

Spotlight on the Board

Notes from the District 15 School Board Meetings

April 1st, 2009

This was a Committee of the Whole meeting. Board members Kelly Keenan and Wendy Rowden were absent. All eight candidates for the Board of Education April 7th election were present.

Citizens Address the Board

Lori Austin and Lori Sidell – Thomas Jefferson parents

Austin said that in the fall of 2008 they did present petitions from Thomas Jefferson parents to the Board to possibly revisit redistricting Carl Sandburg JH from TJ. Right now TJ does go to Sandburg and it is quite a distance. They thought that they would resubmit their petitions considering that the Board is possibly going to have four new BOE members in the spring.

Beginning Conversations about Expanding Opportunities – Middle School

Yvette Davidson, Principal Sundling JH led a PowerPoint presentation on this topic.

www.fcwpta.org/pdf/d15_040109_middle_school.pdf

Board discussion/questions/comments after presentation -

Board member Nancy Lee Carlson – Commented: Winston Campus, for example, was set up as a middle school and got off track. Of all of our classrooms, that one could probably be the easier one to set up as a middle school since it is a K-8 building. She would presume a 6th–8th model vs. a 5th–8th model. Asked Davidson if she thought that Winston Campus would be the first building that we could utilize? Or are there other buildings? **Davidson** – She doesn't know if she would specify one building over another. Thinks Carlson is hitting on a point which is that there is a structure piece, a building piece. What can the building hold? Also how do we arrange it to work in this context? Maybe that is what Carlson is speaking of. Davidson doesn't know at this point. She stated that there are strands of this (middle school concept) that we are trying to do now in our structure. **Carlson** – Asked Davidson if she would be looking at this "across the board". Carlson is looking at this with the cost of the middle school concept; it is very successful in suburban schools. Are you looking at putting this through the entire school district or starting out in a preliminary school?

D15 Superintendent Daniel Lukich – Wanted to step into the conversation. He said that the administration purposely guided the JH principals from going into that part of the study. The architects have already sort of presented that package to the BOE, not with any pro or con, one direction or another. It certainly would be an option but it would be a rather substantial hurdle to achieve in this district with the current capacities and the current building configurations that we have. Asked Carlson if his response that helped? **Carlson** – Yes, that is what she was getting at.

Board president Gerald Chapman – Asked Davidson to explain why the concepts of smaller communities, problem-based learning, varied instruction, expertise of the teachers, safer environment, etc cannot be effectively implemented in a 7th/8th structure? He missed that.

Davidson – What we have now is a situation where we tried to implement those concepts. Let's look strictly at the departmentalization first. Now we have teachers that teach Math, or Science or History etc. So our team composition right now is: a Math teacher, History teacher, Science teacher, Language Arts teacher, PE teacher – which is wonderful. It doesn't give the interdisciplinary approach. What that would do is bring about staffing and certification considerations if we were to look at teachers shrinking down teams, they would have to teach more than one subject. For instance, perhaps you have a 6th grade team that is two teachers and there are 60 kids on their team. That is a close knit team; they know those students quite well. Because you only have two teachers on the team, you would need to have a teacher that is certified to teach Math, Science and Reading and another teacher certified to teach History and Language Arts. So you need the interdisciplinary approach. **Chapman** – In a related question, the Universities are doing this certification and the State

is providing that. Are we aggressively recruiting people with those certifications to teach in our junior highs? **Davidson** – She will speak to his question from her perspective and not necessarily from the district's perspective. There are schools (Universities) that actually have junior high/middle school majors (in Education). Her bachelor's degree is in Junior High/Middle School Education. They also provide special development schools and partnerships in the school districts where they have year-long student teaching experiences for teachers to come into a junior high/middle school setting and get an internship as well as student teaching experience. So there are partnerships for school districts who want to foster specifically for the junior high/middle school. That is what she looks for in the hiring process. **Chapman** – So is a bigger issue for going to a middle school would be the staffing issue vs. the structure of the facility issue? **Davidson** – It could depend on the structure because of what they could teach and whether or not they were endorsed – those would be two of the questions.

