

Spotlight on the Board

Notes from the District 15 School Board Meetings

October 15th, 2008

This was a Regular Board of Education meeting. Board member Wendy Rowden was absent.

2008 Annual Student Achievement Report

Mary Zarr, Asst. Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction – This year, the report includes not only the ISAT results but also the baseline data from our MAP tests. (Referred to slides during presentation.)

Student Demographics – Low Income, LEP (Limited English Proficient) and Minority populations continue their upswing

2nd Grade Reading Results – 91% were reading at 2nd grade level

ISAT Results – Reading - Grade 3 – 81% meets or exceeds, Grade 4 – 81%, Grade 5 – 85%, Grade 6 – 89%, Grade 7 85%, Grade 8 - 90%

ISAT Results – Math - Grade 3 – 93%, Grade 4 – 90%, Grade 5 – 92%, Grade 6 – 92%, Grade 7 – 91% and Grade 8 – 91%

ISAT Results – Science - Grade 4 – 85% and Grade 7 – 86%

Zarr – Would like to share with the Board and audience that late in fall 2007, the State of IL was informed by the federal government that they could no longer give the IMAGE tests. That had a dramatic effect on District 15. We had 1,067 students that were eligible to take the IMAGE test. All of them ended up taking the ISAT test in March. There is not a subcategory that does not contain an LEP (Limited English Proficient) student. Every single one of our subgroups was impacted by LEP students. In many cases, multiple subgroups could be impacted by the same child. A child could be in up to 4 or 5 subgroups and still reflect on your report.

Mobility Data on the ISAT Reading (slide – outlined below)

Different factors are going to affect reading scores. One of the questions that she has been asked over the years is – Can you tell us a bit more about the profile of the students who don't make AYP? So, we put together this chart and it talks about the 1,285 kids who did not meet in Reading this year.

The top line gives you how many students were in each grade that didn't meet. The second line talks about how many of those kids in that first row were in the district less than one year. The third line talks about how many of those kids might have been in the district but could have moved from school to school within the year that they took the test. This shows what factor mobility plays in their reading preparation and achievement. Also included - When did the kids who didn't meet, enter D15 for the first time. The bottom two numbers in each column are in bold because she felt that those are a dramatic amount of students to enter within a year to 1 ½ years of having to take a test. That the first time, 32 kids out of those 146 who didn't meet in 8th grade – the first time that they walked in D15 doors was sometime during their 7th or 8th grade year.

It should be noted that if a child comes in anytime during the two week period in which the ISAT tests are given – they must complete the test. For example, if the student comes in Monday of the 2nd week and you have them for one hour, you are giving them the test. Those bold numbers on the bottom (referring to slide) especially in grades 3, 4 and 7 – there are some pretty dramatic numbers in there in terms of how long we have our children. The bottom line of that top number in each column shows how many kids that are reflected in the number that did not meet in Reading – how many of them once they enter D15, left D15 and reentered at some point. Numerous children left and came back multiple times.

She hopes that the Board can see from this chart and our own trend data in both Reading and Math that if we can get the kids here and keep the kids here – we know they are going to get a great education. Mobility definitely has an effect on student achievement.

	8 th	7 th	6 th	5 th	4 th	3 rd	District 15
Did not meet/exceed In D15 less than 1 year and did not meet/exceed	146	226	157	211	267	278	1,285
In home school less than 1 year and did not meet/exceed	12	15	11	27	28	45	138
Entered D15 for 1st time (grade entered, # of students)	K-68	K-102	K-84	K-134	K157	K-190	
	1st-10	24	16	16	29	25	
	2nd- 6	14	10	9	19	13	
	3rd- 7	20	12	12	28	50	
	4th- 9	7	15	9	34		
	5th- 4	15	7	31			
	6 th -10	23	13				
	7th-16	21					
	8th-16						
Withdrew from D15 and Then reentered	11	69	46	47	66	62	301

AYP Math Results

Zarr – Even though the IMAGE test was pulled, our students were able to exceed in the math area. Most of our subgroups were able to maintain with no significant difference where they were the year before. It should be noted that one of the reasons that we may see some growth in Math where we saw some significant dips in Reading is that as an accommodation on the ISAT test – Special Ed & LEP students could have the Math test read to them. They could not have the Reading test read to them.

