

**Oak Park and River Forest High School  
201 N. Scoville  
Oak Park, Illinois 60302**

**BOARD HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE MEETING  
Tuesday, November 10, 2009  
7:30 a.m.  
Board Room**

**AGENDA**

- I. Approval of Minutes (attachment)**
- II. Sabbatical Reports (attachments)**
  - a. Kristen Knake**
  - b. Sarah Rosas**
- III. Employee Assistant Program Services Agreement (attachments)**
- IV. Recruitment and Employment of Certified 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**

**Oak Park and River Forest High School  
201 N. Scoville  
Oak Park, IL 60302**

**Human Resources Committee  
Tuesday, October 13, 2009  
Minutes  
Board Room**

A Human Resources Committee meeting was held on Tuesday, October 13, 2009 in the Board Room. Mr. Allen opened the meeting at 11:55 a.m. Committee members present were John C. Allen, IV, 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; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; 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, Donna Sebestyen, Coordinator of Benefits; and Terry Dean of the Wednesday Journal.

**Acceptance of September 2009 Human Resources Committee Meeting Minutes**

The minutes of the September 2009 Human Resources Committee meeting were accepted by acclimation, as presented.

**Sabbatical Reports**

The sabbatical reports were delayed until the following month.

**Employee Salary Compensation Report**

Mr. Edgecombe reported that the law now requires that the salaries of the superintendent and certified administrators to be presented to the Board of Education and posted on the website. He asked if the Board of Education wanted to add teachers to this list. Dr. Weninger stated that another law requires all certified employee salaries to be given to the ISBE.

There was a consensus of the Committee members that the names, titles, total compensation, and years of service of all personnel be posted on the website, even though names were not a legal requirement. Years of services will be connected to the teachers' salary schedule.

Mr. Hunter concurred with publishing the names and compensation of the teachers; previously both the local newspapers published that information.

**Recruitment and Employment of Administrative Employees**

The Committee continued its discussion of the District Recruitment and Employment Procedures document.

Dr. Lee expressed concern about the size of the committees in terms of scheduling meetings. The fewer the members, the easier it would be to find time to meet.

Ms. Patchak-Layman continued to feel that there were not enough people at the table giving input as to the characteristics and qualities desired in order to guide the Committee. Mr. Allen felt that was covered in Number 1, "Each of the groups below will participate in the review of the goals and objectives..." This included DLT, BLT, IC and ADA. Mr. Edgecombe stated that characteristics and qualities would be relevant to board and recruitment goals—they are all encompassing. Ms. Patchak-Layman wanted feedback from parents and students as well. She suggested that if the District were able to collect information in another way for it to be part of the discussions, then others would not need to be included on the teams. Mr. Edgecombe did not feel student participation was an impediment but there have been cases where students were comfortable and at other times, they were reticent. Not all participated at the same level. Interview Teams have generally enjoyed having students in this process.

The administration previously had the ability to adjust a procedure such as in the case of the Director of Special Education. It could have adjusted the procedures to have more parent and/or student input, if necessary.

Regarding Number 10, Dr. Lee stated that he had been give one-seventh of the power to approve the hirings of all employees in the District. In Number 10, he was giving his power away to the first round interviewers. He found that completely eliminating a candidate before he/she got to the Board of Education was unacceptable. There should be recommendations and all the applications should be passed up the line. This is about a hiring process in a collective bargaining unit environment. He felt that caution was needed in giving the absolute right to veto. The procedures now give absolute right of veto to various bodies. He reiterated that he was not willing to delegate his power to make hiring decisions. It gives each person in the process, including the Superintendent and the Board of Education, the ability to see all the applications and question why a candidate rated as he/she did. He believed the Superintendent should have the ability to see who has been excluded from the group of people recommended. Mr. Allen felt that was implicit. If he/she asked for the applications, Mr. Allen did not believe he/she would be refused? Mr. Finnegan stated that while the Board of Education has the ability to not approve everyone brought before it, it also has to honor the work done by the committee and he was more concerned about the times when the process is circumvented, i.e., the eventual choice was turned down at a previous level. He was comfortable with what was presented. Dr. Lee felt that when hiring administrators by a committee that is composed primarily of faculty members because only two administrators are allowed on the committee, gives the faculty union the ability to exercise veto power on the Division Head. He did not believe that was wise. Dr. Lee believed all of the people in the decision-making process should have the authority that he used for himself. The Superintendent should be able to know who the people were in the group. The Superintendent should know if there were seven candidates why only six were recommended if the seventh candidate had qualifications as least as great as the other six. If the decision was made by a majority of faculty members, members of the bargaining unit would have veto power over those who would be ultimately making the decision.

Discussion ensued regarding the formation of committees and their purposes and how one related to another. Ms. Patchak-Layman recommended talking about this again on Thursday in order to reflect on the conversation and to make sure the Board of Education was moving in the direction desired. She did ask if the District expected those sitting on the teams to seek out their constituencies' desires relative to qualities and characteristics or were the individuals sitting on the team just giving their own opinions. What is HR's responsibility in this process? To her, HR's responsibility is to list the number of years of experience, etc. Mr. Allen's stated that HR's role was recruitment, the Board of Education goals, the position descriptions, and to ensure that there is a process; it does have a role. Ms. Patchak-Layman suggested that HR develop an initial framework to start the discussion, e.g., the minimum numbers of years experience, etc., to be used as a guide. Mr. Allen felt that had been included in Numbers 1 and 2.