Board member Sue Quinn – She had looked into middle schools and its history. There was an original push in the 1980s to go from the traditional 7th/8th to the middle school concept. The proponents wanted to do that because there were concerns that the social/emotional aspects of the children at this particular age were not being met with the traditional model. The opponents were worried about academics taking a backseat. There was a big push towards the middle school concept for about 20 years until about 2000. At that point, the middle school proponents realized that a lot of the academic results they had hoped for were not materializing. The proponents at that time were saying things like you can't just put these three grades of kids together; you have to fully implement all of these different structural changes. Now there is talk of middle school reform in fully implementing the concept. Those are the proponents, so even the proponents are saying that it doesn't matter where the seats are sitting so much as the integration of teachers that are certified and these other concepts. The opponents are still saying yes, that is because you didn't take care of the academics.

Regarding D15, Quinn thinks we have an obligation to have a relentless focus on academics. We have academic issues in making the transition from JH to high school that we need to address particular to our district. She doesn't want D15 to lose that focus. At the same time, she thinks as with all things the truth is somewhere in the middle. Yes we need to pay attention to some of these social/emotional issues. As Davidson said, we have implemented some of these middle school concepts, Quinn would like us to see what else we can do without the huge cost. Let's make sure the kids get through this (JH/middle school) socially and emotionally but we have to hit those academic benchmarks.

She would like to see a presentation that looks at some of those strands mentioned – especially gifted and the high stakes testing, those are particularly relevant for our district. Then come back and say what more can we do without the large cost, large structural changes to move more towards the middle school concept. Take the best of the middle school concept and what can we apply and how far can we go before we have to do some large modifications?

Davidson – She thinks that one of the key pieces will be how other schools who have looked at making the change. The students that are not making it in the middle schools, when you turn backwards – those students in those suburbs weren't making it in the other configuration either. That is one of the pieces that have been talked about quite a bit. When we make comparisons, are we using an exceptional middle school as the bar? Or are we using one of those schools that reconfigured for the sake of reconfiguration? Hopefully taking care of the social/emotional issues and the environment allows us to increase student achievement. We are not in the business of solely meeting social/emotional issues. We are interested in increasing student achievement.

Ed Nelson, Principal Sandburg JH – In his experience both at the elementary and JH levels, having kids and parents from K through 6th grade there is certainly an opportunity to build community and relationships. What has frustrated Nelson in his experience at the junior high, it appears to him that we are bringing in incoming 6th graders over for orientation in a week and a half, then they start in 7th grade and before you know it, they are taking their high school EXPLORE test and they are gone. We just don't seem to have them long enough to really make a difference that he thinks they could if we had kids for three years.

Board member James Ekeberg – Asked Nelson if the fact that you only have the children for two years make it more difficult to identify those that are “slipping through the cracks” because you just don’t get a chance to know them that well? **Nelson** – Thinks that there is some of that, yes.

Quinn – Doesn’t that go to the articulation also between the schools? She wants D15 to apply middle school concepts not just in 7th/8th but also in 5th/6th. There is a lot you can do and maybe we need to bring things down to the elementary more and making sure we have that continuity. A lot of those kids will go amass from one school to the next (elementary to JH to HS). It is making sure that they know and can keep those connections along the way. **Nelson** – A lot of that is a certification issue at the K-6 buildings. **Quinn** – So that may be something that may take time to address but with that goal in mind.

Lukich – The National Middle School Association and movement were not started on the basis of forgetting academics and focusing on social/emotional. It was started to improve academics by way of supporting and enhancing the social/emotional.

