BOARD HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE MEETING
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 13, 2009
IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING THE SPECIAL BOARD MEETING
BOARD ROOM

AGENDA

I. Approval of Minutes (attachment)

II. Sabbatical Reports (attachments)
   a. Kristen Knake
   b. Sarah Rosas

III. Employee Salary Compensation Report (attachment)

IV. Recruitment and Employment of Administrative Employees (attachment)

V. Discussion of Non-Agenda Items

Human Resources Committee Docket

A. Division Head Compensation and Length of Work Year
B. Employee Retention
C. Race and Ethnicity Statistics
D. Sabbaticals and Lane Changes
E. Structure for Non-Affiliate Salaries
F. Workers’ Compensation Policy and Procedures

C: John Allen, Chair, Jacques Conway and Amy McCormack, Board Members
A Human Resources Committee meeting was held on Tuesday, September 8, 2009 in the Board Room. Mr. Allen opened the meeting at 10:00 a.m. Committee members present were John C. Allen, IV (departed at 10:57 a.m.); Ralph H. Lee, and Amy McCormack. Board members present were Terry Finnegan, Dr. Dietra D. Millard and Ms. Patchak-Layman. Also present were: Dr. Attila J. Weninger, Superintendent; Jason Edgecombe, Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources; Cheryl Witham, Chief Financial Officer; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Visitors: Kay Foran, Communications and Community Relations Coordinator and James Paul Hunter, FSEC Chair.

Acceptance of August 2009 Human Resources Committee Meeting Minutes
The minutes of the August 2009 Human Resources Committee meeting were accepted by acclamation, as presented.

Recruitment Procedures for Administrative Positions
Mr. Allen reviewed the procedures that he and the administration had outlined for the recruitment of administrative positions. At next month’s Human Resources Committee meeting, recruitment procedures for teachers will be presented.

As the committee reviewed the procedures, Mr. Allen noted his preference to wait until the positions were filled before notifying unsuccessful candidates in order to keep the pool as large as possible as long as possible.

Discussion ensued about how information would be forwarded from one search group to another. Would the search committee members send a screening packet, including applications, reference checks, writing assessments, etc., to DLT or would it just send a summary of their recommendations? Mr. Allen and Ms. McCormack felt the entire packet should be given to DLT. Ms. McCormack was concerned about the continuity of the entire process; she wanted the first screeners’ impressions of the candidates to be diluted as the process progressed.

Committee members learned more about the hiring process used last year. Applications were first reviewed by the screening committee which made a determination, based on its understanding of the values desired, as to who would be interviewed. DLT does not question why the committee chooses to interview one candidate over another. The screening committee is asked to forward to DLT three unranked candidates; DLT values their comments. The DLT member who chairs the committee then actively engages DLT in what had occurred in the
interviews. Dr. Weninger stated that any document related to employing an individual has to be kept on file for a year, including those who are rejected. Case law says that anything written could put the process at risk. That is why no notes are taken at the meetings and no checklists are used. Should a form be used in the future, it must be clear and cautious and the faculty must be educated on how to use it. Mr. Finnegan felt that a note taker would be useful in this process.

Ms. Patchak-Layman felt that it was important to have a more inclusive conversation about the desired aspects/expectations/characteristics are for these administrative positions. It should not be just those of DLT, BLT, and IC members. She also wanted the Board of Education to participate at this point. She felt that the more informed the committee members were, the more likely it would be that they would find the right candidate. She also noted that the Board of Education was to have the opportunity to review the job description. Mr. Allen responded that special attention was given to having all stakeholders involved in the process.

