



08-02

Glen Ellyn School District 41

Dr. Ann K. Riebock, Superintendent

**AGENDA
BOARD OF EDUCATION REGULAR MEETING
AUGUST 13, 2007
7:30 P.M.
DISTRICT 41 ADMINISTRATION CENTER
793 N. MAIN ST., GLEN ELLYN, IL 60137
MARY J. LUGINBILL BOARD ROOM**

- I. Call to Order
- II. Pledge of Allegiance
- III. Roll Call
- IV. Public Participation
- V. Presentations and Reports
 - A. Literacy Curriculum Attachment #1
- VI. Superintendent's Report
- VII. Discussion Items
 - A. 2007 Referendum Follow-up
 - 1. Canvass of Votes (Vote Analysis) Attachment #2
 - 2. Space Utilization Attachment #3
 - 3. Master Facilities Plan Attachment#4
 - B. Security Audit Attachment#5
 - C. Proposal for Consultant Services: Hadley Junior High School Attachment #6
 - D. FGM Contract for Summer 2008 Capital Projects Plan Attachment #7
 - E. FGM Contract for Storm Water Studies Attachment #8
- VIII. Action Items
 - A. Consent Agenda
 - 1. Human Resources
 - (a) Personnel Report Handout
 - Employment Recommendations
 - Resignation and Retirement
 - Leave Requests
 - Resignations
 - Internal Transfers
 - 2. Finance, Facilities and Operations
 - (a) June and July Bills Attachment #9

- 3. Other Matters
 - (a) Board Regular & Special Meeting Minutes Attachment #10
 - June 20 Special Meeting
 - July 25 Regular Meeting and Closed Session
 - (b) Appointment to Fill Vacancy: District 41 Attachment #11
 - Local Election Official (Board Policy #2:30)

- B. Superintendent's Recommendations
 - 1. WatchD.O.G.S.

- VIII. Upcoming Meetings
 - August 27, 2007 Board of Education Regular Meeting, 7:30 p.m., Central Services Offices, 793 North Main Street, Glen Ellyn, Illinois
- IX. Public Participation
- X. Closed Session
- XI. Return to Open Session
- XII. Adjourn Regular Meeting

Glen Ellyn School District #41 Board Report

Date: August 13, 2007
Title: D41 Literacy Curriculum Framework
Contact: Karen Carlson

Background: The Literacy Curriculum Committee was formed and began their curriculum work in the Summer of 2005. They began by studying the research and best-practices for reading and writing instruction. They developed and field tested common, grade level writing assessments during the 2005/2006 school year. These common assessments were then implemented district-wide in the 2006/2007 school year. This year the committee briefly reviewed the research and best-practices, studied literacy curricula from other districts and wrote the District 41 PreK/EC – grade 8 literacy curriculum, which includes both reading and writing.

Discussion: District 41 will be implementing a Balanced Literacy Curriculum Framework. See attached document for a detailed definition and description of the various components. Presentation components will include:

- What research says about literacy instruction.
- Balanced Literacy Framework (Reader's and Writer's Workshop)
- Grade level framework and connections with other curricular areas. (Website)
- Professional Development plan.
- Materials from field testing to adoption. (Matrix)
- Parent education

Recommendation: The 07/08 school year will serve as a year of transition with the literacy curriculum. Teachers will be afforded the opportunity to learn, practice, and reflect upon their teaching and learning practices. The professional development will be divided into segments to "teach" each component of the framework. In addition, it will be differentiated to better meet the needs of the teachers. We will field test materials this school year to propose a materials adoption for the 08/09 school year.

DISTRICT 41 – BALANCED LITERACY
 Throughout the Reading and Writing Workshop
 the teacher will provide explicit instruction through:

- Think Alouds
- Modeling
- Mini-lessons

"DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED"

READING WORKSHOP

Read Aloud

- Teacher has access to the text
- Teacher shares his/her thinking regarding strategies
- Teacher models fluent reading

Shared Reading

- Teacher and students have access to the text
- Teacher and students share thinking about reading strategies

Guided Reading

- Small flexible groups with similar needs/interests
- Instructional level text
- Teacher led
- Book chats with teacher guidance

Reading Conferences

- Teacher and student meet to assess and/or discuss progress, strategy use and set reading goals

Independent Daily Reading

- Student selects text with teacher guidance based on interest and independent reading level

WRITING WORKSHOP

Shared Writing

- Teacher uses the pen
- Teacher explicitly models the writing strategies and skills using Six Traits

Interactive Writing

- Teacher and students share the pen
- Teacher and students share their ideas about the writing process

Guided Writing

- Small flexible groups with similar needs/interests
- Focus on modes of writing using the Six Trait Model
- Teacher led

Writing Conferences

- Teacher and student meet to assess and/or discuss progress, skills and set writing goals

Independent Daily Writing

- Student and/or teacher chooses mode, purpose, audience

Word study

- Phonemic Awareness
- Phonics
- Vocabulary
- Roots and affixes
- Word origins

4

Shared Learning

- A few children share their learning/strategies from the day

Shared Learning

- A few children share their learning/writing pieces from the day

Attachment 1

Balanced Literacy Defined

"DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED"

Balanced Literacy is a framework designed to help all students learn to read and write effectively. The program stands firmly on the premise that all students can learn to read and write. This balance between reading and writing allows students to receive the teaching needed in order to reach grade level status, while allowing students to work at a level that is not frustrating for them.

Balanced literacy is a model for teaching children in a student-centered classroom, providing many opportunities for real life reading and writing experiences. It is based on the research of Marie Clay, Irene Fountas, and Gay Su Pennell. Children read and write each day independently and in group settings (both large and small). Classrooms rooted in balanced literacy focus on different types of reading experiences: read alouds, shared reading, guided reading, reading conferences and independent reading.

Students also participate in shared and individual writing activities each day. The types of writing experiences include shared writing, interactive writing, guided writing, writing conferences and independent writing.

Additionally, during many daily reading and writing experiences, students are engaged in word study. Listening and speaking are also emphasized in this integrated language approach.

Teachers implementing a balanced approach of literacy instruction use an integrated approach to teaching language arts. This framework for literacy lessons consists of a number of elements that provide substantial amounts of reading and writing on a daily basis. Each day the workshop ends with an opportunity for students to share and reflect upon their learning (Sharing/Reflection).

These authentic opportunities for reading and writing are arranged on a continuum based on the gradual release of responsibility. Some reading and writing tasks are modeled by the teachers and others are accomplished with the support of the teacher, leading to those that are done independently by the child.

Read Alouds: Teacher reads a selection aloud to students engaging in a series of activities, including: pre-viewing, predicting, questioning, story analysis, feature analysis, and responding.

Shared Reading: Teacher and students read text together promoting discussion, problem-solving and critical thinking. It is an interactive experience in which an enlarged text is used for all students to see. The use of big books, charts and overhead projectors is a common practice for shared reading. At the primary level, texts are usually read multiple times over a period of days or weeks. Intermediate and upper grades often divide a longer selection over a period of days.

Guided Reading: Teacher works with small groups of children who have similar reading needs. The teacher selects and introduces new books carefully chosen to match the instructional levels of students and supports whole text reading. Readers are carefully prepared when being introduced to a new text, and various strategies are explicitly taught. Ongoing observation and assessment help to inform instruction and grouping of students is flexible and may be changed often.

Reading Conferences: Teacher meets with an individual student, engaging in a dialogue about the student’s reading. In the conference the teacher may listen to the students read, noting the readers’ strengths, providing explicit instruction in terms of reading strategies, and setting reading goals. Conferences allow the teacher to identify instructional needs to be addressed in mini-lessons and evaluate a student’s progress in reading.

Independent Reading: Students self-select and independently read appropriate books based on reading level and interest. During this time, students practice reading strategies that were explicitly taught during read aloud, shared reading and guided reading.