Grade Level Centers

Christine Samojedny, Principal Lincoln School led the PowerPoint presentation on this topic. www.fcwpta.org/pdf/d15_040109_grade_centers.pdf

Board discussion/questions/comments -

Quinn – She sees a lot more restrainers than she sees drivers and is not seeing a lot of benefit moving forward with this. **Chapman** – Thinks this concept became an issue because some parents talked to us about relatively high class sizes. The one thing that is positive about grade level centers is that there would be a better balance of class sizes. Chapman does agree with Quinn that when we talk about splitting families, additional transportation costs – agrees and knows we aren’t looking for recommendations tonight. **Samojedny** – That is what all of the research said that looking at drivers and restrainers. If the number one reason wasn’t student achievement, it was simply because a district was in some type of bind. **Quinn** – Not that we don’t have financial difficulties as well. One of the advantages of having a large district is that you have a lot more possibilities in addressing issues. **Chapman** – We do recognize the fact that due to our class size issues and guidelines, we are going to continue to have the kinds of issues that we face this year. There will be some classes on the higher end that we have to address that on an individual basis. That is the tradeoff for this other alternative. He personally doesn’t think it is a good tradeoff.

Review Draft of 2009-10 Budget

Rebecca Allard, Asst. Superintendent for Business – This is the first look at the 2009/10 tentative budget. There will be many opportunities between now and when we do the final budget adoption currently scheduled for June, to make that everyone is educated, understands what is in the budget and how we come up with our recommendation. A budget is nothing but numerical representation of the district’s educational programs. We look at what we do on a district wide basis and we apply the costs to perform those duties.

What We Don’t Know About REVENUE – At this point in time, there are a lot of unknown variables that are built into this budget because we just don’t have the finalized data yet. The biggest revenue information that we don’t have yet is our **Tax Levy**. In Cook County, that information isn’t known until August/September; sometimes it even goes into October/November. **State funding** she thinks the State is a little behind in their budgeting process at this point in time only because of the transition of governors. The district also doesn’t know the affect of the **Stimulus funds** that it may be getting from the federal or State level which would come directly to the district.

Allard said that a tremendous amount of information was released today about the stimulus funds. We will talk a little later about that but there will be continued conversations. We just don’t know what we are getting at this point in time from the federal funds either. The grant information will be coming out

shortly and we will be able to more accurately predict what our revenues, and our expenditures towards those grants are.

Revenue Distribution –

	Education Fund	Operating Funds	All Funds
Local Taxes	77.07%	75.74%	74.16%
Other Local Taxes	4.56%	4.97%	4.72%
State Funding	11.72%	13.98%	12.86%
Federal Funding	6.65%	5.31%	4.88%
Transfers In	0%	0%	3.38%

Allard – The Education Fund is our largest which funds our educational programs. We are a district that is highly reliant on our local property taxes. The operating funds support the educational programs – Operations and Maintenance, Retirement which are statutory contributions to IMRF, Medicare, Social Security and our Tort Immunity expenses. The State funding for Operating Funds goes up slightly (from Ed fund %) because of Transportation reimbursements.

Board member Tim Millar – Asked if the Transfers were transfers in from the district’s reserves?

Allard – Yes, transfers from Reserves from the O&M Fund to our Capital Projects Fund which is now required by the State for us to do those large projects. We transferred fund balance into capital projects so we can do the projects that will be approved at the next Board meeting.

Education Fund Revenues – are going up a total of 3.21%

Local Property Taxes are increasing 3.68%. Our revenues are limited for what we are going to be able to do in our Educational Fund. The local property taxes are contingent on two numbers – our CPI factor which we have talked a lot about since January which is 1/10th of 1% (0.1%) going forward represents the slowdown in assessed value for this district as a whole, basically the market value of our properties. The cost of a house is going down and that will affect District 15 over the next couple of years. Again because we don’t really know, we have made some projections for State revenues increasing at about 4.81% and Federal revenues increasing at about 12.51%. But again, that information is not clearly known, not clearly defined at this point and we will be revising/modifying those numbers as we go forward between now and June when we adopt the budget.