Adequate Yearly Progress Report for the District as a Whole

To make your AYP you have to meet in every single category, in every single subgroup. This year, we did not meet in the area of LEP in Reading and did not meet in the area of Students with Disabilities for Reading. For this year, that does count the district as not making AYP because you must make it in every single performance category, you must make it in your attendance category and you must make it in your % of students tested.

Conclusions - Zarr – The loss of the option to take the IMAGE test did have a dramatic effect on our ISAT achievement scores particularly in the areas of Reading and Science. Reading because the students had to read the test completely by themselves. Science because 1,067 students were counted in our Science score in 4th and 7th grade that never could have been counted in it before because they did not take the science test as part of the IMAGE test.

Thinks that this hit us particularly hard and on behalf of all of those students in those subgroups that have made marked improvements for the 4 consecutive years prior to that – as you can see in your trend data on both AYP growth for subgroups in math and reading. Every single subgroup accelerated for the previous 4 years. Zarr thinks that they would have accelerated that same way for the 5th year.

Again, the district did not make AYP this year along with 8 of our individual schools not making AYP in Reading. Every one of our schools made AYP in Math, % of students tested and in attendance rates. Every subgroup represented on our AYP report includes LEP students.

Some Next Steps We are Working On

Zarr – Would like to publicly thank and acknowledge all of the work of Dr. Cheryl Wolfel, Dr. Maria McClurkin this summer working with our principals on data digs, principal forums and working so hard to put together extended day centers at the schools listed (TJ, KH, CR, LL, JA, VL, LS, CS, WCJH, SRP, GMS). Extended day centers are where we are actually extending the school day. We have Homework Centers where the kids are receiving targeted instruction for that hour and a half instead of just being monitored while they are doing their homework. We will still have a continuation of our homework

centers at the Palatine Opportunity Center (POC), PNR in Rolling Meadows, Sundling and Plum Grove. We want to increase transition and opportunities for LEP students. We are piloting an AVID program at WCJH which is a targeted study skills program at the JH level where we can catch those kids who have the ability but where teachers have seen/and data shows that they are underperforming.

We are phasing in a literacy coaching model that will improve classroom instruction for all readers. Continuing to research and preview best practice intervention programs for our struggling readers in grades 3 through 8. And increasing staff development in the areas of use of data to target instruction, differentiated instruction, writing instruction, and daily 5 reading instruction, best practice instructional strategies for working with students, progress monitoring and data collection and extended response and comprehension strategies.

Ref: AVID – <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/AVID>
Daily Herald, 10/16/08 – “Dist. 15: Change in test led to low scores”
www.fcwpta.org/pdf/Daily_Herald_101608_ISAT_results.pdf

Questions/Discussion -

Board President Gerald Chapman – Relevant to the report, the two subgroups that did not make AYP – that is a significant issue for us in developing strategies. However next year, the target that you indicated on your chart goes up another 7.5% to 70%. Are the strategies that you developed targeted at not only bringing that group up to our goal of the 70%? **Zarr** – Yes, actually we work a couple of years out. How are they going to look two years out and which students do we need to move forward.

Board Member Kelly Keenan – It was said that some of the schools that decreased much more than others was due to not taking the IMAGE test. A population of the children stopped taking the IMAGE test and started taking the ISATs. **Zarr** – There were some kids that took the IMAGE test at every one of our schools. **Keenan** – She was looking at Marion Jordan and all of their numbers went up except for one. Don't they have a significant population of children that would have taken the IMAGE and instead took the ISATs? **Zarr** – They would not have a significant population. **Keenan** – There are two or 3 classrooms. **Zarr** – Of Kindergarteners. Remember ISAT tests are only 3rd through 8th graders.

Keenan – On one of the slides called Baseline MAP Reading for Fall 07 to Spring 08. It was the target growth vs. the actual growth. Knows that we collect numbers, projected results and knows we get actual results. While this growth chart is great, she would like to look at the numbers of actual results vs. projected results. Not the growth – the actual results. Whatever is easier for Zarr – by school or by grade. She is concerned about – it is great that all 2nd graders are reading at a 2nd grade level in 2nd grade. But she is guessing that a big chunk of those 2nd graders can read at a 3rd, 4th, 5th grade level. If their ability is showing that they can read at a 5th grade level but reading at a 3rd grade level, it looks great in these reports but we are actually failing them. Maybe the opposite is true too. Maybe we are going to have a negative gap there. Keenan would like to get a report showing actual results vs. projected results in growth. Not where they are projected to grow, where they are projected to be.