Dr. Millard spoke of a situation where the committee might present three candidates, who were not all on an equal plane; but someone may or may not stand out for a variety of reasons. There have been differences of opinions about how candidates were ranked as they were brought forward to DLT and then to the Superintendent. A decision was made that was contrary to the original search committee’s recommendation and the reasoning for that was not given to those who were involved at the beginning of the process. Dr. Weninger appreciated that discussion and he, as the superintendent, asked the Board of Education for its guidance on this. He asked if the Board of Education wanted the committee to rank the candidates. Mr. Edgecombe remarked that it would be unfair to say that three finalists came forward to DLT as equals: they come forward as finalists who are acceptable as the final choice. While the candidates may not be equal, they do come forward with strengths that are valuable to the institution. The direction has been that they are free to rank them for the purposes of the First Round Committee. Any preference in finalist order should, however, be held until the DLT has completed its work. Sometimes, only one candidate is viable and the Chair provides an explanation for this result to DLT. Bringing forward multiple candidates is preferred so that DLT can have a give and take about the merits of each candidate.

Mr. Allen asked if minority reports were accepted. Mr. Edgecombe’s operating style is that the committee’s perspective is forwarded to DLT, including a minority perspective. This tells DLT that the committee did not have full consensus. That same principle holds true in the interviewing process. A candidate may be interviewed even if only one person on the interviewing team desires that. This is not an exact science. The separation of the candidates occurs through the process.

Dr. Weninger noted that the position of division head should include having a balance of being an advocate for one’s division and having the responsibilities of a school-wide administrator. This process allows DLT to screen the candidates. Discussion ensued about whether the decision should be made by the entire DLT with the Superintendent giving the stamp of approval or if the Superintendent should be the one to make the decision. Dr. Weninger felt that the superintendent should give final approval on all DLT positions, as they would report directly to him/her. Mr. Allen added that because this is a one-school district, the superintendent works closely with all of the administrators.
Discussion continued on who would make the ultimate decision about administrative hirings. Some members felt strongly that they wanted the Superintendent to make the final decision because they wanted to hold him personally responsible for the decisions. Dr. Lee was adamantly opposed to having Board of Education involvement in the interviewing process. He felt the Board of Education was in charge in hiring only the superintendent. Other members felt that giving the superintendent that ultimate responsibility would devalue the work already done by others.

Ms. Patchak-Layman stressed that it was important that the committee is fully aware of its purpose in order to eventually save time. Only those candidates meeting the expectations would continue in the process. When asked if DLT should receive the applications of those candidates who were not brought forward, Ms. Patchak-Layman replied yes. Dr. Weninger did not feel that was reasonable or feasible considering the number of candidates that apply.

Dr. Millard felt the document was a strong guideline for the process and for the Board of Education, itself, to understand that it only hires the Superintendent. Ms. McCormack concurred and did not want the Board of Education involved in the hiring process for all positions, but she also wanted procedures that addressed the Board of Education's greatest concerns.

Dr. Millard felt the Superintendent should make decisions relative to the DLT members, the Principal should make decisions relative to BLT members, and the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction should make decisions relative to the Division Heads. As such, those persons should be held directly accountable. Ms. Patchak-Layman felt that the person supervising the new employee should have the value of knowing what was fully expected of that person from all arenas in order to be able to evaluate the person properly. Dr. Weninger commented that if the Board of Education made Mr. Prale responsible for employing Division Heads, and the process allowed the divisions to select them, it would be unfair to Mr. Prale as there would be incongruence. Dr. Millard believed that responsibility and accountability was important.

Dr. Weninger stated that at some point the accountability for where things begin and where that direction is set has to be included. Who goes out and does that? The District would not have gotten to the level of 20% in its minority hirings if someone had not believed it was important. Mr. Finnegan hoped that the work being done by Mr. Rouse and Mr. Alexander with the Courageous Conversations on Race would be helpful in that regard. Every educator must be part of that process going forward. He felt there was miscommunication and mistrust at this point. Mr. Finnegan wanted those involved in the process to feel valued and motivated. OPRFHS is a tremendous school and it is a great opportunity for new teachers to make a huge impact on the students and to show other districts what is possible. His goal was to craft procedures so that the committee members felt they were moving in the same direction. He also inquired as to how much was budgeted for substitutes for when those teachers participating in screening committees would be out of the classroom.

