

**OAK PARK AND RIVER FOREST HIGH SCHOOL**  
**201 North Scoville Avenue**  
**Oak Park, IL 60302**

**Committee of the Whole**  
**September 13, 2016**

A Committee of the Whole meeting was held on September 13, 2016. Mr. Weissglass called the meeting called to order at 6:39 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members present were Fred Arkin, Jennifer Cassell, Thomas F. Cofsky (arrived at 8:06 p.m.), Dr. Steve Gevinson, Dr. Jackie Moore, Sara Dixon Spivy, and Jeff Weissglass. Dr. Joylynn Pruitt, Interim Superintendent, and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board of Education and FOIA Officer.

Also present were Tod Altenburg, CSBO; Amy Hill, Director of Research and Assessment, Philip M. Prale, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Nathaniel L. Rouse, Principal; Karin Sullivan, Director of Communications and Community Relations; Dr. Gwen Walker-Qualls, Director of Pupil Support Services; and Sheila Hardin, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Chair.

**Visitors:** Gabe Darley, Riley Egan, P.J. Milionis, Grace Gleason, and Katie O'Shea, students; Regina Topf, Director of Student Activities; Yoko Schmadeke, Peter Quinn, and Christina Smith, OPRFHS faculty; Ginger Colamussi Student Assistance Program Coordinator; and Jennifer Hoffmann, Director of Student Services; Michael Romain of the Wednesday Journal.

**Public Comments**

None

**Minutes**

Mr. Weissglass moved to approve the Committee of the Whole Committee meeting of August 17, 2016; seconded by Dr. Moore. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

**Student Travel Experiences**

Dr. Gevinson introduced Ms. Topf who reported that OPRFHS students had traveled to China, Taiwan, Ecuador, Germany, Japan, and Costa Rica during spring break and over the summer. A common theme of the students was how these trips were life-altering experiences and enhanced learning experiences.

China and Taiwan

Gabe Darley, Riley Egan, and PJ Milionis spoke about their trip to China and Taiwan. They toured Taiwan for seven days and then spent five days in Beijing. They visited the CKS Memorial Hall and the landmark Taipei 101 Building. They drove to the northeast coast of Pitous Cape and the Nanya Rocks Formation. They took a train to Taroko National Park, brewed tea at a tea farm, and visited the Fo Guang Shan Buddhist Monastery. They went to night markets in almost every city they stayed, and these visits were a highlight of the cultural experience. In China, they took day trips to tourist attractions such as Tiananmen Square, the Forbidden City, Temple of Heaven, and the Great Wall.

One student stated that the trip was a life-changing experience as they were forced to use the language they had learned from the class. In Beijing, the accent is much different, and the people speak faster than in Taiwan.

Sevilla, Spain

In July of 2016, 20 students and three chaperones traveled to Southern Spain. This trip is the third time it has been offered. The students stayed with Spanish families, studied language and culture at Centro

Mundo Lengua (a school owned and operated by alumni David Hirsch, an OPRFHS graduate of 1989), and went on many excursions. They toured Sevilla, Granada, and Cadiz. The students stayed with host families, attended a school, where they made life-long friends and lived the Spanish life (making paella and surfing). They became more confident in speaking Spanish. One student applied for a scholarship to attend school in Spain.

### Ecuador

Eighteen students and three OPRFHS faculty members traveled to Quito, Ecuador over Spring Break this past year. The group stayed in a bed and breakfast and had a private tour guide and bus daily. Each day was a new adventure. They visited a local high school and befriended students, and they continue to communicate via social media. They toured downtown Quito during the Good Friday parade and learned about the religious culture and the history of Ecuador. They tasted delicious food where each meal came with rice, vegetables, and freshly squeezed juice. They also went on adventures that included rafting, ziplining, and hiking through the wilderness and even got to pet an alpaca! They took a gondola to the top of a mountain with breathtaking views and enjoyed a swim in hot water springs. One of the students' favorite things to do was to shop at local markets to make sure their loved ones at home received unique cultural souvenirs. One student had planned to study liberal arts and Spanish, but now this student wants to study medicine and Spanish as a result of this trip.