Word Study: Students master the recognition, spelling, and meaning of words through a hands-on, inquiry based approach. They examine words to reveal consistencies within our written language system. It incorporates phonics, vocabulary and spelling instruction.

Shared Writing: Teacher and students work together to compose various forms of writing. Students provide the ideas and the teacher supports the process as a scribe. The teacher provides full support, modeling and demonstrating the process of writing.

Interactive Writing: The teacher and class compose together to create a variety of written text using a “shared pen” technique. The group agrees on what to write through discussion and negotiation. Together the teacher and students navigate through the writing process.

Guided Writing: Teacher works with small groups of children who have similar writing needs. The teacher selects and introduces new techniques and strategies carefully chosen to match the instructional levels of students. Writers are carefully prepared when being introduced to an element of the writer’s craft, and various strategies are explicitly taught. Ongoing observation and assessment help to inform instruction and grouping of students is flexible and may be changed often.

Writing Conferences: Teacher meets with an individual student, engaging in a dialogue about the student’s writing. In the conference the teacher may listen to the students read the writing aloud, reinforce the writer’s strengths, provide explicit instruction regarding some aspect of writing, and set writing goals. Conferences allow the teacher to identify instructional needs to be addressed in mini-lessons and evaluate a student’s progress in writing.

Independent Writing: Students write independently a variety of genres. Writing topics are either directed by the teacher or often self-selected. During this time, students practice writing strategies and techniques that were explicitly taught during shared writing, interactive writing and guided writing.

Sharing/Reflection: Teacher and students come back together at the end of the reading and writing workshop to share their new thinking about the reading and writing process, reflect upon their own reading and writing and to explain how they have used the information learned from the read aloud, shared reading/writing, interactive writing, conferences and guided reading/writing.

Sources/Further Reading:

- Farstrup A. & S. Samuels. (2002). *What Research Has to Say About Reading Instruction.*, Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.
- Fletcher R. & J. Portalupi. (2001). *Writing Workshop – The Essential Guide.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Publishers.
- Fountas, I. & G. Pinnell. (1996). *Guided Reading.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Publishers.
- Morrow, L., Gambrell, L. & M. Pressley. (2003). *Best Practices in Literacy Instruction.* New York, NY: The Guildford Press.
- Routman, R. (1991). *Invitations.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Publishers.

Glen Ellyn School District 41
 Understanding the Literacy Framework
 PreK/EC - Grade 8

"DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED"

Literacy Component	ILS Standards	Teacher's Role	Assessment	Instructional Components	Instructional Materials
<p>This section identifies which essential component of literacy instruction is being addressed and includes</p> <p>Phonemic awareness</p> <p>Phonics</p> <p>Vocabulary/ word study</p> <p>Fluency</p> <p>Comprehension</p> <p>Writing</p> <p>Handwriting</p>	<p>This section identifies which Illinois Learning Standards relate to that particular literacy component, as well as which of the WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards are addressed (to be complete in the 07/08 school year).</p> <p>The WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards are anchored in the Illinois Learning Standards and provide a tool for the instruction of English Language Learners.</p>	<p>This section identifies the skills, concepts, strategies that are taught within each literacy component utilizing a reader's and writer's workshop format.</p> <p>Specific skills, concepts, and strategies listed in bold have been identified as essential learning targets.</p> <p>* Indicates collaboration opportunities between the classroom teacher and the library media specialist.</p>	<p>This section identifies various assessment tools.</p> <p>This section is still a work in progress as we continue to identify additional assessment tools.</p>	<p>This section identifies various instructional techniques, strategies and activities for the teacher to explicitly teach each of the literacy components.</p>	<p>This section identifies specific instructional materials the classroom teacher will use to teach each of the literacy components.</p> <p>Materials listed in bold and italics are district purchased materials.</p>

District 41 Literacy Curriculum - Research

Best practices in literacy instruction are characterized by meaningful literacy activities that provide all children with both the *skill* and the *will* to become proficient readers and writers and motivated literacy learners (Morrow, Gambrell, Pressley, 2003).

The following are ten *research-based best practices* in literacy instruction:

- Teach reading for authentic, meaning-making literacy experiences: for pleasure, to be informed, or to perform a task.
- Use high-quality literature.
- Integrate a comprehensive word study/phonics program into reading/writing instruction.
- Use multiple texts that link and expand concepts.
- Balance teacher-led and student-led discussions.
- Build a whole-class community that emphasizes important concepts and builds background knowledge.
- Work with students in small groups while other students read, or write about what they have read.
- Give students plenty of time to read in class.
- Give students direct instruction in decoding and comprehension strategies that promote independent reading. Balance direct instruction, guided instruction and independent learning.
- Use a variety of assessment techniques to inform instruction.

(Morrow, Gambrell, Pressley, 2003)

Furthermore, the National Reading Panel (2000) identified the following essential components of literacy instruction:

Phonemic Awareness - is the ability to hear, identify, and manipulate individual sounds - phonemes- in spoken words. It improves a child's word reading and comprehension and helps them to learn to spell.

Phonics - helps children learn the relationships between the letters of written language and the sounds of spoken language. Phonics leads to an understanding of the alphabetic principle - the systematic and predictable relationships between written letters and spoken sounds.

Fluency - is the ability to read a text with accuracy, speed and expression.

Vocabulary - refers to the words we must know to communicate effectively. Oral vocabulary refers to words that we use in speaking or recognize in listening. Reading vocabulary refers to words we recognize or use in print.

Comprehension - is the act of constructing meaning from a variety of text. It is the ability to use a variety of strategies or processes such as the reader activating prior knowledge, making connections between the text and existing knowledge, questioning the text, using sensory imagery, inferencing, summarizing/synthesizing and self-monitoring.

Based upon the research-based best practices and the essential components of literacy instruction District 41 has identified a standards-aligned, Balanced Literacy Curriculum Framework to meet the needs of all learners. Of significant importance to our framework is the classroom teacher who makes teaching and learning decisions on a daily basis to guide our students to become successful, independent readers and writers. In addition, classroom teachers work in collaboration with various specialists including the library media specialist to facilitate opportunities that integrate information literacy skills into learning activities, while fostering a love of reading.

Balanced Literacy Framework How do I fit it all in? Grades 1 - 2

Scheduling literacy instruction involves constant decision making. The following guidelines are to help you with scheduling. Times will be adjusted depending on your purpose and your students.

Based on approximately 150 minutes of literacy instruction
*includes social science as appropriate

Reading Workshop

Read aloud/Shared Reading (20 - 30 minutes)

*Guided Reading/Conferencing (30 - 40 minutes)

**Guided Reading Groups to begin approximately 6 weeks into the school year.*

- Independent **Daily Reading**

Shared Learning (5 - 10 minutes)

Word Study (20 - 25 minutes)

Writing Workshop

Shared Writing/Interactive Writing (15 - 20 minutes)

Guided Writing (20 - 40 minutes)

- Independent **Daily Writing**

Shared Learning (5 - 10 minutes)

What are the other students doing during Guided Reading and Guided Writing?

A teacher may choose to have Literacy Stations.

See Literacy Stations link for specific ideas.

Features of Literacy Programs Decision-Making Matrix

*Adapted from the document prepared by the
Commission on Reading National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE)

Background:

- The purpose of the matrix is to provide a standards-aligned criteria to apply as districts select program materials or design programs on instruction in reading and writing. It is intended to be used as part of a professional discussion.
- The model on which the matrix is based is aligned with the position statement, "On Reading, Learning to Read, and Effective Reading Instruction: An Overview of What We Know and How We Know It"
- The matrix offers categorized features for staff to consider in making decisions about appropriate materials and goals for literacy instruction. Blank rows are available for including additional features. These features were ranked by the NCTE Commission on Reading as: (4) Essential; (3) Important; (2) Less Important; (1) Not Important for an effective program of literacy instruction.
- A desirable program/component will be one in which features seen as essential or important (rankings of a 4 or 3) are seen to a high degree.
- Decisions about the relative importance of various features are based on published research and professional resources.