Operations and Maintenance Fund - Revenues are expected to go up 10.2%. Local taxes account for 12.2%. If anyone was here in January COW meeting, we talked about a budget amendment and the redistribution of expenses out of the Tort Immunity Fund. Most of those expenses would be to the Operations & Maintenance Fund. The taxes were in essence transferred from the Tort Fund to the O&M fund. That is why you are seeing such a large increase there. Other Local taxes are basically interest income and are going down -2.97%. We are getting about 1% on our income at the bank. It fluctuates a little above or a little below and that is the reason for the decline in that revenue.

Transportation Fund – We are expecting a 2.89% increase. Local taxes are 2.98%, other local .26% and State is 3%. Our reimbursement for Transportation is based upon for next year, the expenses that were incurred this year so we are predicting at least a 3% increase in that fund. Again, the State tends to fund transportation at a high level because it is a reimbursement that most districts, regardless of their monies that they can get from the general State formula, can have access to.

Quinn – Hopefully we won’t have issues with the State continuing to fund – period. But there is a possibility of that happening with the downturn and the budget deficit. Most of our State funding comes via Transportation and also Special Education. Asked Allard if she talked to any of the legislators to get a feel from the State as to any looming cuts in State funding for Transportation?

Allard – Right now they are not talking about those reductions. She finds it hard to believe that we won’t see some reductions; she just doesn’t know what it will be yet until they finalize what they will be doing in Springfield. It is difficult for her to project.

Retirement Fund – This is a statutory requirement for our district to fund. It is the employers’ share of Social Security, Medicare and the IMRF (Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund). We expect that budget to go up 2.88%. Again, local taxes fund that particular expense.

Tort Immunity Fund – Shows a drastic reduction (-45.22%) because of those funds being transferred into Transportation and the O&M.

Millar – Asked if this (information) was based on the CPI of 4.1% not the 0.1%

Allard – Yes, it is based on 4.1% and a portion of next year’s budget is based on the 0.1%. But because of the delay in the collection of taxes, it is a little less obvious.

Millar – So next year won’t look as good as this year?

Allard – Next year will not look as good as this year. You will see that as we get to 5-year financial projections. You will see that we can hold our own in the 2009/10 school year but then we start to see the effects of the reduced CPI in the 2010/11 school year.

What We Don’t Know about EXPENDITURES –

Allard – It is important to talk about what she have built into the budget, that we know the variables.

Salaries – CTC negotiations, Administration salaries/Non-Union salaries

In the Salary areas, we all know that we are going into teacher negotiations this year. We don’t know exactly what our finalized teacher salaries will be. The Board has not approved any administrative and non-union salaries.

Stimulus Related Expenses – IDEA, Title I, Technology, Capital Projects

We don’t know what the Stimulus related expenses will be for these areas and whether there will be any stimulus money for capital projects and technology.

Actual Cost of Capital Projects - At the April 15th BOE meeting, one of the bids will be awarded for capital projects. We may also have the bids for roofing, mechanical and plumbing work that the architect is working on for that BOE meeting. There will be various bids coming forth from Craig Phillips, D15 Maintenance Manager for the work he is doing.

Quinn – Asked Allard if the Board is going to have most of the bids in before the final budget in June?

Allard – Yes. We should know. There will be some work in house that we won’t have final costs but for the larger ticket items, we will certainly know their costs and whether that \$7M (estimated) is a little bit high or a little big low.

Cost of Tort Immunity Expenses – This is the district’s Property and Casualty, Workmen’s Comp Insurance. We won’t know the Property and Casualty expenses until May. When we go through the bidding process, we will determine if we should stay in CLIC. Our Workmen’s Comp annual renewal is up December 1st.