Mr. Edgecombe will provide the Committee members with copies of the job descriptions which include the duties and responsibilities but exclude the characteristics and qualities desired. Dr. Weninger noted that this same process was used in the hiring of the Principal and the Assistant Principals.

Ms. Patchak-Layman noted that one other thing needed further clarification. Who had the final authority to make the hiring decision. Mr. Allen asked for additional language to be included in Number 10 on this issue.

### **Adjournment**

The Human Resources Committee adjourned at 2:00 p.m. and will reconvene on Thursday, October 15, 2009, after the Policy, Evaluation, and Goals Committee meeting.

**Oak Park and River Forest High School  
201 N. Scoville  
Oak Park, IL 60302**

**Human Resources Committee  
Thursday, October 15, 2009  
Minutes  
Board Room**

A Human Resources Committee meeting was held on Thursday, October 15, 2009 in the Board Room. Ms. McCormack opened the meeting at 10:15 a.m. Committee members present were John C. Allen, IV (arrived telephonically at 10:30 a.m. and departed at 11:00 a.m.); Jacques A. Conway, Terry Finnegan, Dr. Ralph H. Lee, Amy McCormack, Dr. Dietra D. Millard, and Sharon Patchak-Layman. Also present were: Dr. Attila J. Weninger, Superintendent; Jason Edgecombe, Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; Cheryl Witham, Chief Financial Officer; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Visitors: Kay Foran, Communications and Community Relations Coordinator; James Paul Hunter, FSEC Chair; Donna Sebestyen, OPRFHS Coordinator of Benefit, and Terry Dean of the *Wednesday Journal*.

**Recruitment and Employment of Administrative Employees**

Dr. Lee asked for a legal opinion on the following items.

- 1) Are there legal ramifications to adopting a process which gives members of a collective bargaining unit the ability to limit consideration of candidates for administrative positions to those that the collective bargaining unit approves? What has been proposed is a process that actually permits members of a collective bargaining unit to limit its consideration to only those of which they approve?
- 2) If there are no legal ramifications, does legal counsel consider it advisable in the District's relationships with a collective bargaining unit?

Dr. Weninger stated that he would get that information. In Dr. Lee's opinion, it would not be responsible to adopt procedures that would allow for a committee with a majority of collective bargaining unit members to limit consideration to only those candidates of which they approve. Dr. Millard stated that the faculty members' composition would be 50%. She felt two division heads could be included on the interview team, even if it were a retiring division head.

Dr. Millard had used the document to clarify the hiring process. Her concerns were:

- 1) Referring to the First Interview Team as FIT, she suggested that its composition have two division heads as originally proposed.
- 2) Number 5 should include both the job description and characteristics and qualities as identified in Number 4. It was clarified that postings occur once the job description is completed. The qualities and characteristics is an internal document for the committees'

use in determining whether the candidates meet the desired qualities and characteristics at an initial level. It comes after the posting occurs. Convening the teams to do this now would be very time intensive. Ms. Patchak-Layman felt it was only fair for people applying for these jobs to know the desired characteristics and qualities. Ms. McCormack concurred, noting that the candidate would make sure examples of the desired characteristics, etc., were included in the process. Mr. Edgecombe felt that the position description would give a sense of the critical components of the responsibilities. The committee will talk about the subtle characteristics different from those listed in the position description. Dr. Millard was concerned that the Second Interview Team (SIT) could have different characteristics from FIT. Mr. Edgecombe stated that if there were different characteristics and traits, they would be discussed with FIT. Mr. Finnegan did not want FIT to eliminate candidates only to have SIT resurrect them because of a change in emphasis. He wanted FIT to have the postings and a DLT member on the team who had a good understanding of what SIT wanted. Mr. Edgecombe assured him that a DLT member would chair the committee and would be able to inform the committee as to which candidates would be most viable.

Ms. Patchak-Layman felt that the process should be fair and open to any candidates and all information should be available to them. This document is not just for now but for future years as well. Ms. Patchak-Layman wanted these conversations to take place before the posting. However, because of the lateness of this hiring season, she suggested postings updated job descriptions on the web and also giving them to the candidates.

Mr. Allen asked not to move past Number 7, but allow Mr. Edgecombe to move forward that day with the postings. A follow-up meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, October 20, 2009 at 7:00 p.m. He supported Dr. Lee by saying he did not believe the team should be a majority of faculty members and he did not consider the division heads to be administrators. He agreed that the bargaining units or their influence should not rule the interview teams. He objected to the references to New York State in Ms. Patchak-Layman's document (distributed at the table), as that state is hypocritical about human rights.