Dr. Gevinson remarked that the students would carry these memories forever. Dr. Moore encouraged them to speak with their friends about these experiences.

### **Illinois Youth Survey Report**

Since 2006, on an every-other-year basis, OPRFHS has administered the Illinois Youth Survey (IYS) to sophomores and seniors. The survey asks questions about topics related to student health and safety. The primary local interest has been the students' responses related to alcohol and other drug use. This report, prepared by Amy Hill and Ginger Colamussi, provided a summary and visual displays of several key aspects of students' perceptions and self-reported substance use. The full data set from IYS was included. The report summarized the prevention and wellness plans for the 2016-17 school year as laid out by the Student Assistance Program Coordinator, Ginger Colamussi.

Note: A few years ago there was a great deal of concern about an open campus. Since that time and since the survey was initiated, it seems that in most areas, substance abuse has declined. The drug of choice continues to be alcohol, and there is an uptick in the use of marijuana. The survey also indicated that in almost every area but one, the student reported percentages were favorable. The one exception was around depression and suicide.

OPRFHS has administered this survey six times since 2016. Survey results in 2016 include 676 sophomores and 453 seniors. Some patterns emerge in the comparisons of 2016 data to 2014 and the longitudinal comparison from 2006-2016:

- Self-reported use in 2016 was lower across most of the named survey substances, both in comparison to 2014 and when compared to several prior survey years. (Fig. 1, 2, 3)
- Declines are larger for sophomores than for seniors for most substances except cigarettes, where there was a larger percent decline among seniors. (Fig. 1, 2, 3)
- While in both the short-term and the long-term reported marijuana use was lower among sophomores, reported use among seniors was higher. (Fig. 1, 2, 3)
- The percent of students reporting they were drunk or high at school in the past year is lower compared to 2014 and over the span from 2006-2016 (Fig. 4).
- Compared to their Illinois peers' 2014 data:

1. Smaller percentages of OPRFHS sophomores reported using cigarettes, alcohol, and inhalants (IYS 45, 47); driving under the influence of alcohol or marijuana (IYS 57); and binge drinking (IYS 47). A slightly higher percent reported marijuana use (IYS 45, 47).
2. Larger percentages of OPRFHS seniors reported using alcohol and marijuana (IYS 46, 48); binge drinking (IYS 48), and driving under the influence of marijuana (IYS 58). Lower percentages of OPRFHS seniors reported using cigarettes (IYS 46).
3. A higher percentage of OPRFHS seniors had a response pattern indicating they may benefit from an individual substance abuse assessment (IYS 60).
4. For both sophomores and seniors, OPRFHS smaller percentages of students reported bullying victimization across most categories (IYS 61-66) and dating violence (IYS 67).
5. Despite higher percentages of seniors reporting use, OPRFHS students report later “first use” ages for all substances, and lower percentages say they used a substance before age 15 (IYS 49, 50).
6. OPRFHS sophomore and senior responses were more positive for school climate measures (IYS 68, 69).

Taken as a whole, the data provided a mixed picture of the students’ experiences with substances. The downward trend for many substances is obviously good news, as are the declining rates of binge drinking and students being drunk or high at school. At the same time, rates of use among the seniors continue to surpass state averages.

The District is beginning to use this data to inform the programs and services being provided to students. The report highlighted trends and changes and also the data on the contributing factors for substance abuse to predict later substance abuse. The District is trying to identify factors that are most salient in the school and community and it is planning effective interventions. The factors that stand out are alcohol and marijuana. Marijuana has a low perception of risk and a low perception of parental disapproval. Students indicated that their perception was that adults had a more favorable attitude toward alcohol. The following school-wide programs to effect behavior change were highlighted from the report.