Ms. Patchak-Layman suggested that many teachers may not feel comfortable in encouraging others to apply because of what is happening at the Board of Education level. She stated that the
HR Department takes the lead on hiring and activities with employees at the school. HR is the partner component as it is the job function and responsibility. Dr. Weninger noted his desire for the committee to review this document at the next meeting.

Need for Increase in Faculty FTE
The Committee was informed that the administration increased staffing by .2 FTE to meet the need in Spanish 5-6. The reason for this increase was that there were four Spanish 5-6 sections with a total enrollment of 123 students, or an average of 30.75 students in each section. An additional section would reduce that average to 24.6 students, which is slightly more than the established guideline of 24. This course is critical for college preparatory students in terms of understanding key concepts and providing sufficient oral practice of the language.

Adjournment
The Human Resources Committee adjourned at 12:22 pm.
TO: Board of Education
FROM: Jason Edgecombe
DATE: October 13, 2009
RE: Sabbatical Reports

BACKGROUND

A requirement of the Sabbatical Leave process is for faculty returning from sabbatical leave to provide a report of activities and achievement of objectives during the leave to the Board of Education. History teacher Kristin Knake and English teacher Sarah Rosas were granted sabbatical leaves for the 2008 – 2009 school year.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Attached for Board review are the summary pages for the sabbatical reports of Ms. Knake and Ms. Rosas. The length of each report makes it impractical to reproduce these documents; however, any Board member wishing to view the full reports may do so upon request. Both ladies believe the objectives of their sabbatical leave were achieved. They will be present during the Human Resources Committee meeting to provide a brief introduction to their reports and to respond to any questions of Board members.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This is an information only agenda item.
Statement of Purpose

The year I spent on sabbatical was a success in more ways than one. First, I was able to complete the coursework for a Master’s Degree in Curriculum Studies, which was my stated objective. Second, as part of that coursework I completed twenty-four quarter hours in Reading, including a practicum. What I learned in those courses has already had a positive effect on the instruction I provide my classes, and on November 14 I will take the Reading Teacher Test so that I may be endorsed in Reading. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, I was able to take a step back, reflect on my practice, and theorize about what changes I might make—a luxury not afforded most teachers.

Reflection

Over the past year I have grown in my teaching immensely. While that might seem impossible, given that I did not teach last year, it is absolutely true. And while I did not step into a classroom last year, I did think about teaching constantly. I originally applied for sabbatical for two reasons: I was beginning to feel burned out, and I wasn’t feeling as effective as I wanted in the classroom. Specifically, I didn’t know how best to help the struggling readers in my classes. And, to be honest, that frustration was part of the burnout that I felt. For the duration of the last school year, however, I was able to think about exactly how to address the problems I saw in my classroom. I was able to study both theory and applied research in the field. I was able to learn from more experienced, more knowledgeable educators. I was able to question and suppose. I was able to discuss with teachers from other schools who see similar struggles in their students. And I was able to plan without the pressure of having it all figured out “right now.” For the first time in a very long time my focus was my learning, and I am a better teacher for it. I am rejuvenated, have a greater sense of purpose, and feel as though I can make a difference. For that, I am grateful.

Plan

While I have already put the knowledge I gained last year to use, beginning October 19, 2009 I will be working with a group of teachers from the History Division to incorporate reading instruction in their classes and to help them support the struggling readers in their classes. We will work throughout the remainder of the school year as a Learning Team during our late arrival time.
Log