Responding to the formation of the committees prior to the posting in order for FIT to have the conversations about characteristics and qualities, Dr. Weninger noted that there was not enough time to do so. Ms. Patchak-Layman felt that to not include formal interview teams' thoughts about the postings was saying that the District did not want their input at the outset. She proposed that the number of people involved in the process be expanded by opening up an application screening team that would mirror interview teams. The application team, as proposed, is two DLT members and two interview team members. Their job is to review the applications and determine who would go forward. She felt Dr. Lee's concern about openness could be broadened and balanced by having different groups look at the applications to make sure they had the desired characteristics and qualities. Then, FIT would do the interviewing. She also broadened the interview and application screening teams to include more than just teachers and division heads; she added representatives from the employee services support group, , members of the community and parents (who would come from groups already in existence). The unions would designate teachers to sit on the interviewing and screening committees. The Superintendent would select the administrators on the teams. She had omitted

from her proposal someone looking at this from an equal opportunity or affirmative action position to make sure the school gets quality candidates that would increase the number of minority staff at the school.

Relative to Mr. Allen's comments regarding New York State, Ms. Patchak-Layman had suggested that it being important information for the interview committees to have. She also wanted the finished document posted on the website so that candidates knew that this was an open and welcoming process.

Mr. Finnegan felt sending the postings out as soon as possible would not limit anyone in the building even if the conversations about characteristics and qualities had not taken place and that the process would not hurt any particular candidate over another. He reiterated his concern about the conversations between FIT and SIT. He supported limiting faculty representation on the committees to 50% or less and that the committees' makeup be an odd number. He looked at Division Heads as being outside of faculty. He did not share the same concerns of Dr. Lee and Mr. Allen. He wanted significant faculty input. Ms. McCormack also did not share Dr. Lee or Mr. Allen's concern and would be interested in the attorney's position on this as this was part of the screening process. She did not believe it was an issue. She also did not view the Division Heads as being part of the faculty.

Dr. Lee did not believe it was necessary to have a minority of faculty on the team; he was worried about the function of the team itself. From his experience at every level of this process, probably between 40 to 60 percent applicants will not satisfy the minimum technical requirements. He believed what is practical is to leave the interview teams the way they were constituted, except for constituting an odd number. FIT should pass those candidates with the minimum qualifications on to SIT. Their rankings might have annotations with reasons for ranking.

Dr. Weninger asked the Board of Education members as to whom they wanted to vet the administrative applications. The document says DLT and two interview team members would do that vetting. Should there be further vetting of that group or should they be interviewed by FIT with no further vetting? That was Ms. Patchak-Layman's reasoning for suggesting an expanded application review team. Mr. Edgecombe stated that Number 3 was important as that committee would move the candidates forward to SIT. Mr. Edgecombe did note that this was not a straight line process and it could be fluid.

Dr. Lee stated that the function of Number 3 is a fixed thing; it is not fixed and it can be changed. If a committee is needed to decide the qualities desired; however, he suggested changing the name and leaving the composition as it is. It was the consensus of the majority of the Committee members to have FIT involved in the interviewing. Dr. Lee and Mr. Allen did not agree. Mr. Conway wanted information on how parents and students would be chosen and how faculty members would be shown their value. There was consensus to post the positions immediately. Dr. Lee wanted the Superintendent to appoint the parents and students.

Ms. McCormack reiterated that the Board of Education wanted formal input from everyone and that everyone was on the same team. Ms. Patchak-Layman wanted to add staff, counselors and

deans to FIT. Mr. Finnegan felt an EEOC person would enable someone else from DLT to be included on FIT, e.g., Mr. Edgecombe, etc. Mr. Edgecombe concurred that he would be a part of this process. Ms. McCormack suggested that the labor/employment lawyers should address the efficacy of having an untrained person as a part of this process. Ms. Patchak-Layman felt the EEOC position might function as a nonvoting member and perhaps a nonemployee of the school.

Mr. Edgecombe stated that the administration is the Board of Education's representative in the fulfillment of Board of Education goals and objectives set for the District. However, because of the Board of Education's lengthy conversations, the administration is prevented from doing its work. While Ms. McCormack understood his comments, she felt the Board of Education needed to articulate the goals to the administration well so that it could do its job.

### **Adjournment**

At 12:10 p.m., the Human Resources Committee recessed until at 7:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 20, 2009.

**Oak Park and River Forest High School  
201 N. Scoville  
Oak Park, IL 60302**

**Human Resources Committee  
Tuesday, October 20, 2009  
Minutes  
Board Room**

A Human Resources Committee meeting was held on Tuesday, October 20, 2009 in the Board Room. Mr. Conway opened the meeting at 7:13 p.m. Committee members present were John C. Allen, IV (arrived at 8:00 p.m.); Jacques A. Conway, Terry Finnegan, Dr. Ralph H. Lee, Amy McCormack, Dr. Dietra D. Millard, and Sharon Patchak-Layman. Also present were: Dr. Attila J. Weninger, Superintendent; Jason Edgecombe, Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources; Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; Cheryl Witham, Chief Financial Officer; and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board.

Visitors: Kay Foran, Communications and Community Relations Coordinator; James Paul Hunter, FSEC Chair, Jason Dennis, OPRFHS Faculty member (arrived at 8:54 p.m.); and Wyanetta Johnson of APPLE.