Matrix Use

- In Column 2 on the matrix, rate each feature in terms of its importance (1 – 4) for an effective literacy program.
- For each literacy program/component under consideration, mark each feature to the degree of its presence in the program. Use **H** to indicate a high degree or presence, **M** to indicate a medium degree or presence, and **L** to indicate a low degree or presence.
- A desirable program will be one in which features seen as essential or important are evident to a high degree.
- Additional features can be added on the blank lines.

Program Name _____

Intended Audience (Check all that apply)	
Primary	
Intermediate	
Middle School	
English as a New Language (ENL)	
Students requiring reading interventions (RTI)	
Gifted	
Early Childhood/Pre-K At Risk	
Special Education	

<p>NCTE Commission on Reading indicates (4) as essential, (3) as important, (2) as less important, (1) as not an important feature for an effective literacy program. Decisions about the relative importance of various features are based on published research and professional resources. Rate H to indicate a high degree or presence, M to indicate a medium degree or presence, L to indicate a low degree or presence in each reviewed program or component.</p> <p>The "1" column shows NCTE's rating of program features. The "2" column is for your own rating of the features.</p>					
	1	2	H	M	L
MEDIA/TOOLS					
Books					
Authentic connected texts, complete & unabridged	4				
Predictable texts	4				
Decodable texts	1				
Abridged texts	2				
Skills-based texts	1				
Leveled texts	2				
Non-fiction texts	4				
Classroom libraries	4				
Controlled vocabulary	1				
Original illustrations	4				
Publisher-substituted illustrations	1				
Videotapes	2				
Internet	2				
Computer Software	3				
Audiotapes	3				
School-to-home connections	4				
Suggestions for extended readings	4				
Recall level worksheets	1				

NCTE Commission on Reading indicates (4) as essential, (3) as important, (2) as less important, (1) as not an important feature for an effective literacy program. Decisions about the relative importance of various features are based on published research and professional resources. Rate H to indicate a high degree or presence, M to indicate a medium degree or presence, L to indicate a low degree or presence in each reviewed program or component.					
The "1" column shows NCTE's rating of program features. The "2" column is for your own rating of the features.	1	2	H	M	L
MATERIALS REPRESENT					
Authentic multicultural perspectives (text & illustrations)	4				
Accurate, current information	4				
Wide range of purposes	4				
High literary quality	4				
Range of authors	4				
Multiple disciplines	4				
Multiple genres	4				
Content likely to engage and interest readers	4				
Content that is age and developmentally appropriate	4				
Content that is of interest to both genders	4				
Conceptual of thematic structures/connects to content areas	4				
PARTICIPANT STRUCTURES/GROUPINGS					
Whole Class	3				
Small groups	4				
Individual (instructional and independent)	4				
Flexible groups (interest, ability)	4				
Pull out instruction	2				
Fixed ability groups	1				
INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACHES					
Scripted, sequenced, teacher-directed	1				
Student generated topics and questions	4				
Strategies and skills taught in isolation	1				
Strategies and skills embedded in meaningful text	4				
Scaffolded instruction toward independence	4				
Discussion	4				
Role play	3				
Projects	3				
Extensive independent daily reading	4				
Student choice of instructional texts	4				
Literature study	4				
Guided reading	4				
Shared reading	4				
Partner reading	3				

NCTE Commission on Reading indicates (4) as essential, (3) as important, (2) as less important, (1) as not an important feature for an effective literacy program. Decisions about the relative importance of various features are based on published research and professional resources. Rate H to indicate a high degree or presence, M to indicate a medium degree or presence, L to indicate a low degree or presence in each reviewed program or component.					
The "1" column shows NCTE's rating of program features. The "2" column is for your own rating of the features.	1	2	H	M	L
COMPREHENSION					
Development of higher level thinking and critical literacy	4				
Emphasis on meaning making with connected text, including focus on using fiction and non-fiction text structures and features	4				
Emphasis on application of skills in isolated text excerpts	1				
Multiple perspectives, themes, and interpretations	4				
Independence in learning/self-directed	4				
Development of cognitive strategies (predicting, questioning, confirming, summarizing, inferring)	4				
Development of metacognitive strategies	4				
Opportunities for comprehension work	4				
• before reading	4				
• during reading	4				
• after reading	4				
Intertextuality	4				
Development of schema	4				
• connections to current knowledge	4				
• development of new knowledge	4				
WORD RECOGNITION, WORD STUDY, VOCABULARY					
Phonemic awareness in isolation	1				
Phonemic awareness in context	3				
Phonological awareness	2				
Phonics in isolation	1				
Phonics in context	3				
Alphabetic principle	4				
Sight words	4				
Reading fluency with comprehension	4				
Reading fluency without comprehension	1				
Miscues as a window into cue and strategy utilization	4				
Decoding of pseudo words	1				
Word families	4				
Experiential base for vocabulary	4				
Etymological focus for vocabulary	3				
Vocabulary lists	2				
Vocabulary from text	4				
Vocabulary building with roots and affixes	3				
Word lists	1				

NCTE Commission on Reading indicates (4) as essential, (3) as important, (2) as less important, (1) as not an important feature for an effective literacy program. Decisions about the relative importance of various features are based on published research and professional resources. Rate H to indicate a high degree or presence, M to indicate a medium degree or presence, L to indicate a low degree or presence in each reviewed program or component.					
The "1" column shows NCTE's rating of program features. The "2" column is for your own rating of the features.	1	2	H	M	L
Concept-driven vocabulary instruction	4				
Phonics or vocabulary worksheets	1				
READING/WRITING CONNECTIONS					
Constructed spelling as approximations	4				
Spelling as a window into phonics knowledge	4				
Response to text in students' own words	4				
Response to text as fill in the blanks	1				
Reading and writing integrated, e.g. text as a source for student writing opportunities	4				
Essay form	2				
Multiple choice responses to reading	1				
Discussions about individual and social uses of literacy	4				
STUDENT ROLE					
Choice of reading selections	4				
Choice of reading extension activities	4				
Documentation and assessing reading growth via self-reflection, portfolio development, process journals, etc.	4				
Problem-solving and resourcefulness encouraged	4				
Increased independence and responsibility	4				
• social interactions around literacy	4				
• inquiry into own and others literacy processes and practices	4				
• risk-taking in reading and writing encouraged	4				
ASSESSMENT					
Formal, standardized	1				
Unit tests	1				
Classroom-based, ongoing (running record, miscue analysis, retelling, anecdotal observations, student reading histories, records of reading)	4				
Multiple choice comprehension tests	2				

NCTE Commission on Reading indicates (4) as essential, (3) as important, (2) as less important, (1) as not an important feature for an effective literacy program. Decisions about the relative importance of various features are based on published research and professional resources. Rate H to indicate a high degree or presence, M to indicate a medium degree or presence, L to indicate a low degree or presence in each reviewed program or component.					
The "1" column shows NCTE's rating of program features. The "2" column is for your own rating of the features.	1	2	H	M	L
Student directed	3				
Written reactions and responses to text	4				
Portfolios	4				
Lists of learners' reading experiences	4				
Opportunities for student goal setting	4				
PROFESSIONAL RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT					
Scripts for implementation of program	1				
Data on student outcomes	3				
Support for teacher research, e.g. teacher inquiry topic and findings	3				
Support for meeting needs of individual students (resources, instructional approaches)	4				
Resources and professional development experiences to build teacher knowledge about learning and literacy	4				
Research and theory base of the program provided	4				
Support for teacher as instructional decision-maker	4				
Provision for parent education, support and involvement	4				

Additional Comments: _____

Professional Development Outline
Literacy Curriculum Rollout
PreK - grade 8

June, 2007

- Overview of Words Their Way and materials provided to all elementary teachers and interested field test participants at Hadley.
- Planning for the fall - Teachers were provided handouts for getting them started. This included information regarding the Independent Reading portion of the Reader's Workshop: *First 12 Day for grades K - 2, First 20 Days for grades 3 - 5, and First 20 Days + for grades 6 - 8*. Sample lesson plan formats were also provided.
- Revised writing assessments based on teacher feedback from the 06/07 school year.
- A number of teachers worked in small groups this summer to collaborate and plan for field testing and supporting the implementation of Words Their Way.

