - C. 2015 Tax Levy returned to 2012 Tax Levy extension  
Completed
  - D. Debt Service Abatement from Working Cash Fund  
Completed. In December 2017, OPRFHS will make its final debt service payment and no longer have the need to transfer funds from the Working Cash Fund for this purpose.
  - E. Total Fund Balance (Operating Funds only) brought to under 100% of expenses within the next two FY16 to four years (FY 18) and between 25% and 40% of expenses within eight (FY22) to ten years (FY24).

With the adopted FY 18 Budget, the District is expected to have a fund balance of 121.61%. By FY 19 the projected fund balance will be 87.30%.

The current projections show a fund balance of 65.27% of expenses in FY 22. In FY 24, the District's fund balance will continue to decrease and approach the 40% of expenses line. In FY2014 projected fund balances will cross below the 40% of expenditures threshold.

Mr. Altenburg had updated the assumptions and added unknowns. Evidence-based funding (funds) \$2.4 million is the same as what had been received and that is the base. No increases to State and Federal grants were received. He had updated the enrollment. This year a new enrollment study will be conducted. Certified staff is currently 268.5 FTE (heads for equivalency rates and includes counselors) and it includes the base increase, the step increase, and the total expenditures. In order to state a step increase, Mr. Altenburg took the salary scattergram and moved down a step and it was 2.6 which was consistent from previous years. The retirement bump, while missing from this document, was reflected in the PMA model.

The Special Education Fund is maintained at a 10% increase. While costs had increased recently, this past the costs remained flat. Another year's worth of data is needed to either lower or raise the percentage of off-campus tuition.

Mr. Altenburg noted the movement of \$3.5 million from the Education Fund to the Capital Improvement for summer projects as before. IMAGINE's work may cancel or dovetail with what is in the capital plan. When the review of the Life Safety Audit is completed, it will be brought to the Board of Education. However, Life Safety is not an operating fund and it will not be included in the projections. Life Safety is levied separately.



The assumption is that the District would levy for the full CPI and any new construction. If the assumptions are correct the fund balance in FY 2023 will be 44.6%, using the 12/2013 fund balance (anchor model), and in 2024 the fund balance will be between 25% and 40%.

In 2013 almost 4,000 students were projected to enroll, yet now only 3,600 are projected to enroll. The gap in spending is due to the additional PPS Team. The spending for each student is higher than the 2013 model. Mr. Altenburg had been asked to present the increases in step and lane in total because the model is just the total. The matrix lives outside and is not embedded in the model.

**1st Quarter Variance Report**

It was the consensus of the majority of the Committee of the Whole members to recommend moving this report forward as an informational item at the Board of Education’s regular October meeting. Per the guidelines described in Board Policy 4:20 – Fund Balances, on page 1 of the policy under A4, “The Board shall require quarterly variance reviews and obtain explanations of significant variances from budget to actual at the major category level”. This report has been populated with OPRFHS numbers from July 1 thru September 30, 2107. The report was developed from a model that was provided to Mr. Altenburg from a former D97 FORCE member. On the revenue state funding, 5.1% (the state has a cash flow problem and it has not paid); capital projects FY 18 percentage is 0.59% because \$4,185 is interest earned on investments. No corporate property taxes nor any transfers to the capital fund yet.

The next report will have an additional column that will make a year-to-year comparison and one heading will be renamed QI. A suggestion was made to set up some variance criteria that required notes and include a threshold that is material.

**Levy Timeline**

It was the consensus of the majority of the Committee of the Whole members to recommend moving this report forward as an informational item at the Board of Education’s regular October meeting.

October 17, 2017	Committee of the Whole Meeting	Present 2017 Levy Timeline
November 6, 2017	Committee of the Whole Meeting	Present Preliminary 2017 Levy
November 16, 2017	Board of Education Meeting	Adopt Preliminary 2017 Levy
November 17, 2017	Administrative Responsibility	Place Preliminary 2017 Levy on Public Display
December 13, 2017	Administrative Responsibility	Notice of Truth in Taxation Public Hearing published in local newspapers
December 21, 2017	Board of Education Meeting	Truth in Taxation Hearing
December 21, 2017	Board of Education Meeting	Official Adoption of 2017 Levy
December 22, 2017	Administrative Responsibility	Board of Education Resolution, Certificate of Tax Levy, and any abatements filed at Cook County Clerk’s Office

### **FTE/Staff Report and Employee Profile Information for 2017-2018 School Term**

Information presented in the Employee Profile document for 2017-2018 is based on September 11, 2017, data. The FTE for faculty includes all certified staff excluding division heads and administrators. For Non-Certified employees, the information includes individuals who are in the following departments: Building & Grounds, Foods Services, Security, Classified Personnel Association (CPA), and the Non-Affiliated employee group. The profile report provides general demographic data which includes gender, race, age, district residency, and years of service for all employee groups. Additionally, data for certified faculty included education data.

The 2017–2018 Faculty Senate FTE is 276. The Faculty Senate FTE for the 2016-2017 year was 269. The 2017-2018 data presents a net change of 7 FTE due to programmatic changes and the need for staff in the Special Education department. Two new categories for certified staff were added: National Board Certified (3 and one pursuing) and Pre-OPRF Teaching Experience (number of teachers on staff who had teaching experience prior to joining OPRF). The total number of administrators for the 2017-2018 school year is 26. This number is unchanged from the previous school year. The total number of other Non-Affiliated staff is 41. The number of non-certified staff for the 2017-2018 school year is 264. This is a decrease of 3 as compared to the previous year's number of 267. The decrease in staff is due to vacancies in Safety & Security and the CPA groups.

The significance of National Board Certification is that it consists of an intensive year of teaching and learning from a trainer and a year or so of an action-research based project that will improve teaching in the classroom. Some districts offer an incentive because of the amount of rigor needed to reach that level. A partner district has a program that promotes National Board Certification.

Data on where teachers taught before would not be readily available because it has not been added to Applitrack. The residency of faculty and staff in these communities was 30% in 2012, 28% in 2016-17, and this year 33%.

A request was made to show the racial ethnicity of students on this report. This report counts people rather than FTE.

### **Future Agenda Items**

None

### **Adjournment**

At 9:09 p.m., Dr. Moore moved to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Mr. Arkin. A voice vote resulted in all ayes.

Submitted by Gail Kalmerton  
Clerk of the Board