1. Project towards No Drug Abuse
  - 5 PE/Health teachers trained and 2 PE/Health teachers will pilot program
  - 12 classroom-based lessons on motivation, skills, and decision-making
2. Marijuana Prevention Communication Campaign
  - Objective: Increase the number of OPRFHS students who perceive marijuana use to be risky
  - Media materials posted every three weeks: Posters & bathroom stall newsletters
3. Healthy Youth Peer Educators (HYPE)
  - 23 students accepted and trained
  - Student-led classroom workshops, lunchtime activities, and special events
4. Operation Snowball
  - 20 student leaders, 20 faculty & staff volunteers, and 180 student participants
  - Annual leadership development and youth empowerment retreat weekend

The District is also offering programs and services for smaller groups of students, those students who are already engaged in substance abuse, which are:

1. Take Charge
  - ten sessions for 9th & 10th graders with attendance, academic, or behavioral challenges at risk of substance abuse
  - Focuses on personal self-management skills, general social skills, and drug resistance skills. Several using for groups of students and more individualized and intensive support for students.
2. Beyond the Binary & True Colors
  - Ongoing support groups for LGBTQ+ students at risk of substance abuse
  - Focuses on gender and sexuality exploration, support systems, and coping skills

The District will work to support parents and families via partnering with a community coalition to bring family skills, strengthening skills, etc. District 97 is piloting a program, and OPRFHS is in the planning stage. All of the programs being implemented are researched based and include international models of research and have outcomes in reducing heroin as well as drug and alcohol use. Heroin use was zero this year among high school students: it may have been 1% in a past year. The data does not identify abuse of specific prescription drugs such as drugs for ADHD, depression anxiety, etc.

Ms. Colamussi added that recently a medical marijuana store had opened up in Oak Park and this may contribute to the low disapproval rating. The program being implemented will include a differentiation between medical versus recreational use in the classroom workshops, as marijuana is not federally legal. The program focuses on getting information out to students, parents, families, and faculty and staff so that they can all continue these conversations.

Ms. Colamussi stated that many of the evidenced-based programs are new, in development, or are in the last year of the pilot phase. Moving forward with the IYS, the District will start to identify whether the evidenced-based programs are impacting IYS. IYS has been selected as a data point to target with intervention. All of the evidence-based programs already have developed evaluations.

Discussion ensued regarding whether the students at risk for substance abuse had anything to do with health and wellness and suicide, i.e., medicating themselves and whether this was being addressed with families and students? The District did discuss last year preparation for the 2016 school year and the gaps in the survey. The survey has less information on specific areas of mental health changes. A form can be submitted for individual questions, and some questions were identified and added about what factors were contributors and what coping and strategy skills were helping to teach and reinforce. A report on those questions has not been received as yet.

The District may ask for specific areas to be desegregated by race and gender. Were race and gender a factor when looking at the health and wellness of families concerning substance abuse and students being more lenient as they got older? One member felt this information would help gain a greater understanding of the students. Ms. Colamussi noted that there was a learning curve to work with IWAS administrators.

One member noted that the survey did not ask about sex and wondered why it did not. Another member noted that experimenting with alcohol can increase sexual activity. The administration was unsure. While the District is not surveying students about sexual activity on a large scale, the health curriculum does include some information about sex.

### **Course Proposals and Academic Catalog Changes for 2017-18**

Mr. Prale referred to his memorandum in the packet that explained the process of approving the course proposals and the Academic Catalog changes and then highlighted those changes. The Board of Education is the first to review these proposals. After this review, the proposals will be discussed with the internal and external community. These proposals will be reviewed again by the Board of Education at the October Committee of the Whole meeting. While DLT has reviewed this information, changes may still occur.

After a review of the course proposals, the Committee members asked the following questions:  
English

1. Which classes do these replace?
2. Has the District worked out how our students will qualify for the Triton courses?
3. Do these courses reinforce a tracking system for students, essentially funneling them to Triton

instead of providing the 4-year college option?