**Recruitment and Employment of Administrative Employees**

Mr. Edgecombe noted that the positions were posted in ED Week, the key and standard advertising venue for administrative positions, and that a few resumes had already been received. The timeline will be to advertise these positions every other week, e.g., starting with the HR position and then the Division Head positions.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked 1) would the postings read similar to last year's division head and CIO positions versus a job description, as they had come to the Board of Education; 2) would the candidates receive questions in advance, and 3) would the candidates know the desired qualities. Mr. Edgecombe responded that the job descriptions would be posted online and it was not his experience to either provide questions or share the desired characteristics in advance.

It was noted that the Division Head position for Fine and Applied Arts is inclusive of music and performing arts. The final details will be determined after the October 22 Board of Education meeting as to what this position would encompass. It was noted that the retiring Division Head Chair's title is now Fine and Applied Arts.

Mr. Conway asked if Number 1 had been accomplished. Mr. Edgecombe noted that it had occurred but that the conversations were ongoing. DLT, BLT, and IC – have each devoted a portion of their meetings to discuss these items.

Board of Education members with specific input into the terms and responsibilities or characteristics of these administrative positions were asked to provide them to Dr. Weninger.

Discussion of job descriptions ensued. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if these job descriptions would have been appropriate last year or had they been revised. Mr. Edgecombe noted that these were reviewed by IC and there some adjustments this year. The Director of Special Education job description was more specific, as that position is responsible for policies and procedures and records and reports unique to Special Education and related to state and federal law. Dr. Weninger had reviewed all job descriptions, including that of the HR Director. After reviewing several job HR descriptions from other schools in suburban Chicagoland, he, Mr. Edgecombe, and Ms. Witham included several items into this one.

If an interview team is part of this process, how will they be notified and included in the process. Dr. Weninger suggested that the interview team structure in the past had worked well, he just expanded it. The past process was as follows.

- 1) IC (Instructional Council) and BAT (Building Administrative Team) talked about a process of selecting division heads and other administrative positions.
- 2) The process involved a pre-conversation with the division, conducted by Mr. Edgecombe or Mr. Prale to talk about goals and direction of the District, and the goals and objectives of the division (the sitting Division Head was not present).
- 3) They were asked for representatives for the interview team;
- 4) The chair, usually Mr. Prale, would preside over that discussion and be responsible for making sure there was broad and diverse representation from the school.
- 5) The committee was composed of three to five faculty members from the division, one faculty member outside of the division (chosen by the team), and two division heads (seven to nine people in total). Sitting division heads were selected by the division members to serve on the committee.
- 6) DLT decided which division heads would participate in this process.
- 7) The Interview Team vetted the applications, developed their questions and criteria for the candidates, selected, and interviewed the candidates. The Superintendent then joined the team for the second round of interviews. Three was the preferred number of recommended candidates for the second round.
- 8) One-on-one interviews might have taken place if there were a need to get more information or a different perspective.
- 9) The culminating process was a consensus formed with the influence of the Superintendent. The process lasted approximately 10 weeks with only one committee.
- 10) There was no observation of the candidates' teaching abilities.

It was observed that this represented Number 3 and Number 9a and b. Dr. Millard noted that the prior process was dominated by the faculty.

Dr. Weninger asked of the current division heads including Ms. Bishop and Mr. Wilson, how many were external candidates? The response was two. Dr. Weninger valued opening up the interview process. He felt that more eyes were needed on the interview team (Item Number 3) before making a recommendation to DLT. He did not want to make the decision on his own; he wanted DLT's input. In the case of the principal, it was a committee effort, but he wanted to

make the final decision. He opened the process to both the parents and students as well, as he felt their voices were critical. He did not change the basic structure of the interview team.

When he first proposed change, there was a strong reaction. In the hirings of Bill Grosser, Mark Wilson, Janel Bishop, and Dale Craft, DLT did come to consensus on those candidates. He did not have one-on-one conversations with those candidates, but he did with the final principal candidates. For the science position, one name was forwarded; for PE two candidates were forwarded, for the Assistant Principal for Student Health and Safety several candidates were forwarded, and for the Assistant Principal for Student Services, two candidates were forwarded. Mr. Finnegan asked if he felt there was enough choice. Dr. Weninger responded that he had not seen the applications. He said that in an ideal situation he preferred three choices, but he did not know the pool. Division head responsibilities were being shifted to more of a balance of administrative and advocacy, meaning there would be better balance between the administrative and the divisional roles in terms of vetting those administrative applicants. In the case of DLT and BLT members, that vetting should occur by the administration. Mr. Edgecombe did not believe there was dissatisfaction with the applicants that came forward, but there were examples of why a broader number of applicants did not come forward after the first round. He felt it had to do with the makeup of the interview team. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if the applications had been vetted blindly in an effort to prevent bias. The response was no. Ms. McCormack added that sometimes bias is not necessarily bad, should faculty or division heads know something negative about a candidate that should be known so that he/she did not move forward? Dr. Weninger concurred for just that reason.