Board member Nancy Lee Carlson – The test is a snapshot on one day and we are already “teaching to the test” unfortunately. A great deal of time is spent making sure we are prepared for the tests that the state has decided we are now going to be taking. It would be ideal to be able to have a child reviewed over 4 or 5 days every month. She looks at all of this testing and the difference in testing – we have some problems on a larger scale here. One is our Reading issue and the issue of our students who have to read the test which before they couldn't. It makes a huge impairment on many students. We have a population of students that are not being served properly and we are trying to grasp how we are going to serve all of our students on both ends. Thinks that this very monumental task comes at a point where she doesn't know where we have the staff to serve every student at every point.

Keenan – Says that we already have this data (that she is asking for). Has seen the data with the previous Curriculum director (Karen Hindman) and Keenan knows that we have it. This is just one snapshot here and we are making all of these projections. She is talking about reaching out to every

single student and figuring out where they should be, trying to get them there. You cannot determine where you are by AYP. AYP is not a good measure of how well we are doing. How well we are doing is evaluating each student and making sure they are capable of learning everything that they can learn.

Chapman – Asked Zarr if she knew the information that Keenan is asking her to get? **Zarr** – Yes

Board member Sue Quinn – She liked what Zarr said at the beginning about how it is not so much that we learn how to take MAP tests but use them. The using of this information in the classroom to target instruction is what it should be all about. Thinks that this is a great start and thinks the growth numbers do help us to understand where kids can be going or should be going. She would like to see more information about the growth numbers. What these kids that are not meeting their growth targets – what they look like in terms of the breakdown. Not just by our subgroups but how many of these kids are already ahead but are not growing. How many kids are behind and not growing? Get a handle on that population because she thinks that helps us direct our efforts in instruction in targeting the groups that need the most help.

Zarr – Wanted to wrap up by saying to make it clear – in terms of the growth targets that Keenan is asking about. That is what she thinks every administrator, educator, teacher, parent wishes for every child that we could truly know what every individual child is capable of. Then put all of our resources – human and financial – into moving every child to that level. If there was something out there that could do that, we would all want to go to that. It is important to understand that what we have here are two different companies that measure that two different ways. When we had the ITBS (test), we took the cognitive based on your cognitive test. They figured out what your growth model should look like and then did you hit your growth target. Now we have the MAP, you get a RIT score and your projected RIT score, and then you get your growth target. Advised Keenan that what we have is the same product of two different companies and it is all based on the very first assessment that the child makes in that two part model. Did you get that individual child at their best time, on their best day? There is always going to be that potential for individuality of a child. What helps the district with MAP over time is that by giving it several times a year and every year, we should start to see those playing fields level off a little bit where a child is not going up and down.

Keenan – Hears what Zarr is saying but still thinks we need to do the best we can. The old method didn't use one test to try to figure it out. You took a number of different tests to arrive at – this is where we think you are projected to be. With the MAP, you are only taking one (test). There has to be a way to do it because if you take your child to an outside tutor, they can do it very quickly for you. Doesn't understand why we had it before and now hearing, we can't do that. Wanted to know if she could get the information for the next meeting?

Superintendent's Goals

D15 Superintendent Daniel Lukich – Wants to weigh in on this discussion and a couple of things that Zarr left us with in terms of "Next Steps". He told the Board to pay particular attention to those next steps. Lukich said that this is an imperfect game, the whole purpose of testing certainly at the national level. This discussion is a healthy one because what it does and what it says is – This district does care about every child. As Board members you care, as administrators we care and the Department of Instruction. But being as imperfect as it is, we keep working at wanting to get better at this.