August/September

- Word Study using Words Their Way(K - 5) /Field tested (6 - 8) - 8/20/07
- Phonemic Awareness Training (PreK - 1) - 9/14/07
- Write Source (6 - 8) for field test
- Making Meaning expansion (limited)
- Independent Reading - First 20 Days, modified to meet various levels - 8/20/07
- Begin Book Study - Literacy Map/PreK - 5 & Yellow Brick Road/6 - 8

September Institute (PreK - 8, classroom teachers, LA teachers, Special Education and ENL teachers)

- Guided Reading/Conferencing
- Assessment/Running Records

October/November/December

- Teachers "practice guided reading, conferencing, running records
- Onsite continued support offered for word study, phonemic awareness, independent reading, guided reading, conferencing, running records

January/February/March (Onsite through release time)

- Read Aloud
- Shared Reading
- Shared Learning

April/May (Onsite through release time)

- Writer's Workshop

**Glen Ellyn School District #41
Board Report**

Date: August 13, 2007
Title: 2007 Referendum Vote Analysis
Contact: Dr. Ann K. Riebock, Superintendent

Background: The April 17, 2007 facilities referendum to expand and renovate our schools was defeated by 77%. A more precise understanding of the results will help the District plan for its future; toward that end, a number of ways to accomplish that have been reviewed by the administration.

Discussion: The precinct information provided by the DuPage County Board of Elections obviously does not tell us which individuals voted yes or no, nor does it address voter knowledge, opinion and motivation. However, both by itself and as compared to pre-election canvassing data, a precinct analysis can help us understand the vote by precinct, gender, parent/non-parent and possibly other aspects. A precinct analysis can be provided at no charge by a volunteer with extensive experience developing, managing and analyzing voter databases. The opinion information related to the vote (for example, attitudes about the plan itself, willingness to fund expansion, and voter trust) can be addressed through the Public Involvement Model being developed in conjunction with the Long-Range Plan. We may decide to incorporate focus groups, or some other process, specifically for this purpose in the fall based on the direction we gain from the precinct analysis.

Recommendation: Upon completion of the precinct analysis of the April 17 vote and Board review, a recommendation will be made to determine appropriate next steps regarding further community involvement.



Board Report

Glen Ellyn School District 41

Date: August 13, 2007

Title: Space Utilization Study Request for Proposal

Contact: Robert J. Ciserella

Background:

A review of the District space utilization should be done for planning for future needs. Discussions came up during the Boundary Committee process in the fall of 2006 that centered around the question of space within the District buildings and is it being used effectively and efficiently to meet the needs of the District.

Discussion:

The administration has been discussing the concept of hiring a consultant to conduct a space utilization study. This study would focus on the current curriculum programs and enrollments. This study does not include review of future enrollment changes or program changes. The results of this study will be used to confirm the status of our current space utilization and also be used as baseline data for any future more extensive master facility planning studies. A draft Request for Proposal that the administration would release to vendors is attached for review.

Recommendation:

No recommendation at this time. This is being offered as information and discussion only at this time with an anticipated recommendation for approval at the August 27, 2007 meeting.

Key Objective: Provide resources – people, time and money - to ensure the growth and development of our vision.

"DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED"

**Glen Ellyn School District 41
Request for Proposal**

**Space Utilization Study
September 2007**

Background

District 41 has approximately 3,600 students enrolled Early Learner (Pre-K) to Grade 8. The district currently has 5 schools and one administration center building. The district also currently owns 4 portable classroom structures for a total of 12 classrooms and leases 4 additional portable classroom structures for a total of 14 classrooms. The District passed a building referendum in 1997 which added some classroom space, Art and Music Rooms and classrooms. This referendum also completed most of the outstanding major building maintenance repairs. In 2001 the District passed an Education Rate Referendum that allowed the District to maintain reduced class sizes and hire full-time specialists for each building in certain subject areas. In April 2007 the District put forth a building referendum question to create a 5th – 8th Grade, Grade Level Center by building an addition at the current Junior High School. This question also included some funds for renovations at the remaining schools. This referendum was not successful. Therefore, the District is now charged with continuing with further study of our facility needs. The initial step to this is to analyze the effectiveness of how we are currently using our existing space. Basic building specifics are below.

Building Name	June 2007 Enrollment	Grade Levels Served	Building Total SF w/o Portables	# Portable Classrooms/ Structures	Site Acreage
Abraham Lincoln	643	Pre-K – 5	55,525	6/2	7
Benjamin Franklin	629	Pre-K – 5	55,632	4/1	7
Churchill	605	K- 5	54,615	8/2	8
Forest Glen	556	Pre-K – 5	49,221	4/2	6
Hadley JH	1,150	6 – 8	153,141	4/1	17
Central Services	33 Staff	N/A	13,686	N/A	45,715 SF

Scope of Work

District 41 is seeking professional assistance to review, analyze and comment on current space usage as it relates to current program delivery models for an Early Learner – 8th grade classroom environment. This project will result in a written report from the contracted firm that would include but not be limited to, overview of current space, best practical use of space in an educational environment, and suggestions/comments for adjustments/changes if any.

Administrative staff will provide all background information that is available and necessary to complete the study. It is not anticipated that there will be any staff, parent or community involvement in this study.

Contracted firm must have minimally one staff member assigned to this project that are certified as an educational space planner. Staff assigned to this project must be

**Glen Ellyn School District 41
Request for Proposal**

**Space Utilization Study
September 2007**

guaranteed to remain intimately active with the project for the entire length of the project unless approved by the District.

Contractor is to deliver a draft of the report to the Administration for review and discussion by November 8, 2007. After review with the administration, the contractor will present this report to the Board of Education Finance Committee November 26, 2007 for review and discussion. The contractor will then present the final report to the Board of Education for discussion December 10, 2007.

Response to RFP

The proposal should include the following items:

- Narrative describing in detail the process that will be used to complete this project. This should include approximate hours to be spent on the project and list possible resources you would require of the District to complete the project
- Names and brief background on staff that will be assigned to the project
- Reference list of other school districts similar studies have been completed for including contact person name and information
- Project Cost details.

Selection of Successful Respondent

District 41 intends to conduct on-site interviews (or teleconferences) with firms(s) receiving final consideration as a part of the selection process.

The Board of Education will accept the proposal that best meets the needs of the school district using following criteria:

Company experience
Option(s) for complete or phased in recommendation
Personnel assigned to the project
Project timeline
Report format
References
Cost

RFP Deadline and Questions

Three copies of the completed proposal should be delivered to Mr. Robert J. Ciserella, Assistant Superintendent for Finance, Facilities and Operations, 793 North Main Street, Glen Ellyn, Illinois, 60137 no later than 2:00 pm on Thursday, September 6, 2007. Questions regarding this request for proposal should be directed to Mr. Robert J. Ciserella, 630-534-7220 or bciserella@d41.org.

**Glen Ellyn School District #41
Board Report**

Date: August 13, 2007
Title: Master Facilities Plan
Contact: Ann Riebock

Background: Consistent with its Long-Range Plan, District 41 is preparing to develop a Master Facilities Plan that will address present and future student needs, support its educational plan and be based on sound financial planning. District 41 schools are at capacity, with 26 portable classrooms deployed among five schools. In April of 2007, the community rejected a facilities expansion and renovation plan that was developed through a long-term planning process that involved many stakeholders.

Discussion: A Master Facilities Plan is needed that will define the necessary steps to ensure that our physical plant will meet the educational needs for the next 15-20 years. A significant amount of data for this plan already exists, but we need a fresh, comprehensive and systematic evaluation of the assets and limitations of our buildings and our land. The evaluation should include the following components:

Space Utilization: is building space being maximized? Are there untapped capacities and efficiencies? Are there indoor environmental concerns to be addressed?

