

THE CITY OF LAKE FOREST SCHOOL DISTRICT 67 & 115

Title: Compensation Committee Meeting
Date: Monday, December 16, 2019
Time: The meeting was called to order at 8:10 am
Location: West Campus, Seminar Room A
Committee Members present: D67: Jeff Folker, Suzanne Sands, Justin Engelland,
D115: Dewey Winebrenner, Jenny Zinser
Administration: Mike Simeck, Rebecca Jenkins, Jennifer Hermes
Staff/Invitees Present: Jordan Salus, Anne Whipple, Allison Stempian
Approval of Minutes: A motion was made by Suzanne Sands and seconded by Justin Engelland to approve the minutes from the November 11, 2019 meeting. The motion carried.
Public Comment: None

On Monday, December 16, 2019, the joint District 67/District 115 Compensation Committee met to 1) discuss/review criteria used in determining Shared Service compensation benchmark districts, 2) review Shared Service redundant tasks/activities (and subsequent workload implications) for various Shared Service roles, 3) review a draft proposal from Eklund Consulting and discuss the use of an outside consultant to deliver the long-term objectives of this committee, as well as review the effectiveness of the Shared Service model in general.

DISCUSSIONS/PRESENTATIONS:

Discussion/review of criteria for determining Shared Service compensation benchmark districts

Mr. Folker shared a detailed spreadsheet put together to help the committee update the Shared Service benchmark districts that were established in 2014. Per the request of the committees at our November 11th meeting, several districts were added to the initial group based on the wealth of communities in those districts or other criteria that might make them a “peer” district to Lake Forest 67/115 (e.g., another Shared Service arrangement). The districts added to the mix were:

- Lyons Township: contains Western Springs, Burr Ridge
- Glenbard: contains Glen Ellyn
- Township HSD 211: contains Inverness
- Mundelein 120/75: another Shared Service arrangement

This brought the total group of “potential comp districts” to 21.

The intention was then to begin whittling these potential comps down to a reasonable number by analyzing/ranking key criteria (e.g., ACT scores, community wealth) and eliminating those that don’t compare closely in these areas to Lake Forest Districts 67 and 115. However, the committees felt this exercise was unnecessary at this time for the following reasons:

- If the committees are going to recommend a change in “comp” districts for compensation, then it would make sense to also use these districts for other types of comparisons (student performance, finances, etc.). However, the committees aren’t ready or willing to make that broad of a recommendation at this time. Other information would need to be analyzed and input into this discussion.
- Based on a cursory analysis of the data, all 5 of the districts currently being used as “comp” districts remain, even using additional criteria. As a result, the impetus to expand that group to include new districts is low or unnecessary.
- The committees didn’t feel that they are in a position to determine the “right” number of districts that should be used as comps.

As a result, the committees will not be recommending a change to the current benchmark peer districts being used to determine compensation “salary bands” for Shared Service personnel in March.

Review of redundant tasks/activities for specific Shared Service roles

Mrs. Jenkins presented partial “Shared Service Redundant Task Matrixes” for the following roles: Chief Technical Officer, Director of Communications, Director of Human Resources, and Director of Buildings & Grounds. Mr. Salus, Mrs. Whipple, and Mrs. Stempien then provided detail/support to the committees regarding the matrix for their specific role, and why they included the activities/tasks they did and how they determined the time associated with each one.

Following this discussion, it was decided that Mrs. Jenkins would present the “Redundant Task Matrixes” for the remaining 3 Shared Service roles (Chief Business Officer, Deputy Superintendent, Comptroller) at our January meeting.

Review of “draft” proposal from Eklund Consulting & discussion re: use of an outside consultant

Mr. Folker presented a draft proposal from Nathan Eklund @ Eklund Consulting that was written at the committees’ request to help us estimate the potential timing and cost of a project to “define strengths as well as inefficiencies as they pertain to the existing shared services model.” Upon review of this proposal, the committees decided 1) to explore recommending the use of an outside consultant to review the Shared Service model and develop a more detailed, objective joint compensation philosophy, and 2) to develop an informal “Request for Proposal” to send out to other consultants. Mr. Simeck will reach out to his peers to get a list of potential consultants to contact (beyond Eklund Consulting) in January. The hope is to present a recommendation to both Boards at their March 2020 meetings regarding the use of an outside consultant to review Shared Service and recommend ways to make the model more efficient and effective.

Next meeting:

The date, time & location of our next meeting has yet to be determined.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 10:10 am.