During the 2009-2009 school year I was a full-time graduate student at DePaul University, attending class during the Fall, Winter, Spring, and Summer Quarters. Please see the attached syllabi for details of my studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Courses Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 2008</strong></td>
<td>CS 488 – Designing and Interpreting Curriculum&lt;br&gt;CS 461 – Literacy Processes and Practices&lt;br&gt;BBE 404 – Language, Literacy, and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring 2009</strong></td>
<td>CS 464 – Assessment, Diagnosis, and Instructional Planning: Middle-School and Adolescent Reading&lt;br&gt;CS 582 – Reading Practicum in Curriculum Studies: Reading Teacher Endorsement Course Series&lt;br&gt;CS 492 – Creating and Sustaining Professional Learning Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer 2009</strong></td>
<td>CS 579 – Research in the Teaching of Reading: Developmental and Remedial Instruction and Support&lt;br&gt;CS 465 – Teaching Reading in the Content Areas&lt;br&gt;CS 425 – Workshop for Inservice Teachers: Children’s Literature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kristin Knake 2008-9 Sabbatical Report

Civil Liberties and the Rule of Law in the US in an Age of Modern Terrorism: Research, Resources and Curricula

1. Statement of Completion of Purpose

My sabbatical research involved how US policies aimed at combating terrorism have impacted the rule of law and civil liberties in the United States. My principal purpose was to develop a deeper understanding of this topic and to create related curricula for multiple levels of learners in our American History, Law, Government, and Comparative Politics courses.

Specific sub-questions for my research included:

1. Separation of Powers. How have such policies affected the separation of powers under the US Constitution? To what extent is there a new balance of executive versus congressional power? What role is the Supreme Court playing in the separation of powers questions that come before it? To what extent did the war on terror lead to increasing governmental secrecy?

2. Individual Liberties. How have the policies impacted domestic civil liberties such as freedom of speech, freedom of association, freedom of the press, and the protection against unreasonable searches and seizures? How have the policies led to racial and religious profiling and thus raised Equal Protection/discrimination questions? The Fourth Amendment in an age of modern terrorism – privacy rights balanced against national security needs. (Focus: FISA/NSA Wiretapping) Detention and Habeas Corpus. (Focus: Hamdi)

3. International Law. To what extent have the policies comported with international law and treaties such as the Geneva Conventions and the International Convention on Torture?

4. A Comparison. Have other countries dealt with terrorism differently from the United States? Specifically, how have the Israeli government and Supreme Court balanced liberty and security in Israel's ongoing fight against terrorism?

5. Impact of US Policy. What impact has US abrogation of the rule of law had on other countries' compliance with the rule of law? Is there any indication that US abrogation has led to mimicry or hostility?

6. Promoting Democracy. Have the US war on terror and associated policies affected the US's ability to spread democracy abroad?

7. Connecting to the Classroom: These are engaging and important topics, but they are complex, and available published curricula is slim and unsatisfying. Teachers to a large extent have not yet comprehensively brought the material into their American history, law, and government classrooms. The most important question I addressed, therefore, was what are the best ways to bring this material into various levels of high school classrooms?
It was a successful 10 months and I fulfilled my purpose. I had the opportunity to read all of the important recent work in the field, as well as the relevant cases and codes in full. Immersing myself in and understanding the material so fully enabled me to create the following:

1. Curricula (including DBQs and mock trials) for US History (all levels,) Law, Government and Comparative Politics Courses.

2. A digital library of resources – print, web, and multi-media – for students or faculty wishing investigate a discreet sub-topic within my broader topic of civil liberties in the age of modern terrorism. I refer to this digital library, in my log, as “Diigo.” (It is a website that allows researchers to archive, organize, and retain access to published news items.)

3. A student research guide for history research papers.

4. A presentation of my research and curricula for the American Bar Association’s Law Related (LRE) Conference on October 3. My objective there was to provide other teachers with an organized and interactive approach to teaching this important subject, and specifically to share techniques for connecting multiple levels of learners with the material.