Land-use and Stormwater: What potential exists for school expansion either up or out? What limitations exist in terms of stormwater and related issues such as boggy areas, grading issues and environmental concerns?

Safety and security: What is needed in terms of security of ingress and egress, lines of sight, alarms, surveillance and so forth to make sure our buildings are safe places for students, staff and the other community groups that use our buildings?

Educational Priorities: What priorities for increased student learning and opportunity must be considered as drivers for our facilities planning? What implications from program evaluations may impact the use of our physical space?

Recommendation: The Board direct the administration to develop a proposal to address each of the components above. Each component will be approached as a separate proposal and the Board will take action upon them individually.



Board Report

Glen Ellyn School District 41

Date: August 13, 2007

Title: Building Security Study Request for Proposal

Contact: Robert J. Ciserella

Background:

A review of the District overall building security should be done in order to plan for any future capital improvements or staff development needs that fall within this area.

Discussion:

It is recommended to use an outside consultant to conduct this type of study. This study would include a review of our current facilities and procedures and recommendations for changes if needed. The results of this study would then be incorporated into the future Rolling Capital Projects list and staff development planning. A draft Request for Proposal that the administration would release to vendors is attached for review.

Recommendation:

No recommendation at this time. This is being offered as information and discussion only at this time with an anticipated recommendation for approval at the August 27, 2007 meeting.

Key Objective: Provide resources – people, time and money - to ensure the growth and development of our vision.

“DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED”

**Glen Ellyn School District 41
Request for Proposal**

**Security Audit Study
September 2007**

Background

District 41 has approximately 3,600 students enrolled Early Learner (Pre-K) to Grade 8. The district currently has 5 schools and one administration center building. The district also currently owns 4 portable classroom structures for a total of 12 classrooms and leases 4 additional portable classroom structures for a total of 14 classrooms. Basic building specifics are below.

Building Name	June 2007 Enrollment	Grade Levels Served	Building Total SF w/o Portables	# Portable Classrooms/ Structures	Site Acreage
Abraham Lincoln	643	Pre-K – 5	55,525	6/2	7
Benjamin Franklin	629	Pre-K – 5	55,632	4/1	7
Churchill	605	K- 5	54,615	8/2	8
Forest Glen	556	Pre-K – 5	49,221	4/2	6
Hadley JH	1,150	6 – 8	153,141	4/1	17
Central Services	33 Staff	N/A	13,686	N/A	45,715 SF

Scope of Work

The Board of Education of Glen Ellyn School District 41 is seeking proposals for a comprehensive school security audit/ assessment. The intent of the Board of Education is to identify existing strengths in safety/security and to identify areas for risk reduction.

Firms submitting proposals must have a minimum 5 years experience in the field of comprehensive school security audits/assessments (preferably including successful projects in the Chicago metropolitan area). Proposals should include a complete, district-wide assessment plan.

Proposals must address the following minimum audit/ assessment requirements:

- An examination of the physical design, environmental characteristics and structure of District 41 schools.
- On-site structured interviews with key stakeholders, including administration, faculty, central office personnel and School Board members.
- An audit of school safety/ security related policies and procedures inclusive of critical incident plans and emergency response preparedness.
- Structured interviews with local law enforcement and public safety personnel.
- An analysis of district-wide and local school campus communication systems.
- An analysis of staff education and training as related to school safety/ security issues.
- Final reports must include an executive summary, detailed report, budget impact, recommendations for phasing/ prioritizing remedies.

**Glen Ellyn School District 41
Request for Proposal**

**Security Audit Study
September 2007**

Response to RFP

Responses must include the following information organized in section and numbered as indicated below:

1. Company background and history
2. List and resumes of key personnel assigned to this project
3. List of personnel participating in on-site visits
4. List of school district references with complete contact information
5. Performance methodology including format for final report, timeline for completion of end product and available start date

Selection of Successful Respondent

District 41 intends to conduct on-site interviews (or teleconferences) with firms(s) receiving final consideration as a part of the selection process.

The Board of Education will accept the proposal that best meets the needs of the school district using following criteria:

Company experience
Option(s) for complete or phased in recommendation
Personnel assigned to the project
Project timeline
Report format
References
Cost

RFP Deadline and Questions

Three copies of the completed proposal should be delivered to Mr. Robert J. Ciserella, Assistant Superintendent for Finance, Facilities and Operations, 793 North Main Street, Glen Ellyn, Illinois, 60137 no later than 2:00 pm on Thursday, September 6, 2007. Questions regarding this request for proposal should be directed to Mr. Robert J. Ciserella, 630-534-7220 or bciserella@d41.org

**Glen Ellyn School District #41
Board Report**

Date: August 13, 2007
Title: Request for Contracted Services – Ron Williamson
Contact: Ann Riebock

Background: During the 2006-2007 school year, the District requested the services of Ron Williamson to begin an evaluation of our Exploratory Programs at Hadley Junior High. In the course of his initial visits and interviews, Ron also asked interviewees questions about the general program at Hadley. His findings were consistent with areas the staff has identified for improvement, and administration suggested that Hadley's long-range improvement efforts could be greatly enhanced by Ron's expertise.

Ron Williamson is currently a professor of Leadership and Counseling at Eastern Michigan University. Prior to that he taught at the University of North Carolina, and was a teacher, principal, Executive Director of Instruction, and Deputy Superintendent for Instructional Services in the Ann Arbor (MI) public schools.

Ron has also been Executive Director of the National Middle School Association, a member of the National Association of Secondary Schools Principals' (NASSP) Middle Level Council and President of the National Forum to Accelerate Middle Grades Reform. He recently received the Gruhn-Long-Melton award from NASSP in recognition of lifetime achievement in middle level leadership.

In addition to his work at the university, Ron works with middle and high schools across the country.

Discussion: Ron is working with Hadley Junior High this August to help a team of teachers, support staff and parents shape a renewed mission/vision statement for Hadley. We have asked for him to submit a proposal to continue his work with Hadley over the course of the year as they shape their action plans and strategies identified in their school improvement plan and in the program evaluation for Exploratory. One significant area for research, planning and action involves an examination of time in the school day and how that time is structured for students. This particular focus must include an examination of team structure, configuration of periods of time (i.e. literacy block), and exploratory classes. Ron's breadth and depth of experience in middle level education will offer an expertise that can help guide Hadley in developing a long-range plan for continuous improvement.

Recommendation: The Board approve at the August 27, 2007 meeting a contract with Ron Williamson which will include twelve days on-site @\$1300.00/day for a total of \$15,600 inclusive of preparation time and consultation with groups both at the school and the district office.

DRAFT
May 20, 2007

Proposal for Consultant Services
Junior High School Program

Glen Ellyn School District 41
Glen Ellyn, IL

Prepared By: Ronald Williamson, Ed.D.
Professor, Leadership and Counseling
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, MI 48197
734.429.5261
734.417.4949 (C)
e-mail: rwilliams1@emich.edu

Date: May 20, 2007

DRAFT
May 20, 2007

Description of the Project: This project will provide support to the Hadley Junior High School community as they work on the following school improvement activities:

- design and articulation of an agreed upon mission and vision for the school;
- plan program modifications including:
 - modifying the current exploratory program
 - selecting and implementing an appropriate scheduling model
 - maximizing the benefits of the team structure; and
 - identifying appropriate program evaluation measures.

Proposed Services: This project consists of two parts, one addressing the issue of mission and vision and the second program planning.

Part I: Articulation of an agreed upon statement of mission and vision

Facilitate the work of a representative group of faculty, parents, and administrators to develop a clear statement of the mission and vision of Hadley Junior High. This statement will be used to guide subsequent program planning.