#### FINE AND APPLIED ARTS DIVISION

##### Visual Arts Department

1. Why is History of Film in the FAA department?

#### THEATRE/BROADCASTING DEPARTMENT

1. What has changed from last year's proposal?
2. What effect might this happen on Leadership and Launch? What numbers of student might be affected?
3. With the growth of performing arts in the community and the high demand for shows and places to perform can the District still address that need?
4. Can the District connect the Leadership and Launch classes to the Acting classes?

#### BUSINESS EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

1. Need more development of the internship and an understanding of the cost factors.

#### HISTORY DIVISION

1. Could the hip hop course be interdisciplinary and involve sociology, history, political influence.

#### MATHEMATICS DIVISION

1. Does the District have any data on the effectiveness or at least the impact of the extended algebra?

Course as long as it wants to apply the ide to pre-algebra and algebra 10?

2. Is there an explicit connection between the revision to computer science and the ad for Android apps?

#### PHYSICAL EDUCATION DIVISION and SCIENCE DIVISION

1. Is the rationale to move this out of summer school strong enough?
2. How would teaching health in the 9<sup>th</sup>-grade influence FTE or other courses offered?
3. Many parents and students have an experience in the summer before ninth grade where students Take health, become oriented to the high school, are placed in an untracked environment. Removing health from summer school removes that experience unless we offer another experience that brings students into the school in a similar way. What will be offered?
4. Please explain the online health class. What is the course? How does it measure up to the District's needs?
5. What is the plan for making health a legitimate wellness-focused class?

#### SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY DIVISION

1. How is the District targeting students of color and female students for the new course and PLTW? Courses in general?
2. More information about the relationship with Triton and the high school are needed.

#### GENERAL QUESTIONS

1. What is the effect of all this on FTE?
2. What is management responses to the need to stem the rise of FTE?
3. How are comprehensive decisions made about the course?
4. How is the larger sense of the needs of the students settled?
5. How does the District determine what experiences students should have as a result of their experiences at the high school?

Discussion ensued about the impetus for freshman study hall. Originally, freshman study hall was implemented as a component of cost containment, with the concession of musical performance. One member argued that theater arts should be treated just as the musical arts. The Leadership and Launch and the peer leadership experiences should not be the reason they would not be treated the same way.

Students may take up to four online courses for select electives from Brigham Young University, etc. Seventy-five students are presently taking online courses. One member felt the Health Class was very important and was happy that it would not be an online option.

### **Update on Culture, Climate and Behavior Committee**

Ms. Spivy noted that the work of the committee had been slowed as its focus has changed because of SB 100. The next meeting will occur September 27. Discussion ensued about how to start the discussion regarding Restorative Justice and how to communicate that the District is looking at the possibilities of having restorative practices as part of the school's culture and climate using the resources within this community, i.e., people willing to help at Dominican University and the University of Illinois. Dr. Pruitt stated that DLT had conversations about the work around equity. Today, Mr. Prale and Ms. Sullivan had a writing session about the work being accomplished regarding equity. CCB is critical. The last CCB meeting was powerful, as it allowed people to say what they wanted to happen. However, change does not happen overnight. The work of the CCB will go beyond 18 months. Before the messaging, the District must craft what it will look like and a plan at this time would not be prudent. Ms. Sullivan and Dr. Pruitt met with Dr. Kelley of District 97 about how she had crafted her listening tours. The CCB heard a voice that said it is time for action. Dr. Moore stated that people must be made aware of its work. The District should have a dedicated space on its website that shows the District's commitment to making a positive change just as it does for the pool and the referendum. Dr. Gevinson concurred. Dr. Moore stated that the experience at the committee needs to be broadly shared with the community.

The Committee recessed at 8:21 p.m. and resumed at 8:27 p.m.

### **Compensation Philosophy: Merit Pay**

Mr. Altenburg and Ms. Horton met with Tom McMullen of Korn Ferry on August 11, 2016, to review the work that had been completed by the District thus far in the area of compensation philosophy. Merit pay was part a component of the compensation philosophy. During the discussion of the pros and cons of merit pay, it was noted that a performance management process must be developed which includes the combination of formal and informal processes and practices that help drive and focus employees on outcomes, goals, activities, decisions and behaviors that will produce positive short, medium and long-term results for the organization and would take approximately 6 months to develop.