We knew that these results were coming, knew that they were going to be less than what this district wanted to achieve last year. What he has seen since he has been here is a very committed department, a very committed set of principals both elementary and junior high. People started coming back this summer knowing that the results were something that needed to be worked on for one really good reason. They wanted to start on Day One knowing who the kids were, so that no day and no time was going to be wasted in this district and this district's resources would not be wasted. They wanted to target and differentiate the instruction to do everything possible to help these kids. Lukich thinks that the focus that has been put on will render better results next year. Not perfect results but hopefully improved results.

One of the goals that the Board gave him as a superintendent is simply this – Improve student achievement in ELL and those not making target. That has been our discussion over the last several minutes. Referred to a handout given to the Board and advised that they can see what the department (of instruction), the principals and teachers have started doing beginning day one this year. The outcome statement is very simple – By May, increase by 10% students meeting targets in reading and math as measured by MAP data. By 2009, Hispanic, LEP and subgroups will increase student achievement in reading to reflect at least 70% (of students) meeting or exceeding state standards according to 2009 AYP growth. That is a very lofty aspiration on the part of this district.

For those of us (on the Board) sitting around here in 2009/2010, who knows what the results will be because the outside environment – Springfield – and the inside environment – District 15 – changes.

Citizens Address the Board

Sally Smith – Lake Louise parent

Spoke before the Board last month, repeated her comments concerning large class sizes within the district and presented an additional 240 petitions. Smith said that no one she approached refused to sign the petition unless they were district employees. She said that multiple assistant principals, superintendents, teachers and other district employees encouraged the petitioning and had expressed a sincere desire or demand for smaller class sizes. Smith will continue petitioning, residents want their voices heard, parents are angry and feel cheated when their children end up in large classrooms. These voters will align themselves with Board members who share their passion (for small class sizes). Asked the Board to act swiftly to consider each classroom/grade level and reduce target class sizes, provide additional program assistant hours and ultimately place caps on class sizes to ensure equal opportunity for teachers and students.

Proposed 2008 Tax Levy

Chapman – As the Board knows, we are limited in terms of our tax levy to CPI or 5%. The request is higher than that but obviously that request would not be made.

Rebecca Allard, Asst. Superintendent for Business – (presented a few slides for the audience's purposes which summarizes the materials that were included in the Board packet) There are some legal requirements that the district is required to do to file a tax levy. A public hearing must be held if the levy exceeds 5%. It is called a "Truth in Taxation" hearing. It is currently scheduled for Wednesday, December 10th at the Regular Board meeting. Everything we do from a financial standpoint is governed by state statute. The proposed tax levy sets forth the maximum receipts we can receive in a given tax year. It is limited and enacted by the property tax extension act. Historically a school district will request an amount in excess of what it expects to receive for one reason only. To make sure we bring in the maximum tax dollars that we are entitled to. As Chapman said, the tax levy is pretty much limited by the CPIU. (Showed a slide of the history of what that has been.) The calculation for the 2008 levy is the December 2007 CPIU which was 4.1%. The levy that was just extended and used in the calculation of the tax bills that are due November 3rd was a factor of 2.5%. As you can see (on the slide) as you go back through the years, it fluctuates from year to year. Because we are a district that is dependent on the local property tax for its operation, it is important from a fiscal standpoint and from her perspective, that we do achieve the dollars we are looking for. Because the tax extension was just filed by the county clerk, this is probably the first time that you are seeing what the actual looks like. We will actually receive in our capped funds, our operating funds - \$99,133,079. That is 3.8% greater than the 2006 tax extension. We are asking for a 19.68% increase in the levy but that really again is just a number. Because what we actually expect to receive is about 5.05% given that the CPIU factor is 4.1% They then give you a factor formula that calculates in any new construction that may be beneficial to and has occurred in the taxing bodies in the district. We think that when all is said and done, a year from now that we will realize \$104,139,301. She goes back to that phrase "Truth in Taxation" - we are before you as a Board tonight asking you to make a request for tax dollars. It is based on assumptions that we will not know until a year from now. When the county clerk does its extension, we usually get some preliminary numbers in July/August. The levy was finalized between mid to late September and the tax bills are currently on the streets. Again, we are predicting what is going to happen in this economy. It is our best guess. We are asking for dollars that exceed what we

anticipate receiving when all is said and done. It is make sure that we have the available resources to do what we do in this district.