Resources: 3 days
Timeline: Summer 2007 or early Fall 2007

Part II: Planning of a modified Junior High School Program

Facilitate the work of a representative group of faculty, parents and administrators to make recommendations for providing a comprehensive set of exploratory experiences for students, strategies to modify the school schedule with the priority being enhanced instructional flexibility and improved learning for all students, strategies to strengthen the current teaming model, and identification of the metrics to be used for ongoing evaluation of the junior high program.

Resources: 12 days
Timeline: Fall 2007 – Spring 2008

DRAFT**May 20, 2007**

The Consultant: Ron Williamson is currently a professor of Leadership and Counseling at Eastern Michigan University. Prior to that he taught at the University of North Carolina, and was a teacher, principal, Executive Director of Instruction, and Deputy Superintendent for Instructional Services in the Ann Arbor (MI) Public Schools.

Ron has also been Executive Director of the National Middle School Association, a member of NASSP's Middle Level Council and President of the National Forum to Accelerate Middle Grades Reform, a coalition of all the major professional organizations serving middle schools. He recently received the Gruhn-Long-Melton award from NASSP in recognition of lifetime achievement in middle level leadership.

The author of over 100 books, chapters, papers and articles in all the major professional journals serving middle school teachers and administrators, Ron is recognized as one of the major advocates and researchers in the field of middle schools.

Ron provided direct services to several large urban school districts when selected by the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation to serve as a leadership coach in their national middle school reform project. He also worked with the Galef Institute in Los Angeles on a Comprehensive School Reform project to improve middle schools in New York City, Houston, Louisville and Los Angeles. He has worked with dozens of middle and high schools throughout the nation on issues of school improvement.

Responsibilities:

The consultant agrees to:

- employ contemporary literature on effective junior high/middle school programs;
- use a collaborative facilitation style with planning teams;
- meet with school and district staff on a mutually agreed upon schedule;
- explicitly link project activities with other school improvement initiatives underway at the school and in the district;
- submit an invoice to the district for provided services each month of the project;

The district agrees to:

- provide relevant data about the school and district to the consultant;
- provide released time for members of the planning teams to participate in meetings;
- schedule meetings at mutually agreed upon times;
- make all arrangements for meeting space, materials and refreshments for the planning teams;
- print copies of any materials needed for the project;
- provide prompt payment for services to the consultant but no later than 30 days after receipt of an invoice;

DRAFT
May 20, 2007

Proposed Budget: The estimated cost of the project is as follows:

Part I: Articulation of an agreed upon statement of mission and vision

Consultant

3 days on-site @ \$1300 \$3,900.00

Expenses

Reasonable and customary travel expenses

Part II: Planning of a modified Junior High School Program

Consultant

12 days on-site @ \$1300 \$15,600.00

Expenses

Reasonable and customary travel expenses

NOTE: In recognition of the long-term nature of this project the consultant fees are reduced from the normal daily rate. These fees also include work by the consultant off-site in preparation for the on-site work.

Additional days may be scheduled at the established daily rate by mutual agreement of both parties.

Budget Summary:

Consultant

\$19,500.00

Expenses

Reasonable and customary travel expenses

Timeline:

This project will commence and conclude on a schedule mutually agreed to by the district and the consultant.

Ronald D. Williamson

Date _____



Board Report

Glen Ellyn School District 41

Date: August 13, 2007

Title: Summer 2008 Capital Projects – Architectural Services

Contact: Robert J. Ciserella

Background:

In the fall of each year the Administration along with the architects meet to start reviewing the Rolling Capital Projects list that includes the 10-Year Health Life Safety Survey Items, Roof Assessment Study and building and site renovation requests made by staff or needed due to program delivery changes. These meetings create the list of projects to be done during the upcoming summer months that are reviewed by the Finance Committee. Projects approved to go forward by the Finance Committee are then put out to bid.

Discussion:

FGM Architects were appointed as the District Architect of record in 2005. Progress payments for each year's summer projects are covered under an amendment to the original agreement. The compensation to be paid for their involvement in the projects is stipulated in the original Professional Services agreement.

Recommendation:

No recommendation at this time. This is being offered as information and discussion only at this time with an anticipated recommendation for approval at the August 27, 2007 meeting.

Key Objective: Provide resources – people, time and money - to ensure the growth and development of our vision.

“DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED”

ALCONQUIN
MT. VERNON
O'FALLON
OAK BROOK
PEORIA

Amendment 13 to Professional Services Agreement Dated: May 16, 2005

Between the Owner: Glen Ellyn School District 41
793 N. Main Street
Glen Ellyn, IL 60147

And the Architect: FGM Architects-Planners, Inc.
1211 West 22nd Street
Oak Brook, IL 60523

Project: Glen Ellyn 2008 Remodeling Work

FGM Project Number: TBD

Date of Amendment: August 8, 2007



1.1.2 Project Parameters:

1.1.2.1 Project Objective: Provide architectural and engineering Basic Services for the 2008 Remodeling Work. Basic Services to include Design Development, Construction Documents, Competitive Bidding and Contract Administration Services.

1.1.2.2 Physical Parameters: Remodeling work at multiple sites.

1.1.2.3 Owner's Program: Scope of work is to be determined.

1.1.2.4 Legal Parameters: no change

1.1.2.5 Financial Parameters: no change

1.1.2.6 Time Parameters: Work to be bid in the fall of 2007.

1.1.2.7 Procurement method: General Contractor

1.5 Compensation:

1.5.1 Compensation will be based on a percent of construction costs in accordance with Exhibit B. Exhibit B is part of the original Professional Services Agreement dated May 16, 2005.

The fee will be adjusted to reflect the actual construction cost when the project is bid.

Progress payments for Basic Services shall total the following percentages:

Schematic Design:	fifteen percent (15%)
Design Development:	twenty percent (20%)
Construction Document Phase:	forty percent (40%)
Bid Phase:	five percent (5%)
<u>Contract Administration Services:</u>	<u>twenty percent (20%)</u>
 Total Basic Compensation:	 one hundred percent (100%)

1211 WEST 22ND STREET
SUITE 705
OAK BROOK, IL 60523-2109
630.574.8300
630.574.9292 FAX
WWW.FGM-INC.COM

S:\jobs\2005\05-0120a\Admin\1.0 Project Mgmt\1.1 Owner - Consultant Contracts\Glen Ellyn Amendment 13rev_7-18-07.doc

Additional meetings, presentation materials, etc. will be billed on a time and material basis at hourly rates as noted in Exhibit C of the original Professional Services Agreement dated May 16, 2005.

2.8 Schedule of Services:

8.8.1.2: Average of two (2) days per month for four (4) months and an average of one (1) day per month for two (2) months for visits to the site by the Architect over the duration of the Project during construction.



Owner
Glen Ellyn School District 41
793 N. Main Street
Glen Ellyn, IL 60147

Architect
FGM Architects-Planners, Inc.
1211 West 22nd Street
Oak Brook, IL 60523

By: Ann Riebock, Ed. D.
Title: Superintendent

By: James G. Woods, AIA
Title: Executive Vice President

By: Ronald W. Richardson, AIA
Title: Senior Project Manager



Board Report

Glen Ellyn School District 41

Date: August 13, 2007
Title: Storm Water Study
Contact: Robert J. Ciserella

Background:

All of the District properties will encounter storm water issues for any future building/site improvement projects. These projects can be adding blacktop space for playgrounds, expanding green space for usable play areas, parking lots and/or building additions.

Discussion:

This study will be coordinated through the district architecture firm, FGM. Eriksoon Engineering Associates, LTD (EEA) will provide the civil engineering for this study. EEA has worked with the District on previous building projects that involved civil engineering needs. The results of this study will include at least two storm water detention options that will incorporate potential new construction including an amount for areas that may become disturbed due to the construction. The fee for this study is \$15,400.00 plus architectural coordination fees. A copy of the proposal from FGM is attached for review.

This proposal does not include Benjamin Franklin School site. A similar study for Benjamin Franklin was done in 2006 as part of the administration's discussions with the Village of Glen Ellyn staff in planning for expanding the parking lot at Benjamin Franklin School.