Expenditure Distribution –

Type	Ed Fund	Operating Fund	All Funds
Salaries	75.59%	64.72%	59.42%
Benefits	13.78%	15.46%	14.19%

Expenditure Budget Breakdown

Allard – Education fund is increasing at a total of 3.38%. Salaries are increasing when you look at all employee categories and the assumptions that we have built into that – 3.38%. Benefits are 2.41%. Since salaries are the biggest component, it is important that you understand what has been built into the budget for those.

Education Fund Salaries – 3% has been used for all employee categories except for the CTC (teachers union) because the average Step increase is 2.77%. For projection purposes only, this is

critical for everyone to hear, for projection purposes only we have projected a Base increase of 2.13%. That portion of the budget is held "in check" in essence because of declining enrollment so we are reducing staff and because of planned retirements, there are that savings from those that will be exiting the district and the planned replacement salary of those retiring.

Administration 3%, CTC 3.99% (Step average = 2.77%, Base 2.13%)
ESPA (program assistants) **3%, Food Service 3%, Non-union clerical 3%**

The 2.13% Base comes from the current teachers' contract and is the Base increase that has been applied over the last contract. It is not to say that we won't go forward with it. It is just the basis for us making these projections. It is complicated.

Chart shown of CTC Base contract increase from 2006/07 to 2007/08 to 2008/09

www.fcwpta.org/pdf/d15_040109_CTC_Base.pdf

Chart shown of CTC Average Step Increase by each Lane

www.fcwpta.org/pdf/d15_040109_CTC_Step.pdf

Lukich – Is sure the Board has studied this teacher's salary chart over the years. There are a lot of variables in the chart. A lot of those variables are very manageable. There are a couple of variables across those FTE (Full Time Equivalent) lines that are pretty unusual. From the administration's standpoint, it is difficult to manage because it represents people that are here. When you look at the Masters, Masters +15, and Masters +30 categories, you have a huge proportion of your staff are well-educated and have been here a long time.

Millar – Asked if Allard included (in the expenses) anything for Lane changes on top of the others.

Allard – Said that there is a dollar amount in there for Lane changes. It fluctuates to about \$600K a year that we spend on Lane changes.

Operations and Maintenance Fund – 2.41% increase

Salaries are at 6.4%. Benefits are down just because of the redistribution of staff. Purchased services are down; supplies are up, capital outlay is up 7.9% only because when the budget was built a year ago, the \$2M was built into that budget. We know we are not going to spend it this year. We have built in a normal level of capital outlay for Craig Phillips to work with; it just shows that very large percentage.

Transportation Fund – It is reflecting a 1.44% increase.

Salaries are going up almost 6% (5.98%). Although that probably will be reduced when the Board actually agrees on what the salaries are for the transportation staff next year. We don't know what that is yet, hasn't been brought forward to the Board yet.

Expenditure Budget Breakdown for Operations & Maintenance and Transportation Funds

www.fcwpta.org/pdf/d15_040109_OM_Trans_budgets.pdf

Retirement Fund – For next year is reflecting at 4.6%. This does accommodate an unknown factor for the increase in the district's IMRF costs because of the loss of investment income for the IMRF fund.

Tort Immunity Fund – Projecting to go up 7.42%.

Purchased Services – Up 7.5%, will have more of a handle on it in June when budget is adopted.

Chart shown of 2009/10 Tentative Budget – By Object

Lists Revenue, Expenses, Excess Revenues and Est. Fund Balance for the Education Fund, Tort, O&M, Transportation, Retirement and Total Operating Fund

www.fcwpta.org/pdf/d15_040109_tent_budget_part1.pdf

Lists above for Working Cash, Debt Service, Capital Projects, Health & Life Safety and Total District Funds www.fcwpta.org/pdf/d15_040109_tent_budget_part2.pdf

Quinn – Wanted to reiterate what Allard said that we are deficit spending but we are spending that large amount of money for capital projects is basically coming out of our reserves. Hopefully that \$7M went it goes out to bid, we will get some good bids and it will be lower so it will be less that we have to take out of reserves. She also wanted to make a comment about Staff Development. Currently in the budget, we have an 18% decrease in our Staff Development budget. She has heard this Board say a number of times that we highly value Staff Development and encourage it. Her personal view is that we should increase that line item.