Carlson – This is such a sad situation, nothing we can do about it.

Quinn – She is uncomfortable with the 19% number because it is out of touch with the reality of the situation. She understands completely that we need to ask for more than we are capped at because we want to capture any new construction that might happen. Thinks that may impact us more, not this year but next year because it is in arrears a year. The impact of what has been going on for the past year in the economy is not going to be felt by us for another year. So we need to think about how to plan ahead for that. It seems to her that the district should be asking for something a little more reasonable, reasonably close to what we actually get so it is not confusing to the public. As if we are asking for 19%, there is no possibility of us getting that. Last year, we asked for 10%. Asked if she needs to make an amendment (to change the percentage)?

Chapman – Asked Allard - there is a suggested motion in here that does two things. It sets the amount and the date for the hearing. Does that have to be approved tonight? **Allard** – yes.

Chapman – Dilemma that we face is that based on the projected levy, if we as a board decide that this amount is too high and unattainable and do as we did last year and set it at 10%. Does the resolution have to be modified? **Allard** – Replied that the modifications can be made. **Chapman** – when we get to that part of the agenda, Quinn can make an amendment.

Allard – Would like to comment that next year, we will come back and ask for 19% or greater because there is a TIF coming off – a large TIF next year.

Chapman – Wanted to make a comment for the sake of the audience. The fact that we might ask for that unusual large amount has no impact on individual homeowners' taxes. The TIF's are properties the village identified and froze the amount the school district gets over a relatively long period of time. When that TIF (tax increment financing) ends, then the school district can levy against those properties at its current rate and it is treated like new property. So even if we ask for a large amount, it doesn't mean that we are expecting that large amount to apply to all of our individual home owners.

Carlson – Added that with that large amount, it will go through several appeals.

Lukich – Question for Allard – does the difference between the 19% and the 10% whatever the Board might choose to do, does that compromise the potential revenue for the district? **Allard** – No it doesn't. To be honest with you, the formula sets forth what we will actually get. The statute says that we have to go through this process. In actuality, a county clerk extends the taxes due based upon the formula.

Lukich – So it is in the best interest of the district to capture as much money as reasonable.

Carlson – Added, or possible. **Chapman** – By the nature of the cap, it doesn't make it reasonable.

Board member Tim Millar – Wanted to comment that in the past, we actually did come up short because of the new construction.

Class Size – Parameters and Procedure

Ref: **Class Size and Configuration Discussion Executive Summary** (D15 document)

www.fcwpta.org/pdf/d15_101508_class_size_discussion.pdf

Chapman – Referred to information provided in the Board packet and stated that there is no question that the Board is sympathetic to the issue of class size. The dilemma is one of available funds which was just discussed relevant to the tax cap. The district cannot manufacture funds beyond what the state allows us to gather and that is compounded by the fact that state aid has not kept up with our additional costs. Another significant issue was the failed referendum two years ago (February 2005). It was made clear to parents at that time that if the referendum failed, the Board (and he stated that he was not a member of the Board at that time) made it clear to the people in the community that there was going to be class size issues. While we are both sympathetic to the teachers, students and parents, we have limited funds. If you look at the allocation of funds within the district as we develop our budget, it is extremely high in the way of using our funds to hire the teachers that we are allowed to hire given the financial constraints that we have.

Keenan – These class sizes are lower than what we had before the referendum. That first year after the failed referendum (and she doesn't think she was on the Board), class sizes went up for one year and then the very next year, they were brought down again. **Chapman** – What he is saying is that we do not have the ability to raise our funds in order to reduce class sizes. **Keenan** – Her only issue is that this had nothing to do with the referendum that failed. It is lower than what we had before the failed referendum.

Carlson – As it stands today, unless we have an increase in our taxes for this district, we will not be able to accomplish the goal of lower class sizes. Financially she doesn't see how the district is going to be able to do it. We have a tremendous amount of facility work (to do) as the facility study shows. Realistically in these very severe economic times, people will have to make a decision. Her heart goes out to everyone. When she grew up in the 50s, she and her sister went to a school with split schedules. There were too many children and not enough facilities. At some point, we will run into these same problems. Parents have to make a decision and taxpayers. And it is just not parents, it is taxpayers because the schools are only....people think it is just those kids. Whether you have children or not, it is immaterial. We need to make some hard decisions and it has to do with your wallet. The realistic part of it is that we spend most of our budget on salaries directly related to the education of our children. We are going to have some difficult decisions ahead to make in the next year. That is simply it. Signing petitions is wonderful, a tremendous American activity but we have to look at things. Carlson would love for somebody to come up and tell us how to pass the budget and get class sizes down given the parameters we have and the parameters we are facing today.