Recommendation:

No recommendation at this time. This is being offered as information and discussion only at this time with an anticipated recommendation for approval at the August 27, 2007 meeting.

Key Objective: Provide resources – people, time and money - to ensure the growth and development of our vision.

"DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED"

ALGONQUIN
MT. VERNON
O'FALLON
OAK BROOK
PEORIA

Amendment 12 to Professional Services Agreement Dated: May 16, 2005

Between the Owner: Glen Ellyn School District 41
(Name and Address) 793 N. Main Street
Glen Ellyn, IL 60147

And the Architect: FGM Architects-Planners, Inc.
1211 West 22nd Street
Oak Brook, IL 60523

Project: Glen Ellyn Storm Water Study

FGM Project Number: TBD

Date of Amendment: August 8, 2007



1.1.2 Project Parameters:

1.1.2.1 Project Objective: Provide civil engineering Basic Services for a site detention study at multiple sites. Basic Services to include development of Schematic Design Documents for two (2) site detention solutions per site. The study will also include the development of Opinion of Probable Cost information based on the Schematic Designs.

1.1.2.2 Physical Parameters: Work is limited to the following sites:

- Abraham Lincoln School
- Churchill School
- Forest Glen School
- Hadley Junior High School

1.1.2.3 Owner's Program: Develop two (2) site detention solutions.

1.1.2.4 Legal Parameters: no change

1.1.2.5 Financial Parameters: no change

1.1.2.6 Time Parameters: No time parameters

1.1.2.7 Procurement method: Not applicable

1.1.2.8 Other parameters are:

1.1.2.8.1 Updated topographic mapping will be developed by the Owner which must include areas that were disturbed after the 1997 construction.

1.1.2.8.2 The two (2) solutions will be designed to provide the necessary detention volume in an underground, excavated detention basin.

1.1.2.8.3 The detention design will be based on an allowance for new construction area and associated disturbed area. The detention design may include storage required from the 1997

1211 WEST 22ND STREET
SUITE 705
OAK BROOK, IL 60523-2109
630.574.8300
630.574.9292 FAX
WWW.FGM-INC.COM

improvements. The scope of the storm water work associated with the 1997 improvements is unknown.

1.1.2.8.4 One (1) meeting with the Village and Owner is included in the Basic Services. Additional meetings will be billed on a Time and Material basis.

1.5 Compensation:

1.5.1 Compensation for Basic Services will be based on a lump sum of \$15,400 (\$3,850.00 per site). Architectural coordination, additional meetings, presentation materials will be billed on a time and material basis. Hourly rates are noted in Exhibit C of the original Professional Services Agreement dated May 16, 2005.



Owner
Glen Ellyn School District 41
793 N. Main Street
Glen Ellyn, IL 60147

Architect
FGM Architects-Planners, Inc.
1211 West 22nd Street
Oak Brook, IL 60523

By: Ann Riebock, Ed. D.
Title: Superintendent

By: James G. Woods, AIA
Title: Executive Vice
President

By: Ronald W. Richardson, AIA
Title: Senior Project Manager

**INTERIM PAID BILLS
06/15/07 - 07/31/07**

<u>FUND</u>	<u>TOTAL BILLS PAID</u>
General Fund	\$2,888,282.83
Bond & Interest	340,991.25
B & I Debt Service Grant	0.00
IMRF	128,740.90
Life Safety	0.00
S & C Cap Imp	0.00
97 Project Fund	0.00
Working Cash	0.00
SUB-TOTAL	\$3,358,014.98
Self-Insurance	1,437.55
Insurance	282,713.99
TOTAL	\$3,642,166.52



Glen Ellyn School District 41

Dr. Ann K. Riebock, Superintendent

**MINUTES
GLEN ELLYN SCHOOL DISTRICT 41
BOARD OF EDUCATION – SPECIAL WORKSHOP
JUNE 20, 2007
CENTRAL SERVICES OFFICE
793 NORTH MAIN STREET, GLEN ELLYN, ILLINOIS**

Call to Order

Board President, Terra Howard called the special meeting to order at 3:39 p.m.

Roll Call

Upon the roll being called, the following answered present: John Vivoda, Erica Nelson, Steven Vondrak, Robert Solak, Terra Howard. Kevin Cosgrove arrived at 3:43 p.m.; John Kenwood arrived at 3:45 p.m.

Also present: Dr. Ann K. Riebock, Superintendent; Julie Worthen, Director of Communications; Dr. Henry A. Gmitro, Consolidated Community School District 93; Maureen Stecker, Recording Secretary

Public Participation

There were no visitors present who wished to address the Board.

Board Workshop Discussion

The District 41 Board of Education retreat session, facilitated by Dr. Hank Gmitro, Superintendent of District 93 in Carol Stream, focused on roles and responsibilities of the Board, Superintendent and Administration, school board governance and future planning for District 41. Dr. Gmitro explained that this workshop is a follow-up to the District 41 Board Retreat that was held in August 2006 and an opportunity for new and veteran board members to review, edit and confirm the Board's work during the August retreat. Below is a summary of the topics discussed.

Trusteeship and Governance

Board members discussed their role as "trustees" of the District and responsibilities for seeing that the organization fulfills its purpose, which, in the case of a school district, is to provide a quality common educational program for the children of District 41. As trustees, board members come together as a Board of Education which should exist to govern the school

district. A Board should make collective decisions on the basis of what is "correct" or "best" for the school district, not the desires or special interests of individuals.

Governance is the primary purpose of a Board of Education. As the governing body of the school district, it is the responsibility of the Board to establish the District's mission, vision and goals; establish policy that aligns with its mission, vision and goals; determine how well they are achieved and whether they are achieved within the parameters that the Board of Education has established.

The Board discussed some of the challenges related to the transition from the "parent" or "community" member role to a member of the Board of Education. It also discussed the importance of establishing a mechanism for board members to get help when struggling with an appropriate response to a question, idea or situation and agreed that Dr. Riebock would be the contact person for board members.

School District Management

Basic to the concept of school board governance is the employment of a superintendent to manage the organization within the framework established by the Board. The Board discussed and affirmed its responsibility to govern the District and the Superintendent's responsibility to manage the day-to-day operations of the District and see that the District carries through on its mission and Board policies and procedures. The Board acknowledged the importance of having open, honest dialogue on a regular basis relative to the behavior of the Board and individual board members and the impact of that behavior on the Superintendent's ability to manage the District.

Roles and Responsibilities

The Board reviewed their roles and responsibilities as identified during the August 2006. Specific discussion took place related to the following responsibilities:

#4 – To support the Superintendent fully in all decisions that confirm to professional standards and Board Policy

#5 - To hold the Superintendent accountable for the Administration of the school district through regular constructive written and oral evaluations of the Superintendent's work. Effective evaluation is an ongoing effort and should be linked to goals established by the Board with the assistance of the Superintendent. The Board discussed this year's process for evaluating Dr. Riebock. While board members agreed that the process worked overall, they acknowledged a need for improvement. Board consensus that emanated from this discussion is that the evaluation tool was inadequate, the superintendent's evaluation process needs to be aligned with other processes and evaluation cycle of the superintendent should be fall (October/November) and spring (March/April). Board members also discussed the process for Board self-evaluation and monitoring its performance. Dr. Riebock explained that the previous Board conducted a series of Board self-evaluation meetings (Targeting Achievement through Governance) facilitated by a representative of the Illinois Association of School Boards. The Board affirmed that its self-evaluation should be less personal and more about how the Board is operating as governance body of the District. It also agreed to use a similar timeline for evaluation as that of the superintendents.

#10 – To provide a plan for Board/Superintendent communications. Board members discussed appropriate ways in which the Board and Superintendent communicate and how to determine appropriate ways in which to have difficult conversations about complex issues that ultimately need to be discussed in public. The Board acknowledged that there is a process in place to

inform the Board president and/or superintendent of topic(s) that need to be discussed. Topics can also be discussed publicly by placing them on board meeting workshop agendas. Board members agreed that strategic issues should be discussed during a Board retreat.