#### PROS (if the process is well managed)

- Clarifies what is important in the organization
- Linked to annual performance review
- Effective reinforcement method for motivating employees to perform at peak
- Drives organizations performance and high productivity
- Promotes healthy competition
- Encourages all to work hard to achieve best and deliver results
- Gives recognition and reward for job well done
- May help with recruitment of achievement-oriented employees
- Helps to retain best employees

#### CONS (if the process is not well managed)

- Subjective v. objective
- Causes conflict among employees
- Encourages competition v. collaboration
- Biased and leaves room for favoritism
- May lead to employees feeling unmotivated and unimportant
- Inconsistencies among raters
- Teaming/collaboration may get lost; if personal goals override team goals

In the education world, employees know who and what the increases are. A couple of schools in the NWPA allocate a percentage, but the increase is not tied to goals set ahead of time. Merit pay is a business sector model, and some schools have it for non-affiliated personnel. Supervisors make a recommendation of merit pay for work well done. It happens sporadically. Merit pay would be a significant culture shift as it is not common in school systems. The con list would come to a head if it were not well managed. Discussion ensued about what parameters would be used to minimize the subjectivity. The teacher evaluation tool is interrelated: Everyone has the same training so that they have the same conceptual understanding of the pieces of the evaluation tool. Dr. Pruitt's responsibility is to evaluate all members of DLT, and she is meeting with them about the status of their goals from their last evaluation. While some goals would be consistent, i.e., management, leadership, supervision of personnel, individual goals for the year would be pertinent to each of their roles and responsibilities. A performance-based evaluation is different from a merit-pay evaluation. Teachers have performance-based evaluations. Merit pay would be above and beyond the work based on the performance-based evaluation. Merit pay starts with performance goals, and then their assessment, which then drives the reward.

Mr. Weissglass noted that he had originally raised questions about two provisions in the philosophy. For several months, he had asked about whether merit pay would be part of the compensation philosophy. He did not believe there had been agreement on merit pay, and he was very skeptical. Mr. Arkin had referred to a meeting before he was elected in 2015 at which time the HAY group reported on the compensation/work which included an implementation plan. Compensation was a key component at that time. He was disappointed that this was still being discussed. Mr. Cofsky reflected that when he joined the Board of Education, it had a goal to put in place a performance-based compensation for the administration and this Board of Education kept that goal, which led to a meeting with the HAY Group. It helped get compensation in order by putting together a structure. A presentation on the second and third phases was made, which stated that performance management is a critical part of paying for performance. He believed the District had changed its direction.

Dr. Gevinson remembered that after the new Board of Education was elected, it approved a certain percentage for everyone in the administration and that was the reason for wanting a philosophy that would reflect performance in pay. He did not believe they had said "merit pay" but it does seem to be a merit pay concept. If the concept were managed well, how would the model be transferred? Would it be the superintendent's responsibility? Would it be performance coaching? Dr. Pruitt stated that Illinois has an administrative tool that relates to the building principal. While the development of a tool would be a group process, include the Board of Education, as well as other tools, the actual management would be her responsibility to meet with individuals, monitor, collect data, have summative conferences in February, notify individuals, etc. In her past work, administrative compensation was aligned with whatever the teachers received, based on the completion of their goals. If the teachers received 3%, the administration received 2.5 to 3% based on the accomplishment of their goals. The merit increase is an addition to the pay increase. The key piece is to have a good performance-based tool, clear descriptors, and criteria about what has to be accomplished to eliminate subjectivity. This is done with the teacher evaluation tools and takes hours of training and interrelated reliability.

Dr. Pruitt noted that the common language is "performance-based evaluation" and national standards have descriptors. The word "merit" adds another context above and beyond the scope of the work. Performance evaluation is based on the normal scope of the work.