Millar – The options are obvious - a referendum and managing our contracts - 75% of our budget is our contracts. There are a lot of things that we could do. Looking at the past from a financial standpoint, we had the opportunity to have much lower class sizes had we been a little more prudent. Millar is not trying to cast anything on previous Boards but again - we still also need to manage it financially and responsibly. There is a lot of area where we can do that. There are different options. Obviously there is the referendum option but again, it has to be everything, it has to be a concerted effort to bring down class sizes. It is a big challenge. With facilities, if you don't have room (in the building) to expand by lower class sizes. That actually was a strange side effect of lowering class sizes that we did, all of a sudden we found ourselves without space. Again, we didn't think about it when we made that decision because we were really trying to get those class sizes down. We did a very effective job but again have to look at the big picture. Look at everything as a unit rather than taking just one thing and trying to fit that in. Can't be short-sighted, have to look long-term and really manage everything we have – all of our responsibilities and not just take one thing at a time. Regarding a referendum, if you don't solve the business model, we may have to ask for another one a few years after that.

Quinn – We have challenges academically that need to be addressed. Lowering class sizes is one approach but is probably the most expensive way we can attack the educational achievement. We have many other options. Zarr gave a list of everything we are already implementing. We need to aggressively go after our achievement goals and at the same time, we need to make sure the roof doesn't fall in. A good business model is helping us save money wherever we can to put those resources back in the classroom. Quinn doesn't think that the class size is the end all be all of everything. There is a whole lot more to the educational picture. We are trying to hit on all fronts. Wants to make sure our kids do have the education they need.

Chapman – This Board is committed to a long-term plan to take a look at all issues of education within the system. That begins not only with our facilities but with the use of our funds. That will begin with our Special meeting on Saturday morning (October 18th, 8 a.m., Sundling) and will continue with several others (meetings). Millar was talking about the impact that it (class sizes) has on facilities and that may affect the model that we use as to how kids are assigned to schools. We will be addressing that as we go through the year.

Keenan – Our enrollment is projected to decline over the next 4, 5 to 6 years. **Lukich** – That is one scenario. Asked Garwood for clarification on the chart provided to the Board. He asked if Special Ed students from other districts were included. (Garwood – Replied no). That is another piece that affects facilities.

Millar – Wanted to go back to class size (Board discussion on Calendar had begun); we never really discussed whether the (current) model we feel is working? By not commenting, do you (Board members) believe that the current model is working or not? He thought that would be part of the discussion. **Chapman** – He feels that it is part of the entire aspect of what we talked about relevant to facilities. Thinks it is a complex issue.

Quinn - Agrees, she addressed that a little but perhaps didn't take it far enough. We need to talk about education and class size is one aspect of our educational achievement and how we are going to achieve that. Yes we can look at it under the constraints of what we can afford to do right now. But the cost and the facilities impact is huge to doing something about class sizes. She would look first to doing what other things we can. (To Millar) Do you want to answer the question – Do our class sizes now meet our educational objectives? Well, we are not meeting all of our educational objectives right now but she doesn't think that class size is the one and only answer to meeting those educational objectives. We need to do everything that we can to do that. Quinn thinks that when we look at the facilities closer, that is going to be a piece of it but really the numbers are difficult to get around - One million dollars to just lower one child in the classrooms across the district. That is a very large number.

Millar – (when asked what he thought) replied that providing for staff development is one thing we can do and they do a good job with matching the teachers to the situation. You could have a class of 15 kids and if it is not the right teacher – the class of 30 kids will perform better than the class of 15. There is no real basis for saying if you drop (class size) by 2 (students), you are going to have improvement in performance. That is the challenge for him.