Mr. Edgecombe noted that an ADA had discussed 9a and 9b but he had been unsure as to whether or not DLT was in agreement with the ADA proposal. When they met on the 13<sup>th</sup> there had been a consensus that this had been agreed to or proposed to present to the Board of Education.

The administration was asked to get the answer to the following questions from the District's legal advisors.

- 1) Are there legal ramifications to adopting a process which gives members of a collective bargaining unit the ability to limit consideration of candidates for administrative positions to those of that the collective bargaining unit approve of? What has been proposed is a process that actually permits members of a collective bargaining limit consideration to only those approved of?
- 2) If there are no legal ramifications, does legal counsel consider that advisable in the District's relationships with the collective bargaining unit?

Mr. Finnegan was concerned that if there were a situation where someone was rejected by FIT and then brought back by SIT and was hired, the District would be open to lawsuits from those who were originally rejected? Mr. Edgecombe will provide legal counsel's opinion on the proposed hiring process and the legality of the Collective Bargaining Unit's involvement.

There was consensus on Number 4 of the document.

Ms. Patchak-Layman suggested that the vetting of applications be done by a separate group that was trained and knew the characteristics being generated in other conversations.

The Committee members suggested reordering the number as follows:

- No. 3 becomes No. 5
- No. 4 becomes No. 6
- No. 5 becomes No. 3

Dr. Lee wanted to talk about combining 3 and 9b as a package because one is dependent upon the other. Dr. Weninger suggested not having a second vetting of applications as suggested in 9b as it was too time consuming and just eliminate 9b. Ms. McCormack and Mr. Conway concurred. Mr. Allen stated that 9A was to make sure that some were not screened out.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked how the interview team members would be selected. Dr. Weninger responded that there were 3 or 4 DLT members and 2 division members from that interview team who would vet the applications. DLT members have been assigned the chairs of these hiring committees. DLT, BLT, Division Heads are administrative positions and, in the case of the Division Head position, it is a balance between advocacy and administration. The person setting a vision for the District should be a part of the process. Dr. Millard suggested 1) the Superintendent would concentrate on other areas; 2) parents and students should not be involved in vetting of the applications; and 3) faculty and DLT should be involved in the vetting of the applications.

Ms. Patchak-Layman stated that another goal is to have a fair and balanced process where no one could come back and say the outcome was predetermined. Ms. McCormack clarified that not all members of FIT would be included in the vetting of application. Mr. Finnegan added that a vetting team of five people could not control who would come out of the first interview. The Committee agreed to the administration's recommendation that three DLT members and two faculty members would vet the applications.

Number 10: It was the consensus of the Personnel Committee to make the following changes:

- 1) Add the word "select" before the word "applicant"
- 2) Move fourth bullet point to Number 11 to fifth position.

Number 11: It was the consensus of the Personnel Committee to make the following changes:

- 1) Add "lesson observation at the person's placement (optional)" (Item 2 above.)
- 2) Replace "for" with "by" in the last bullet of 11.

In Number 12, it was pointed out that the Superintendent could be a tie breaker if there were a division in terms of equality or he/she could be a welcome to OPRFHS, i.e., a formal introduction to having the position, as candidates appreciate being welcomed by the Superintendent. While Ms. McCormack originally wanted Mr. Prale to be involved in that final

process for Division Heads and Mr. Rouse involved in the case of BLT members to alleviate the perception that the Superintendent had made the final decision, she withdrew her concern. Mr. Allen had disagreed, as it gave the Superintendent freedom of choice. Mr. Finnegan added that the discussion questioned whether the Superintendent should be involved in all cases. Division Heads report to the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction and BLT members report to the Principal. Should those positions make the key determination or does the Board of Education want the Superintendent to make those decisions; they are not direct reports to the Superintendent. Mr. Conway stated that the Superintendent is responsible for everyone in the building. Mr. Prale knew of no situation where one person made the decision to hire someone; it was agreed to by the team. The practice has been a fluid conversation. Both Mr. Prale and Mr. Rouse agreed with the document as written.

Mr. Edgecombe stated that FIT would give a written summary of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidates as perceived by its members. He was unsure if there was agreement or if there was a minority position, but he did believe the conversations were frank. Dr. Millard stated that some have participated on interview teams and felt that no one cared about their reaction. There were some faculty members who were reluctant to participate on these committees, because they did not believe anyone cared about their opinions and they were missing their classes. Mr. Conway stated that the Board of Education must move forward, it cannot go back and heal the wounds that exist. Dr. Weninger was unsure where that feeling came from and the document needs to make clear their role so that they do feel valued.