2. Statement of Professional and Personal Value

The opportunity to take a sabbatical has made me a better classroom teacher. It has renewed my energy for the important hard work of coaching students to become active and engaged citizens – of the school community and more broadly of the world’s community. Students can only recognize their agency and make meaningful arguments and policy choices if they have a strong civic background – if they truly understand (not merely memorize) how the Constitution functions in our system, how it mediates important policy debates between liberty and order, freedom and security. The tension between liberty and security is a theme that can be traced throughout American (and world) history, law, and government, but the recent war on terror has provided (if nothing else) a tremendous opportunity to address the question with students in a modern and meaningful context.

The important question of liberty versus security, in the context of the ongoing wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, is complex. Much has happened quite recently, and a great deal of government action was done secretely or semi-secretely, and so understandably, I think, it is difficult material for full-time teachers to incorporate comprehensively and meaningfully into history, law, or government curricula. A fear of taking too superficial approach, or of being wrong, means that teachers might still eschew the topic entirely. Published curricula in the field are largely unsuitable for high school learners, as materials are either pitched too high, or too low.
So the sabbatical was unbelievably valuable. I was able to immerse myself in the important recent work in the field and create lesson plans and unit plans for myself and my colleagues to engage multiple levels of students in the material. There is tremendous professional and personal satisfaction in knowing I am current in the field. And it is even more exciting to know that I am prepared to hook students up with current the scholarship, through mock trials, simulated hearings, debates, and good readings and discussions.

Finally, personally, I feel learned and ready to go. I have learned techniques from people who spend their professional lives doing only Law Related Education (LRE) and mock trials. I was able to watch teachers in other schools use LRE and Street Law mock trial techniques, and I had the time to reflect on their successes and limitations as well as on my own. A year of research, planning, and reflection has renewed my ability to focus on making positive changes in the lives and learning of students, and to simply handle – but not sweat – the small stuff.

3. Plan to Share Sabbatical with School Community


And/or

2. “Using Differentiated Instruction to Teach Citizenship through Constitutionalism” workshop for teachers. I will prepare a workshop for any teacher to attend where I will present and discuss (1) the results of my research; and (2) how my research can be used in all levels of the history curriculum (American and World) to promote citizenship through constitutionalism.

First workshop is November 12, at the History Division Meeting.
Oak Park and River Forest High School
District 200
201 North Scoville Avenue • Oak Park, IL 60302-2296

TO: Members of the Human Resources Committee of the Board of Education
FROM: Jason Edgecombe
DATE: October 13, 2009
RE: Employee Compensation Reporting Law – Public Act 096-0434

BACKGROUND

The August 2009 signature of Governor Pat Quinn made effective Public Act 096-0434. The Act requires School Districts to annually make available an itemized salary compensation report for every employee in the District holding an administrative certificate and working in an administrative capacity. The report must be posted on the District’s internet website, presented at a School Board meeting, and submitted to the District’s regional superintendent of schools. The Act requires the compensation report to be annually posted by October 1st of each school year. However, we did not believe it appropriate to post this information prior to a review by the Board of Education. While there is no specified penalty for missing the October 1st timetable, in future years the information will be presented in September to permit compliance with the Act.

