

A special meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on October 02, 2017 in the Board Room of the high school.

Call to Order

President Moore called the meeting to order at 6:39 p.m. A roll call indicated the following Board of Education members were present: Fred Arkin, Matt Baron, Jennifer Cassell, Thomas F. Cofsky, Craig Iseli, Dr. Jackie Moore, and Sara Dixon Spivy. In addition, 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 Carosio, Chief Information Officer; Karin Sullivan, Director of Communications and Community Relations; and Dr. Gwen Walker-Qualls, Director of Pupil Support Services.

Visitors

David Pope, community member

Public Comments

David Pope, a resident of OP and parent of a freshman daughter who is having a wonderful experience, felt positive about her education and extracurricular experiences. He attended his first parent visitation day and spoke about what classes he had visited. Mr. Pope is now the president of the Oak Park Residence Corporation and the Director of the Housing Authority. He spoke to the Village of Oak Park Trustees about affordable housing. He asked that as conversations about negotiations of upcoming contracts include affordability in the community. He had served on the high school's Finance Advisory Committee (FAC) and he appreciated all of the work in which the high school was involved. The mission of the Residency Corporation is to provide quality and affordable housing. The single greatest threat to affordability is the tax burden of the 23,000 community members. The FAC had discussed the difficulty of identifying a market and a way schools look at comparable communities and setting levels of salary structures. When he was president of the Village of Oak Park, the Village looked at the number of applications for a vacancy as a way to determine if the salary, benefits, and working conditions were sufficient to attract quality personnel. Mr. Pope asked the Board of Education to consider this process during the negotiations.

Closed Session

At 6:45 p.m., Dr. Moore moved to enter closed session for the purpose of discussing the appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of specific employees of the District or legal counsel for the District, including hearing testimony on a complaint lodged against an employee or against legal counsel for the District to determine its validity. Collective

negotiating matters between the District and its employees or their representatives or deliberations concerning salary schedules for one or more classes of employees; seconded by Mr. Ms. Dixon Spivy. A roll call vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

At 8:41 p.m., the Board of Education resumed its open session

5-year Financial Projections

It was the consensus of the majority of Board of Education members to continue this presentation at the Committee of the Whole meeting and to have the assumptions that the Board of Education approved in June of 2016 incorporated into this report.

Comments/questions:

- More information relative to enrollment was desired. How will the lower enrollment projections affect the projections?
- A 5-year rolling average for insurance costs was used. Previously the projections were for 10% increases, but the District did not come close to that projection.
- The FAC recommended that the District earmark 5% for the TRS pension cost every year which adds \$150,000 to benefits.
- How will SB 1947 affect the projections?
- Did tuition projections change because of the past, legislation, or otherwise?
- While expenditures this year are only \$500,000 more than last year, enrollment is 177 less (or 5%). However, off-campus tuition could affect this number.

Senate Bill 1947

Mr. Altenburg shared a presentation on Senate Bill 1947, The Evidence-Based Funding for Student Success Act Public Act: 100-465.

SB 1947

- Recognizes individual student needs
- Accounts for differences in local resources
- Closes funding gaps and keeps them closed
- Provides a stable, sustainable system that gets all districts to adequacy over time. Note No district loses funding.
- Each district will be given a Local Capacity Target (LCT) that reflects local tax resources that are available to support education (OPRFHS = \$26.7 million)
- Each school district is treated individually with an Adequacy Target based on the needs of its student body. The greater the student need, the higher the Adequacy Target (OPRFHS = \$41.2 million)
- New dollars go to the neediest districts first (those furthest away from their Adequacy Target)
- School funding is tied to those evidence-based best practices that research shows enhance student achievement in the classroom, a.k.a. “The 27 Essentials”

“The 27 Essentials” Elements (Only those applicable to Grades 9 - 12 are listed.)