Ms. Patchak-Layman stated that it seemed that putting a varied group of people together for the first round of interviews is done because of the perspectives they will bring forward in terms of candidate. There may be more value in rating sheets coming forward so there are ways to take these perspectives into consideration or a combination of rating sheets, and, perhaps, a totaling of points. Discussion ensued about using a point system but the drawback would be that the District might bind itself to a certain requirement. Other suggestions that were made included:

- 1) Requiring the chair to provide both the majority and minority opinions (Ms. McCormack)
- 2) Having FIT members pick its chair, rather than assignment of a DLT member (Ms. Patchak-Layman)

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked to have a list of the candidates being interviewed. Dr. Weninger warned that many candidates do not want it known that they are candidates, as a matter of confidentiality. Ms. Patchak-Layman felt it could be part of confidential personnel report for the Board of Education and the Board of Education would be able to see the breadth of candidates coming forward. There was no support from other members for this information. Mr. Allen stated there would be a report on demographics after the process was finished, without names.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if the Board of Education would get the list of finalists. Mr. Allen suggested that it could be part of a report on demographics of the candidate pool. No one asked for the names. Ms. Patchak-Layman asked how the Board of Education or the community would share information about a candidate prior to his/her Board of Education approval. It was pointed out that the Board of Education does not hire below the Superintendent and the first opportunity to see candidates would be at the meeting. It would be appropriate to raise an issue in closed

session. Ms. Patchak-Layman felt the Board of Education had been eliminated from the process and yet it is asked to vote for approval. The Board of Education may have valuable input for this process. She suggested that if Board of Education members had been involved earlier in the discussion, there would be different work to do.

At the next meeting, Mr. Allen stated the document would contain the following revisions.

- 1) The numbering would be reordered;
- 2) The changes noted above in Numbers 10 and 11; and
- 3) There will be no 9b, only 9.

Dr. Lee withdrew his request for a legal opinion.

### **RFQ for Search Firm**

The committee members reviewed a draft of an RFQ to be sent out to superintendent search firms. Dr. Millard asked the committee members to look carefully at the items required of the search firms on pages 14 and 15 and she asked for their additional input.

Mr. Conway asked how the Board of Education protected itself from the same circuit of applicants. Dr. Millard referred him to number 6 on page 14 which requires the firm to state explicitly its methodology for recruiting candidates. The Committee members were told that any candidates they recommended would be directed to work with the recruiting firm.

The RFQs are to be received in the District by November 2 and those asked to make a presentation to the Board of Education will do so at the November 10 Finance Committee meeting. It was the consensus of the committee members to accept this proposal with the following disclaimer on page 15: "Criteria will include but will not be limited to the following." The Board of Education will meet November 3 at 7:30 p.m. to review the RFQ's that have been received.

Dr. Millard also provided the committee with a list of possible search firms and asked the Committee members to provide additional names to Ms. Witham. When asked what an "Independent Search" meant, Dr. Millard stated that it might mean finding someone from the community at large to compose a committee representing stakeholders who would be held to confidentiality. Ms. McCormack noted that it would be difficult to employ someone who did not have a track record.

Ms. Patchak-Layman asked if there was a more public view for the RFQ, i.e., a website. It was noted something would be posted on the AASA and IASA websites. Discussion ensued also about a posting in *Education Week*.

### **Adjournment**

The Human Resources Committee adjourned at 9:53 p.m.

***Oak Park and River Forest High School  
District 200***

*201 North Scoville Avenue • Oak Park, IL 60302-2296*

TO: Board of Education

FROM: Jason Edgecombe

DATE: November 10, 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.

	Courses Completed
Fall 2008	CS 488 – Designing and Interpreting Curriculum CS 461 – Literacy Processes and Practices BBE 404 – Language, Literacy, and Culture
Winter 2008	SCG 410 – Introduction to Research: Purposes, Issues, and Methodologies SCG 406 – Human Development and Learning: Secondary CS 463 – Assessment, Diagnosis, and Instructional Planning: Emergent and Developing Reading CS 485 – Curriculum and Program Evaluation
Spring 2009	CS 464 – Assessment, Diagnosis, and Instructional Planning: Middle-School and Adolescent Reading CS 582 – Reading Practicum in Curriculum Studies: Reading Teacher Endorsement Course Series CS 492 – Creating and Sustaining Professional Learning Communities
Summer 2009	CS 579 – Research in the Teaching of Reading: Developmental and Remedial Instruction and Support CS 465 – Teaching Reading in the Content Areas CS 425 – Workshop for Inservice Teachers: Children’s Literature

## 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 secretly or semi-secretly, 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 an 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**

1. **“Teaching Research in American History” workshop for American history teachers.** I will prepare a workshop for American History, Government, and Law teachers where I share my student research guide for history research papers.

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: Human Resources Committee Members

FROM: Jason Edgecombe

DATE: November 10, 2009

RE: Employee Assistance Program Renewal

---

**BACKGROUND**

Annually the Board of Education is asked to renew a contract with a vendor for employee assistance services. Such a contract is a part of the collective bargaining agreement with Faculty Senate. Workplace Solutions has provided an Employee Assistance Program (EAP) for the District since the fall of 2000. The range of their services includes counseling services, four (4) hours of professional development opportunities, Health/Wellness Fairs, Critical Incident/Trauma Response Assistance, and Steps to Wellness, a monthly e-mail publication. Eligibility for these EAP services include employees and their household family members. To date, there have been no employee reports of dissatisfaction with the services of Workplace Solutions.

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

Workplace Solutions is proposing as a part of its renewal package to increase the services available to District employees from its Standard Plan to its Premier Plan. The Premier Plan includes not just the services referenced above, but two new services, Work Life and Legal Financial Services. The upgrade in services would be provided at no additional fee. The current fee is \$21.00 annually per FTE employee (\$21.00 x 425 employees = \$8,925.00). The proposal is for a two year contract at the same rate for each year.