The Act requires Districts to provide an itemized salary compensation report for administrative employees, which must include, without limitation: base salary, bonuses, District paid pension contributions, pre-retirement enhancements to salary, annual salary increases, the District’s cost of health insurance, the District’s cost of life insurance, paid sick and vacation day payouts, annuities, and other forms of compensation or income paid on behalf of the administrative employee.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The attached document provides the required information of the Act for all members of the District Leadership Team, Building Leadership Team and Instructional Council.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This is an information only item.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
<th>Months</th>
<th>TRS/MRF</th>
<th>Retirement Benefits</th>
<th>Health/ Dental Benefits</th>
<th>Life Insurance</th>
<th>Vacation Days Available for Payout</th>
<th>Sick/Vacation Days Paid Out</th>
<th>Other Forms of Compensation Stipends 403(b) MATCH</th>
<th>Total Compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BISHOP, JANEL L</td>
<td>Asst. Prin. for Student Health and Safety</td>
<td>$105,000.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$2,869.44</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$5,289.56</td>
<td>$577.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$113,736.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOULWARE, BILL</td>
<td>Fine and Applied Arts Division Head</td>
<td>$132,771.14</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$1,702.92</td>
<td>$7,966.27</td>
<td>$17,338.80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$160,356.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADA, LINDA S</td>
<td>Dir. of Special Ed</td>
<td>$162,112.00</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$2,079.25</td>
<td>$9,726.72</td>
<td>$14,213.28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$163,078.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARIOSCIO, MICHAEL</td>
<td>Chief Information Officer</td>
<td>$136,861.41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$11,852.20</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$13,787.64</td>
<td>$577.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$114,790.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHERRY, ROBERT D</td>
<td>Interim Mathematics Division Head</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$14,213.28</td>
<td>$577.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$114,790.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAFT, DALE M</td>
<td>PE/Driver Ed Division Head</td>
<td>$133,000.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$3,235.71</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$17,338.80</td>
<td>$577.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$12,202.28</td>
<td>$146,354.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDGECOMBE, JASON</td>
<td>Asst. Supt. for Human Resources</td>
<td>$207,833.00</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$2,665.69</td>
<td>$12,470.10</td>
<td>$6,066.48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$7,868.04</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$237,482.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORAN, KATHERINE</td>
<td>Director of Communications</td>
<td>$72,192.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$7,251.17</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$13,787.76</td>
<td>$212.10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$93,452.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEVINSON, STEVEN M</td>
<td>English Division Hd.</td>
<td>$148,553.14</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$1,905.34</td>
<td>$8,913.19</td>
<td>$12,734.88</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2,741.18</td>
<td>$139,366.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROSSER, WILLIAM</td>
<td>Science Division Hd.</td>
<td>$120,000.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$5,312.53</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$17,338.80</td>
<td>$577.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2,498.86</td>
<td>$132,829.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HILL, AMY V</td>
<td>Dir. of Assessment and Research</td>
<td>$109,395.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$3,019.78</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$14,213.28</td>
<td>$577.50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$6,747.23</td>
<td>$2,843.88</td>
<td>$201,932.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANENA, JACK</td>
<td>Dir. of Student Inform. Systems</td>
<td>$165,498.00</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$2,122.68</td>
<td>$9,929.88</td>
<td>$13,750.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$14,407.12</td>
<td>$134,134.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERTZ, RICHARD A</td>
<td>History Division Hd.</td>
<td>$104,139.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$1,260.08</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$17,338.80</td>
<td>$577.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$28,354.06</td>
<td>$132,593.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILOJEVIC, CINDY</td>
<td>Asst. Prin. for Student Activities</td>
<td>$107,500.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$2,937.76</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$13,750.44</td>
<td>$577.50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$3,690.18</td>
<td>$184,161.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRALE, PHILIP M</td>
<td>Asst. Supt. for Curr. and Instruction</td>
<td>$161,582.40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$4,460.38</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$17,338.80</td>
<td>$577.50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$3,198.00</td>
<td>$164,978.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROUSE, NATHANIEL L</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>$140,000.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$3,864.62</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$13,750.44</td>
<td>$577.50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$14,125.02</td>
<td>$121,162.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAHAGUN, CLAUDIA C</td>
<td>World Languages Division Hd.</td>
<td>$91,601.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$1,108.37</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$10,863.36</td>
<td>$164.82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$121,149.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STELKER, JOHN</td>
<td>Athletic Director</td>
<td>$99,944.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$10,177.10</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$13,787.64</td>
<td>$577.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$176,829.67</td>
<td>$203,380.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOGEL, DONALD C JR</td>
<td>Bus. Ed. and Lib/Media Serv. Div. Hd.</td>
<td>$151,436.00</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$1,942.32</td>
<td>$9,086.15</td>
<td>$13,787.64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$8,322.30</td>
<td>$5,248.05</td>
<td>$262,787.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENINGER, ATTILA J</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>$211,120.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$23,311.77</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$14,213.28</td>
<td>$577.50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$3,984.24</td>
<td>$202,313.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILSON, MARK T</td>
<td>Asst. Prin. for Student Services</td>
<td>$125,000.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$3,416.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$5,224.80</td>
<td>$577.50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$134,218.30</td>
<td>$202,313.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITHAM, CHERYL</td>
<td>Chief Financial Officer</td>
<td>$174,421.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$18,105.98</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$5,224.80</td>
<td>$577.50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$3,984.24</td>
<td>$202,313.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Retirement Benefit
BACKGROUND
During the August and September meetings of the Human Resources Committee, Board members have been reviewing and offering suggestions to the District’s established procedures. The primary issue for Board members at the September meeting was the issue of who should be charged with making the final decision on administrative hires. Some Board members believed it appropriate for the superintendent to have final authority on administrative hires. Other Board members believe final authority should be determined by supervisory lines. While the full process description (with revisions based on the September discussion) is once again provided below, the intent of the discussion on the 13th is to bring closure to the decision making issue.