Discussion ensued about the Board of Education members' expectations. One member had thought that a performance-based tool would be used and if the rating were "needs improvement," support would be given, and the increase would not be as much as those who exceeded expectations. How would merit pay/bonuses be distributed? Where is the pool of money for merit increases? One member thought that

the originally proposed indicators would be used and that is why this member voted for it. The first step had been to normalize compensation to industry and market norms and then overlay it with a performance-based program. Another member had questioned #8 before it was adopted: "While base salary and base salary increases are the primary ways we offer compensation, variable pay (i.e., bonuses, incentives) may be offered in some departments of the District to meet external market conditions better as well as internal business needs." ET competes across many sectors and yet here competes mostly with the school environment. The ranges last year seemed to be working, even though not everyone felt they were in the right category, which created some upheaval. Is there some additional to layer on top or not, and if so, what would it be? If it were akin to bonuses, that would be uncomfortable. Another member stated that the compensation philosophy was meant for the administration and non-affiliated personnel and to provide an opportunity to consider merit pay in the form of bonuses ultimately. The HAY Group had presented a way of doing an assessment of the market. If the market reflects a 2% increase, an additional increase would be given because 1) where one is in the range, and 2) performance rating. The matrix has been completed, and an employee may get a 1%, 2% or 3% increase, depending on where they are in the range. Having strong performance management is critical. The people who are at the low end of the range get a higher increase and would get in range with 1 or 2 years. Each position was benchmarked at the beginning with a range been 75% to 125% of a certain number. Annually the outside consultant will do a poll of the NWPA schools and HAY's index of educational and nonprofit institutions on the general population as a whole. Increases would be set up in the matrix and are predetermined each year. The matrix says if one is in the first quartile, and performance factored in, those in the 75% to 100% range would receive a 1% increase, etc. If a person is at 80%, he/she will get a 2.3% increase. If a person is at 120%, he/she will get a 2% increase. If someone were on the low end and performed below expectations, he/she would get a 1% increase. If the expectations had been met, this person would get a 2% increase and if he/she exceeded the expectations, he/she would get a 3% increase. The ranges are wide and typically broken into four quartiles. The philosophy is that if one is in the first quartile at the low end of pay, the person is gaining much experience. If in the fourth quartile, that person has peaked at compensation.

One member talked about item 6, merit and performance. Slide 15 said, "Pay for performance" is not just about the base salary increases and incentive pay. It is about reflecting pay for performance in multiple rewards. It is about differentiated opportunities for promotions, career development, nonfinancial recognition and meaningful work opportunities. It is about career income levels, not just annual income differences." Because there are not many career ladders in the educational environment, how would the District provide an incentive for interesting or complex work and how effective would actual compensation be regarding dollars in motivating individuals and teams in reaching overall outcomes within this context?

One member stated that a standardized performance-based evaluation tool involves more than once a year check and coaching support. The superintendent should be directed to explore that aspect. People come to work in a school not just because of the dollars but because of the lifestyle aspects, so trying to talk about incentivizing someone to work beyond the expectations from a monetary standpoint is counter intuitive to a collaborative nature of a school setting. The performance-based assessments should show what they have done and how it fits within the goals of the institution and the accountability piece, which is based on the quality of performance. Promotion is limited within schools. Curriculum and Instruction is a one person department, yet the school revolves around instruction. Some classes have 20 students, and some have 35. It is about the performance of their work on which they are evaluated. A performance-based tool is needed that will evaluate individual performance. Bonuses and incentives would be paid for the work that is beyond the scope of the work.

Dr. Pruitt clarified the rating system. If a rating of 4 is what is expected of everyone, then it would warrant a full pay increase. Normally administrators do not get more of an increase than the classroom

teacher. However, at one time every administrator got the same increase as the teachers. Then the Board of Education decided to show that it valued teachers and gave administrators a lower percentage increase. Bonuses and incentives reflect work that is above and beyond and are intended to cover situations such as the one in the ET Department.