Chapman – Philosophically he agrees with Quinn but those figures are based on requests that we receive (from staff). **Quinn** – Thinks we should say, “You need more staff development and come to us and tell us how you would best utilize the funds”. Quinn thinks the staff development needs to be very targeted to get its most effective usage. She doesn’t want people to feel like “we can’t do this because we don’t have staff development funds”. The Board needs to make sure that is a culture that needs to be pushed down. This is important, we want to value this and she is sure that the Dept. of Instruction can come up ways they would like to use that. **Allard** – Again because we don’t know what the grant funds will be from the State or Federal government – most of our staff development is done with grant funds. When we finalize State and Federal monies, you will see a huge jump in that line item on the budget. She just doesn’t have that data right now.

5-Year Financial Projections

Revenues -

Allard – The biggest revenue source that we have is local property taxes. It is important to understand that we are controlled by a document that is released by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in December of each year (CPI-U). For the 2008 levy year which we will know this July or August, the levy will be extended based on 4.1% increase. For 2009, it will be based upon 0.1%. In our projections because she thinks it would be anybody’s guess right now to where we will be in December of 2010. We are projecting that the CPI will be 1% (2010), then we are projecting 2.5% on out. Allard thinks that as the economy, in general, settles down that we have some reliable economic data, this will also be revised. It is important to note that financial projections are a living document. Every time that you get new concrete information, you revise your financial projections. Right now this is just our best guess of 2.5% which was used in financial projections of the past.

Tax Levy (CPI-U) -

2008 is 4.1%; 2009 is 0.1%; 2010 projected to be 1%; 2011, 2012, 2013 projected to be 2.5%

Quinn – Cannot say strongly enough that projections are just that. They are going to change all of the time, this is just going to be a snapshot of what we know right now. Speaking of which, Senate Bill 2126 (SB2126) is in the State Senate right now. She believes the Senate is considering, not sure if they are going to vote, a floor on CPI levy at 2%. So it can’t go below just as they have a cap, they could also have a floor. Did you know about that?

Allard – Actually she thinks it could be voted on in the next day or two. There have been emails from the School Board Association and most Associations to their membership saying contact your local legislator and ask them to support that. **Millar** – It is not a good thing for taxpayers. **Allard** – That could be debated. It would make the level of increase probably more consistent because if you look at the history of CPI, it is probably closer to that 2% vs. 3% level since the early 1990s. **Millar** – But if they (taxpayers) are not getting a raise or laid off. **Allard** – yes, that would be very difficult for them.

Expenditures -

Allard – Salaries are the very largest expense. It is 3% of all employee groups except the CTC. For the CTC salaries going forward in the 5-year financial projections, we used a Base increase of 2.13% and an Average Step increase of 2.77%. There will be a 9% growth in our Employee Benefits expense. She thinks that as the conversation in Washington DC talks about nationalizing HealthCare, then our costs should tend to be reduced whether it happens or not. Just the conversation helps control costs. She is not saying she agrees or disagrees with it but she is just saying that the conversation helps control the costs. The Purchased Services, Supplies and Capital Outlay are pretty much flat throughout

the financial projections because again we need to be able to fund our Salaries and Employee Benefits/Costs.

Capital Projects Expenditures –

Allard – In the summer of 2009, we are anticipating spending \$7M, in 2010, just a small amount of \$451K. For 2011, 2012 and 2013, you can see the larger amounts. The \$7m (for 2009) is coming from Fund Balances (Reserves). When we look at the Fund Balances of the Operation and Maintenance (O&M) going forward, it is important to note that the Capital Projects in 2011, 2012 and 2013, require funding sources.