At the November meeting, we will address the procedures established for the recruitment and employment of faculty members.

PROCESS DESCRIPTION

Position Posting The following provides information about the District’s procedures in the recruitment and employment of administrators.

1. Review of Recruitment Goals and Objectives for each Position – A review of goals and objectives are established and discussed by the Administration. For administrative positions, a timeline is created for the open positions during this phase of the process. Each of the groups below will participate in the review of goals and objectives, as well as in the establishment of a recruitment timeline. (Superintendent/ASHR)
   - District Leadership Team (DLT)
   - Building Leadership Team (BLT)
   - Instructional Council (IC) – Division Heads, BLT and 2 DLT members for curricular issues, chaired by Phil Pralle.
   - All District Administrators (ADA) – in contrast to the earlier groups this group includes non-certified administrators.

2. Review/Revision of Position Description – A review/revision of the position description for an open position is requested of the immediate supervisor prior to the position being posted. (ASHR)
   - Immediate supervisor
   - Departing employee provides input as appropriate
   - DLT/BLT/ADA as appropriate
3. **Formulation of Interview Teams** – Individuals to participate in the search process are solicited and/or asked to serve by members of DLT and leaders of employee groups. Administrative Interview Teams are expected to include a DLT member as chair, 3-4 faculty members of the Division, two Division Heads, 1 non-Division member from the faculty, 1 student, and 1 parent. The Interview Team is also expected to be demographically representative of the internal school community. (DLT/BLT/IC)

4. **Desirable Characteristics and Qualities** – Desirable characteristics and qualities are discussed and agreed upon by the Interview Team assigned to conduct the search. The agreed upon characteristics and qualities are expected to be in alignment with the District’s mission and goals and the established recruitment goals and objectives. (DLT/BLT/IC)
   - Specific characteristics and qualities may be determined by the DLT, which are discussed with the Division and/or Interview Team.
   - The Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources holds a pre-organizational meeting with each Interview Team to review recruitment goals and objectives, and to discuss specific professional and personal characteristics and qualities as determined by DLT.

5. **Position Posting** – Open positions are posted in the Human Resources area of the District’s website and on the employment bulletin board outside of the Office of Human Resources. (ASHR)
   - Position postings provide candidates with a summary of position responsibilities (why not the position description?—this is just a description of the information available from the posting document), reporting lines for supervisory purposes, contact information for submission of credentials and inquiries, and the posting time frame for the position.
   - A position description for each posted position is available on the District’s website.

6. **Position Marketing and Advertisement** – Open positions are advertised in a variety of venues beyond the District’s own website. (ASHR) Those venues include but will not be limited to
   - **Education Week** (both print and on-line editions);
   - Job Fair attendance by members of the District’s Recruitment Team;
   - NWPA schools;
   - colleges and universities within the State of Illinois;
   - selected Historically Black Colleges and Universities;
   - websites and list serves specifically designed for the educator audience;
   - websites and list serves specific to the content area for which an opening exists;
   - internally with faculty and staff (e-mail and bulletin boards); and
   - general circulation newspapers as appropriate.