Discussion continued. Removing the word “merit” and replacing it with performance-based compensation and using a tool that has a scale of performance to say the levels are being met is the best way to manage. One member felt the expectation would be that the “meets expectations” rating would be the standard. The “exceeds” rating would be for those who do something extraordinary, which would be defined and not subjective. The District must be cognizant of those not meeting expectations and hold them accountable. What performance and improvement plans for those less than successful would be put in place to help them meet expectations?

It was the consensus of the majority of the Committee of the Whole members for the administration to work on a document that reflected the conversation and to bring it forward to the Committee in October.

The Committee members wanted more clarity on the statement made at the end of page 14: “The best organizations have a higher percentage of employees that do not receive annual base salary increases and incentives.”

**Presentation of Educational Technology Equipment Purchase**

The Committee of the Whole unanimously recommended that the Educational Technology Equipment Purchase be moved forward to the full Board of Education for approval under the consent agenda at the September 22 meeting.

**Presentation of 2016-2017 Budget**

The Committee of the Whole unanimously recommended that the 2016-2017 Budget be moved forward to the Board of for adoption at its regular September 22 meeting. Mr. Altenburg reported that the FY17 Proposed Budget reflects updated revenues and expenditures since the FY17 Tentative Budget was presented on August 17, 2016. The public hearing and subsequent recommendation for adoption of the FY17 Proposed Budget are scheduled for the regular September 22, 2016, Board of Education meeting.

Revenues have increased by \$738,978 or 0.9% and were reflected as follows:

Local Sources:	Amount
TIF Surplus Distribution	\$ 334,178
Food Service Sales	159,267
~ Total Local	\$ 493,445
State Sources:	
General State Aid	\$ 66,720
Driver Education Reimbursement	40,537
Special Education Orphanage Reimbursement	(11,041)
Food Service State Reimbursement	13,878
~ Total State	\$ 110,094
Federal Sources:	
Title I	\$ 27,681

IDEA	33,758
Title II	289
Food Service Lunch Reimbursement	69,607
Food Service Breakfast Reimbursement	4,104
~ Total Federal	\$ 135,439
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	<b>\$ 738,978</b>

Expenditures have increased by \$537,022 or 0.6%. The change in expenditures represents approved personnel recommendations including new hires and replacements thru August 25, 2016:

Education Fund:	Amount
Salaries	\$ 455,026
Benefits	2,933
~ Total	\$ 457,959
Food Service Fund:	
Salaries	\$ 5,991
Illinois Municipal Retirement/Social Security Fund:	
Benefits	\$ 73,072
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>\$ 537,022</b>

PMA projected a 5.9% in surplus and the District projects a 2.7% in surplus in the operating funds. The difference in the variance in the projection model in is the education fund. The amount of money to be received from TIF income has been decreased. Also \$751,000 from federal funds has not be received. PMA had already allocated \$1 million dollars to the Life Safety Fund from the Operations and Maintenance Fund, so it had been double counted in the allocation. Property taxes were reduced from \$53 million to \$52 million. The Education Fund will be \$1 million higher because of property taxes. On the expenditures side, substitute salaries had not been included in the PMA model previously. Transportation expenses had increased \$494,000, due to increased contract rates from the prior year, Special Education routes, and the purchase of a new bus. PMA updates its model when the new budget is approved, and the audit is completed.

**Presentation of Monthly Financials and Monthly Treasurer’s Report**

The Committee of the Whole unanimously recommended that the Monthly Financials and the Monthly Treasurer’s Report be moved forward to the Board of Education for approval at its regular September meeting. Note: some teachers are paid from previous year’s salary in July and August to finish out their contracts. The auditor accrues them back, not the District; this is reflected in the Annual Financial Report.

**New Business**

A status on the performance arts space was requested. The administration is meeting with stakeholders the following day, and an update will be provided at the Board of Education meeting on September 22.

**Adjournment**

At 11:18 p.m., Dr. Moore moved to adjourn; seconded by Mr. Arkin. A voice vote resulted in motion carried.

Submitted by Gail Kalmerton  
Clerk of the Board