The Letter of Proposal, and Program Summary and Pricing documents are attached for Board review.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Move to approve the two-year proposed contract for Employee Assistance Program services with Workplace Solutions as presented.



November 4, 2009

Mr. Jason Edgecombe  
Oak Park River Forest High School  
201 N. Scoville Avenue  
Oak Park, IL 60302

Dear Jason:

This document will serve as an amendment to the services agreement dated **November 1, 2000** ("Agreement") between **Oak Park River Forest High School** ("Employer") and **Workplace Solutions, LLC** Employee Assistance Program ("WS"), together the ("Parties").

Whereas Employer desires to continue to provide to its eligible employees and dependents ("Employees") the employee assistance program provided by WS, and

Whereas WS desires to provide said services.

Now therefore the Parties agree to the following:

1. **Article I. Section 1.2 Employer Obligations:**

(a). The Employer shall pay WS a professional fee ("Professional Fee") for the EAP, Work-Life and Legal-Financial Solutions services, provided by WS pursuant to Section 1.1. The Professional Fee shall be based on a rate of **\$21.00** per employee per year, based on an employee count of **425** to continue to be billed on a **quarterly** basis according to subsection 2.1 (a).

(p). Consultation, referrals, educational materials and online resources to address a wide variety of Work-Life and Legal-Financial concerns.

2. **Article III. TERM:**

The terms of the Agreement shall be effective for a period of **two (2) years** beginning **November 1, 2009** and continue through **October 31, 2011**.

By signature below both parties demonstrate their agreement to the new terms as stated above for the period as designated.

We look forward to our continued partnership.

Sincerely,

*Paula Peacock*

Paula Peacock, LCPC, CEAP  
Director of Business Development

**Oak Park River Forest High School**

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_





**Workplace Solutions®**  
OUR BUSINESS BRINGS OUT THE BEST IN YOURS

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

1100 E. Woodfield Rd., Suite 433  
Schaumburg, IL 60173  
Fax (224) 353-2759

1-800-327-5071



[www.wseap.com](http://www.wseap.com)

35 E. Wacker Dr., Suite 1740  
Chicago, IL 60601  
Fax (312) 822-0815

# PROGRAM SUMMARY & PRICING

Oak Park River Forest High School

## THE PREMIER PLAN

*Robust Blend of Services with High Touch Service Delivery*

### Operational Services

- Convenient Access to Services 24/7
- Toll-Free Phone Line: **800-327-5071**
- TTY for Hearing Impaired
- Immediate Access to Telephonic Interpretation Services for Over 180 Languages
- Thousands of Resources at the Click of a Mouse: **www.wseap.com**

### Account Services

- Dedicated Account Management Team Partnering for Success
- High Touch Case Management Process
- Expert Management Consultation to Address Employee and Organizational Concerns
- Substance Abuse Professional (SAP) Services in Accordance with DOT Requirements
- Informative Publications Emailed Monthly
- Promotional Posters for Prominent Display Refreshed Quarterly
- Two Webinar Topics Each Month for Ease of Access to Timely Educational Information
- **New for 2010** Leadership Webinars delivered Quarterly
- Customized Tri-Fold Brochures with Perforated Wallet Card
- Orientation DVD for Convenient Program Promotion
- Comprehensive Utilization Review and Program Planning Conducted Annually

### Counseling, Work-Life and Legal-Financial Services

- Confidential Counseling Services to Address Personal and Professional Concerns
- No Specific Limit to Sessions Encouraging Flexibility in Providing Cost-Effective Care
- No Limit to the Number of Presenting Concerns/Occurrences Per Year
- Convenient Access to Professionals In-Person or by Phone
- Eligibility includes Employees and their Household Family Members
- Expert Consultation, Qualified Referrals, Educational Materials, and On-Line Resources for Work-Life and Legal-Financial Solutions

### Onsite Services

- Unlimited Manager Training: Integrating EAP as a Management Tool *Included*
- Unlimited EAP Orientation for Employees *Included*
- Four (4) Hours of Education from our Learning Institute *Included*
- Unlimited Participation in Health/Wellness Fairs *Included*
- Critical Incident/Trauma Response Services *Included*