- Core Teachers
- Specialist Teachers
- Substitute Teachers
- Core Guidance/Nurse
- Supervisory Aides
- Librarian/Library Aide/Media Tech
- Principal/Assistant Principal
- School Site Staff
- Professional Development
- Instructional Materials
- Assessment
- Student Activities ‘
- Maintenance and Operations
- Central Office
- Employee Benefits
- Intervention (Low-income/ELL)
- Pupil Support (Low-income /ELL)
- Summer School
- English Language Learners
- Special Education Teachers/ Aides/Psychologist
- Computer Technology

Faculty and staff salaries are based on statewide averages with ISBE annual recalculation based on ECI (Employment Cost Index) and adjusted by region

A Base Funding Minimum is set for each district intended to ensure that no school district receives less in state funding because of the change in the formula (of course, that is dependent on how much money the State to appropriate each year)

- Every district receives at least the amount of State funding received FY17 in the first year;
- In subsequent years, no district will receive less state funding than the prior year; and,
- If appropriations do not cover the necessary amount, funds are removed from the Base Funding Minimum from the most adequately funded district.

OPRFHS Base Funding Amount is \$2.4 million.

Each district is set an Adequacy Target based on its Local Capacity Target (OPRFHS = \$26.7M), Base Funding Minimum (OPRFHS = \$2.4M, and Corporate Personal Property Taxes (CPPRT) [OPRFHS = \$1.5M] to determine its Percent of Adequacy.

The Adequacy Target for OPRFHS is 117%.

- The goal is to bring every district up to its Adequacy Target
- The State revenue available will be first distributed to those districts from its Adequacy Target
- 4 Tiers of Distribution

The 4 tiers are:

- Tier 1: 50% of all new dollars are allocated to the neediest districts. The top of Tier 1 is determined by how far the 50% of the appropriation will go to fill 30% of the Tier 1 gap
- Tier 2: Most of the rest of the available funding (49%) goes to inadequately funded districts funded proportionally
- Tier 3: These districts funded between 90% to 100% of the Adequacy Target share 0.9% of new dollars
- Tier 4: These districts funded above their Adequacy Target are allocated 0.1% of the new dollars available SB 1947 replaces:
 - General State Aid
 - English Language Learners Grant
 - Special Education Funding for Children
 - Special Education Summer School
 - Special Education Personnel Reimbursement OPRFHS Total =

\$2,442,932 (Base Funding Amount)

Discussion ensued. Any report that the Business Office, IT, and Human Resources submits must be accurate so that the state's own formula is calculated to the District's advantage. OPRFHS gets 5% of its overall budget from the state.

While OPRFHS adequacy target is 117%, well above other school districts, the rate could reach 140%, as the adequacy target is based on revenue target. If OPRFHS asks for \$56 million, it is at 117%; if it asks \$66 million, the adequacy target will go up to 142%. Over the long term, OPRFHS will get less money from the state. The purpose of Senate Bill 1947 is to bring all districts up to the 100% level. Now OPRFHS will get approximately \$20,000 more than it presently does. Any disparity in what the state may not provide going forward will have to be paid out of the General Fund.

This year OPRFHS has a greater influx of students whose parents are asking for off-campus services because of the severity of their needs. More students with learning disabilities and students with Aspergers and/or are autistic are staying on campus because they are paired with teacher assistants. Students with IEPs now number over 600.

The tax adequacy was to have started this year, but it is still an issue with the GSA. Note, this could decrease the District's taxes by 10%.

Questions: What is the difference in cost for general education students versus special education students? Does OPRFHS have a disproportionately high

number of Special Education students compared to the districts to which OPRFHS compares itself? Note: sometimes residential placements can cost \$60,000 or more. When asked how many new special education students come from the Chicago Public School system, the response was not many. The majority of students going off campus are not new to OPRFHS.

It was noted that this conversation should not come off as anything negative. It is for information for the future.

Adjournment

At 10:15 p.m., Ms. Dixon Spivy moved to adjourn the Special Board Meeting; seconded by Ms. Cassell. A voice vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Dr. Jackie Moore
President

Jennifer Cassell
Secretary