7. **Potential Candidate Outreach** – Individuals considered to be viable potential candidates (based on professional experience) are approached and encouraged to apply for open positions. *At present there is no established protocol limiting the initiative of any employee who believes he/she knows a viable candidate for a position. Typically, the potential candidate will be referred to the Chair of the Interview Team or the ASHR.* (All Employees)
   - Current and former employees
   - Colleagues through social and professional networks
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8. **Collection of Applicant Credentials** – Applicant credentials are collected during the posting period for the position. *(ASHR)* The following typically occurs during this phase:

- Acknowledgement of materials received by email from Human Resources.
- In order to be considered for an interview an applicant must the following materials on file in Human Resources: a cover letter, resume, District online application, unofficial transcripts, copies of required certifications/endorsements, and three letters of reference.
- Notification of materials still necessary for a completed portfolio and responses to applicant inquiries will be handled by the Office of Human Resources.

9. **Review of Applications** – Received Administrative applications are vetted by members of DLT and 2 members of the Interview Team. *DLT involvement in the vetting process for non-DLT administrative positions is a change from prior practice. This change seeks to ensure that all viable candidates are a part of the First Round Process.*

- A subset of the overall applicant pool is invited to participate in the first round process.
- Unsuccessful applicants will be notified by Human Resources via email; however, the vetting team may put aside a number of applicants not to be notified yet in the event they need to be considered at a later date.

10. **First Round Interviews of Selected Applicant** – The first round process is designed to yield a set of finalists who will move on to the second round of interviews. A typical first round process will consist of the following:

- review of applicant materials by the First Round Interview Team;
- interviews;
- an assessment of a candidate’s writing skills via a writing prompt and assessment developed by the initial interview team;
- a lesson observation at OPRFHS or the candidate’s place of employment;
- reference checks;
- Q&A with Division members; for Administrative positions, members of the faculty and staff;
- development of a list of strengths and weaknesses of finalists by the Interview Team for the second round process;
- recommendation of finalists for second round of interviews; and
- candidates not selected for the second round process will be notified verbally by the Chair of the first round Interview Team and in writing by Human Resources.

11. **Second Round Interviews of Successful First Round Candidates** – The second round of interviews is conducted by members of DLT with the Superintendent as a participant. The second round process will typically consist of the following:

- review of finalists materials by the Second Round Interview Team;
- an interview;
- a second writing assessment, which for Administrative candidates may be a presentation;
- a check of submitted references and professional/social colleagues, if known; and
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- a recommendation to the Superintendent.

12. **Superintendent Interviews** – The Superintendent will engage final candidates in a conversational one on one interview, or at his/her discretion may involve other Administrators.

- Upon the completion of interviews, including the Superintendent interview, a final conversation with DLT participants may occur at the discretion of the Superintendent.
- Recommendation to the Board of Education.

13. **Board of Education Approval of Recommended Final Candidate** – The Superintendent will provide the Board of Education the recommended final candidate along with a rationale and a summary report of the search process in terms of the number of applicants, number of applicants interviewed, demographics of interviewed candidates, and outstanding/issues/concerns with search.

- Finalists not selected will be notified verbally by the Superintendent or the Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources, and in writing by Human Resources.

14. **Post Board of Education Approval (Human Resources Staff)** – The selected candidate will begin the process of becoming a District employee prior to the official commencement date of employment.

- Human Resources pre-employment processes (criminal background check, physical, medical/dental/life insurance participation forms/ TRS/IMRF enrollment, e-mail access, direct deposit and payroll forms).
- Transitional time with departing Administrator. New administrators are expected to make themselves available for 3-5 days of transitional activities.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**
This is an information/discussion item.