**Total Program Cost:**

**\$21.00** per employee per year based on an employee count of 425

# ***Oak Park and River Forest High School District 200***

*201 North Scoville Avenue • Oak Park, IL 60302-2296*

TO: Human Resources Committee

FROM: Jason Edgecombe

DATE: November 10, 2009

RE: District Recruitment and Employment Procedures for Certified Employees

---

## **PROCESS DESCRIPTION**

1. **Review of Recruitment Goals and Objectives for Faculty Positions** – A review of goals and objectives are established and discussed by the Administration. For faculty positions, the annual Northwest Personnel Administrators' (NWPA) Job Fair signals the formal beginning of the recruitment season; however, faculty recruitment should be viewed as a year long process, with the tender of a contract offer possible at any time for a known vacancy in the next school year. Each of the groups below will participate in the review of goals and objectives for the hiring process. **(Principal/ASHR)**
  - District Leadership Team (DLT)
  - Building Leadership Team (BLT)
  - Instructional Council (IC)
2. **Review of Open Positions** – The District Leadership Team discusses the filling of any vacant/open positions with the appropriate Division Head vis-à-vis long range financial and programmatic considerations. A review of anticipated open faculty positions then occurs with the appropriate Division Head. **(ASHR)**
  - Division Head
  - DLT/BLT as appropriate
3. **Desirable Characteristics and Qualities** – Desirable characteristics and qualities are discussed and agreed upon by the Interview Team assigned to conduct the search with input from the BLT. The agreed upon characteristics and qualities are expected to be aligned with the District's mission and goals and the established recruitment goals and objectives. **(ADA)**
  - Specific characteristics and qualities may be determined by the BLT, which are discussed with the Division and/or Interview Team.
  - The Principal and/or the Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources will conduct a pre-organizational meeting with each Interview Team to review recruitment goals and objectives, and to discuss specific professional and personal characteristics.
4. **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:
  - Job Fair attendance by members of the District's Recruitment Team;
  - colleges and universities within the State of Illinois;
  - Historically Black Colleges and Universities;
  - websites and list serves specifically designed for the educator audience;

# ***Oak Park and River Forest High School***

## ***District 200***

*201 North Scoville Avenue • Oak Park, IL 60302-2296*

- 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
  - designated circulation newspapers as appropriate.
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, 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. **Formulation of Interview Teams** – Individuals to participate in the First Round Divisional Interview Team are solicited and asked to serve by the Division Head. Division Interview Teams are expected to include the Division Head as chair, 2-4 faculty members from the Division, 1 non-Division faculty member, 1 student, and 1 parent. The Interview Team is expected to be demographically representative of the internal school community. **(Principal/DH)**
7. **Potential Candidate Outreach** – Individuals considered to be viable potential candidates (based on professional experience) are approached and encouraged to apply for open positions. **(All Employees)**
- Current and former employees
  - Colleagues through social and professional networks
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.
  - Verification of receipt of requisite application materials. The requisite application materials are a cover letter, resume, District on-line application, unofficial transcripts, copies of required certifications/endorsements, and three letters of reference.
  - Notification to applicant of materials still necessary for a completed portfolio.
  - Office of Human Resources responses to applicant inquiries.
9. **Review of Applications** – Received faculty applications are vetted by members of the First Round Divisional Interview Team and the BLT Liaison.
- A subset of the overall applicant pool is selected as viable candidates for the first round process.
  - Applicants not selected for the first round process 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.
  - At least one minority candidate must be interviewed for each position, and preferably several. If there are none interviewed, a written explanation of the circumstances involved must be prepared by the Division Head and submitted to the Principal and Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources, with copies to the Superintendent and Chair of the Board Human Resources Committee.

# ***Oak Park and River Forest High School***

## ***District 200***

*201 North Scoville Avenue • Oak Park, IL 60302-2296*

10. **First Round Interviews of Selected Applicants** – The first round process is designed to yield a second subset of recommended finalists who will move on to the second round of interviews. A typical first round process consist of the following:
  - review of selected applicant materials by the First Round Divisional Interview Team;
  - interviews;
  - an assessment of the candidate's writing skills via a writing prompt and assessment developed by the Divisional Interview Team;
  - reference checks using the District prescribed reference form;
  - development of a list of strengths and weaknesses of finalists by the Divisional Interview Team for the second round process;
  - at least one minority candidate must be forwarded/recommended for second round interviews; if there are none interviewed, a written explanation of the circumstances involved must be prepared by the Division Head and submitted to the Principal and Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources, with copies to the Superintendent and Chair of the Board Human Resources Committee. and
  - recommendation of finalists for second round of interviews.
11. **Second Round Interviews of Successful First Round Candidates** – The second round of interviews is conducted by the Principal, BLT Liaison, 1-2 DLT Members, and the Chair of the First Round Divisional Interview process. The second round process will typically consist of the following:
  - review of finalists materials by the Second Round Interview Team;
  - review of written documents composed by the First Round Interview Team;
  - an interview;
  - an observation at OPRFHS or the candidate's place of employment (optional);
  - a check of submitted references and professional/social colleagues, if known;
  - notification of candidates not recommended by the second round process as finalists by the Chair of the first round Interview Team and in writing by Human Resources; and
  - recommendation to the Superintendent of a final candidate for employment.
12. **Board of Education Approval of Recommended Final Candidate** – The Superintendent will submit to the Board of Education the name(s) of the recommended final candidate(s) for employment.
  - At the conclusion of the recruitment season, the Office of Human Resources will produce a summary report for the Board of Education of the search process in terms of the number of applicants, number of applicants interviewed, demographics of interviewed candidates, and outstanding/issues/concerns arising from the recruitment season.
  - Finalists not selected will be notified verbally by the Principal or the Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources, and in writing by Human Resources.
13. **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.

# ***Oak Park and River Forest High School***

## ***District 200***

*201 North Scoville Avenue • Oak Park, IL 60302-2296*

- 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 within the Division, where possible