Carlson – Believes in the holistic approach to education. We can't do this piecemeal. Thinks that after Dr. Chapman, possibly after the Facilities Study – somewhere into the January/February calendar when we start making some decisions - we have to put each piece together and come up with what we think the D15 puzzle is. **Chapman** – Agrees. He thinks that the impact of just reducing class sizes by one student --- that is our budget. It has to be reviewed for our budget. Hates to say that it is financially driven, but given the limited resources we have that's what we have.

Quinn – We have to use our money to get the best educational bang for the buck. Thinks that traditionally, we have decided year by year what can we do for class size based on this year's budget for next year. We had sort of a floating need, what can we do, what is the best resource allocation for this year. We are going to have the larger context this year because we have the longer, bigger facilities planning. It does put another large factor in there that we need to take a close look at. Thinks we are in agreement. **Chapman** – It is a complex issue. Everyone here has empathy for the issue and hopes that is clear.

2009/10 and 2010/11 Projected School Calendars

Chapman – In the Board packets are the projected school calendars for the next two years. The superintendent's thought is that we ought to not look at this in isolation but to also look at them for two years' worth of planning. We also want to coordinate with the high schools' calendars. We will see those calendars as part of our packet next time. The Board will revisit this at the next BOE meeting.

Consent Calendar

Item G: Resolution – Truth in Taxation Law

Chapman – It is two-fold. One is to establish our hearing date in December and the other is to set an amount for the levy. Our Asst. Superintendent for Finance (Allard) recommended a percentage and some of our Board members expressed concern. If we look at 10% like last year and if there is a TIF that comes off, what if we have set that % too low – of course we do not know all of the limits.

Quinn – Asked if there was any TIF that is going to get us a 19% increase because she would like to know when that is going to happen? **Chapman** – He doesn't say it is 19%, it may be 10%.

Quinn – Even 10%? **Carlson** – yes, she thinks there will be one, especially next year.

Allard – Next year definitely. **Quinn** – Is talking about this year.

Allard – Has been trying to get accurate information.

Chapman – Here is the dilemma that we face. The village determines when the TIF comes off and goes on the tax rolls for next year. **Quinn** – Are talking about the Dundee/Rand Road TIF.

Keenan – No, it is a TIF for downtown Palatine.

Carlson – She does believe in Truth in Taxation. However, given the fact that we don't know (exactly), she would rather be high than low especially since we have no idea what is going to happen in the Assessors Office and what those numbers are going to be. Since we have a cap and it comes off the assessor at a certain value. We cannot appeal the evaluations, they can appeal the other way – we have no way to appeal it on our end to say that it is too low. Agrees with Quinn that in this instance it is not going to be 19%, she doesn't know it is going to be 10%, doesn't know it will be 12%

Chapman – What we set tonight can be adjusted downward when we adopt it (the levy) in December. If we are higher than our expectations, we will know that then and we can adopt a more reasonable levy.

Quinn – Motion to amend it (the levy) to be 10% Keenan seconded the motion.

Chapman – Asked if there was any other discussion?

Carlson – Made a motion to amend it to 15%. She is making an amendment to Quinn's amendment. Since we will know that number within a very short period of time, what it made actually be. If it is 10.1% she would hate to lose the .1%. She would highly doubt in her years of vast experience on TIF and assessment work – it will probably be less than 15%. She has been involved in the relocation of certain individuals in that area.

Keenan – Nancy in your professional opinion, I think you can say that it is highly unlikely that it would be more than 10%. There is no way it is going to be more than \$5m dollars.

Carlson – She doesn't think it is, would rather wait. We can bring it down in December; we can't bring it back up. **Chapman** – Has two things to mention. We can reduce it in December. There is no question in his mind that we will. And as Millar indicated, in prior years we underestimated as a Board and never got that money back. Ekeberg seconded the Carlson's amendment.

Vote on amendment to modify the Truth in Taxation Resolution and the modification would be 15% Approved 5:1 (Keenan voting no, Rowden absent)

Vote to modify the resolution to 15% and direct the Asst. Superintendent to modify the resolution for appropriate signatures. Unanimously approved.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:55 p.m. The Board did not go in to an Executive Session.

Posted online: Friday, October 17th, 2008

Jennifer Mondy

fcwnews@comcast.net