Lukich – These numbers (for 2011, 2012, and 2013) are off the Life Safety Report, they are strictly projections. There is no sure deal on any of this. **Allard** – Right, again we have not bid, we have not contracted for anything beyond what we are talking about this summer of 2009.

Quinn – This is essentially what it would take to complete all of the items that were identified in the Life Safety Study. **Allard** – Correct. At previous BOE meetings, it was said that it is important to include all of those expenses that we are talking about although it gives a pretty bleak picture of what we might look like in another five years. But if you don't have those numbers in there, you don't know how to form those conversations that will happen over the next couple of months.

Chart of Capital Projects 2009 – 2013

www.fcwpta.org/pdf/d15_040109_capital_projects.pdf

Chart of Financial Projections 2009 – 2014

showing Education Fund going down, O&M fund in deficit spending and Transportation fund holding
www.fcwpta.org/pdf/d15_040109_financial_projections.pdf

Allard – Capital Projects are factored into this chart under the O&M fund. **Lukich** – That is what is creating those "red" numbers (deficits) in June 2012 and forward. **Allard** – We would have to be transferring the funds out of the Fund Balance of O&M to do the capital projects.

Millar – Appreciates all of the work, good detail, a lot of information. It would be nice again to have some simple charts for some of these things; it would be easier to read for people without digging into the financials. Only suggestion he would make.

Stimulus Package Update

Lukich – The Board received extensive reading material regarding the stimulus package. Lukich wanted to point out a couple of things that the district thinks it knows. Cautioned the BOE to not take these numbers as official, said that they are probably incorrect as he is quoting them. The numbers state that as of the date quoted in the report, the IDEA and Title IA funds total over \$4M. Those are additional funds that D15 may receive. He thinks that the funds will come directly to the district. As he is learning, in the State of IL that anytime anything flows through the State Capitol, you have to be careful because the State Capitol does have something to say before they distribute the funds to the local districts. Lukich said that it appears the new governor intends or has recommended that a lot of the federal funds will be used to balance the State budget to balance the educational payment.

Chapman – So what you are saying is that we may get more Federal dollars but the State because of a lack of revenue will say "you are getting all of the Federal dollars so you don't need so much State dollars now". He thinks that is very likely. While it is nice to be optimistic, we have to be cautious until we really see the dollars.

Lukich – The district is going to put together an internal team to begin to take a look at what we think should be the focus in D15 if and when any of this money becomes available. We are beginning to see a clear picture of the guidelines. It is not meant to be spent just anywhere by anyone. We think that

there are some specific needs that we would like to come to the Board when we have a clearer picture hopefully in the next 30 days. Then we can begin to talk to the Board about that. The administration has had a meeting, has another one set up and is beginning to look at where best we could use those federal dollars in the short-term without a long-term commitment from this BOE.

Quinn – Glad to hear Lukich say that because she thinks that we need to be very careful about how we spend it, if we have any money to spend. She is noticing a trend of not having any construction dollars, not having an educational technology dollars – so if we are spending in the realms of Title I/Special Ed, we need to be careful about how we do that so we don't get ourselves in a bigger bind.

Lukich – We have gone from a mode of "shovel ready" to "relax your shovels" (referring to capital projects).

Budget Adoption Calendar Discussion

Chapman – The district has had the practice of approving the budget in June of each year. He is not advocating a decision but legally we do not have to adopt our budget until the end of the first quarter. There are some factors, including obviously the pending bargaining and the stimulus package that may be affecting our budget. Remember this year we had to go back and make a few adjustments to our budget. He is not asking the Board to make a decision but it may want to have in the back of your mind that the timing of the budget adoption may come into play this year. We will probably know more in the next month or two. He wanted to put that on the table.

Adjournment

The Board adjourned at approximately 8:50 p.m. There was no executive session.

By: Jennifer Mondy fcwnews@comcast.net

Posted: Sunday, April 5th, 2009