District, Board and Superintendent Goals and Responsibilities

The Board reviewed District, Superintendent and Board goals and responsibilities that were developed at the August 2006 retreat. Emanating out of the goals conversation was a Board discussion relative to the District 41 2001 referendum and the failed 2007 facilities referendum.

The Board discussed the advantages and disadvantages of revisiting the discussion about the 2001 referendum and whether the implications of the phased-in referendum had an impact on the outcome of the 2007 Referendum. Dr. Riebock noted that if the Board agrees to revisit the issue, this is an appropriate time because of the impact its desired outcomes will likely have on the District's five-year plan.

The Board also discussed the 2007 facilities referendum and agreed that it would provide an overview of the June 20 Board retreat discussion at its June 25 meeting. As a part of the overview, Dr. Riebock will outline the District's next steps regarding the failed 2007 facilities referendum, including a systematic canvass of the vote with the expectation that the feedback will provide us with actionable data and help us to determine what issues were of importance to voters. Dr. Riebock will work with Board members to develop the canvass material, and after talking with administrative staff and make a recommendation to the Board regarding the outside vendor and estimated costs.

- **Board President Responsibilities:** The Board affirmed that there is a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities of the board president.
- **Regularly Scheduled Board Meetings:** The Board affirmed its decision to conduct two board meetings a month and noted the benefits in terms of time management and work accomplishment. The Board agreed that it should explore the idea of rotating Board meeting locations and discussed the logistics of doing so including: whether it should be the workshop meeting or the business meeting, in which months the rotation should occur, the correlation of agenda items to Board Policy. Dr. Riebock will discuss the suggestion with principals and make a recommendation to the Board.

The Board also discussed the possibility of audio recording future Board meetings. It was noted that research and a cost recommendation was presented to the former Board, but no action was taken. The Board discussed the pros and cons of this practice and agreed that while it is an idea that should be considered, we need to investigate the right media solution and collect data to substantiate the costs (e.g. do people download and utilize the information). The Board directed Dr. Riebock to investigate the options associated with this practice, to discuss the matter with legal counsel, and made a recommendation to the Board.

- **Goal Setting/Five-year plan:** Dr. Riebock suggested that as a result of the administrative work that will be completed over the summer, the Board revisit the plan when it meets in August and determine if the plan still meets the educational and financial needs of the District. A discussion ensued regarding the Board's role in the approval process of curriculum. Dr. Riebock explained that it was her understanding that it was CIT's responsibility to approve the curriculum adoption, but that this is a departure from what most Districts do and recognized that the review process needs clarification.

Due to time constraints, the Board was unable to complete its goals discussion but agreed that it will continue the discussion at a future workshop during the week of August 6th.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Kenwood moved and Vondrak seconded to adjourn the Board of Education special meeting at 8:35 p.m. Motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.

Respectfully submitted,
Maureen Stecker, Recording Secretary

Terra Costa Howard,
President, Board of Education

Erica Nelson
Secretary, Board of Education

Minutes approved: August 13, 2007

**Glen Ellyn School District 41**

Dr. Ann K. Riebock, Superintendent

MINUTES**BOARD OF EDUCATION REGULAR MEETING
JUNE 25, 2007
7:30 P.M.
DISTRICT 41 ADMINISTRATION CENTER
793 N. MAIN ST., GLEN ELLYN, IL 60137
MARY J. LUGINBILL BOARD ROOM****Call to Order**

Board President, Terra Howard called the June 25, 2007 regular meeting of the Board of Education to order at 7:30 p.m.

Pledge of Allegiance

Mrs. Howard led in the Pledge of Allegiance and welcomed meeting attendees.

Roll Call

Upon the roll being called, the following answered present: Kevin Cosgrove, John Vivoda, Erica Nelson, John Kenwood, Bob Solak and Terra Howard. Absent: Steven Vondrak

Public Participation

There were no members of the public who wished to address the Board at this time.

Presentations**Continuous Improvement Team (CIT) Annual Report**

Superintendent Dr. Ann Riebock introduced Continuous Improvement Team (CIT) Co-Chairs, Dinah Bryant and Sue Schoff to present the CIT Annual Report. Co-chairs Bryant and Schoff explained the work of CIT for the past year and presented the planned work for the 2007-2008 school year. Sue Schoff reviewed CIT's membership, purpose and responsibilities; Dinah Bryant reviewed accomplishments and next steps. A copy of the presentation is attached.

(Attachment)

The Co-chairs invited the Board to ask questions and extended an invitation to hear and learn more about the work of CIT. They also reported that the Team is currently taking applications for a community member to join CIT.

The Board asked what resources they could provide to CIT to help support their work. Among the suggestions discussed were the scorecard, how to determine measures, and to help to identify a reporting mechanism to the Board.

The Board also asked for a long-range status report on the work of CIT. Mrs. Bryant reported that as promised, CIT began three years ago at the district level, moved to the building level and this past year to the classroom level. As CIT moves forward, it will be working directly with students, staff and parents to further implement improvement processes with students and families. This vision for this year is focused on student level data collection in the classroom so that students will begin to create meaningful data for themselves and establish goals relative to their own learning.

The Board asked that it be updated regularly so that they are able to have a better understanding of the work of CIT and stay connected with its progress. CIT has scheduled quarterly updates to the Board (October, January, April and June/July) in order to provide it with updated information throughout the year.

(Attachment)

Superintendent's Report

Dr. Riebock provided summary reports on the following items:

- A. Administrative Retreat, June 13-15, 2007: An opportunity of District 41 administrators to meet for an extended time focused on teaching and learning and community engagement as it relates to the five year plan. Moving forward with the five-year plan. Dr. Riebock said that the District's Administrative Team is in the process of building a road map to define how we will implement the five-year plan and to monitor and be accountable for progress.
- B. June 20 Board Retreat Meeting and next steps upon the failed 2007 facilities referendum: Board members spent approximately five hours examining a variety of topics such as governance, trusteeship, roles and responsibilities and will continue its discussion at a future retreat in August.

The Board also discussed the 2007 referendum failure and possible next steps. The Board acknowledged the value of developing a process by which to canvass the voter outcome and directed Dr. Riebock to develop the process. Data will drive the District's next steps to address the facilities issue. Next steps could possibly include master facilities and space utilization studies.

- C. There is currently no Board meeting schedule in July. Since policy allows the District to pay bills ahead of the Board approval, we will need to utilize this procedure in July. Members of the Finance Committee, Kevin Cosgrove and Steven Vondrak will review all July bills and the District will pay them so that we are not penalized, but the bills will be approved in arrears. Mr. Cosgrove noted that this is a procedure that already occurs occasionally, because of timelines and schedules.

Action Items

- A. Consent Agenda: President Howard stated that all items listed below under the Consent Agenda are adopted by one single motion unless a member of the Board or the Superintendent requests an item to be removed to be considered separately or amended. Mrs. Howard recommended removing two items from the Consent Agenda: (1) Personnel Report (Mrs. Howard said that the Board will discuss this matter in closed session and anticipates that it will take action when it returns to Open Session; (2) June 20, 2007 draft Board Minutes (Mrs.

Howard said that this will allow the Board ample time to review the minutes and to take action on this item at their next regularly scheduled meeting. Mr. Cosgrove explained that Accounts Payable and Payroll (Attachment 5) of the Finance Section was amended to reflect the payment of two additional bills that were received late. Hearing no additional requests,

Cosgrove moved and Solak seconded to approve the actions and recommendations in the Consent Agenda described below as amended. On a roll call vote answering "Aye": Cosgrove, Kenwood, Vivoda, Nelson, Solak and Howard; answering "Nay": None. Motion carried.

1. *Human Resources*
 - (b) *Automated Sub System Proposal* Attachment 1

2. *Finance, Facilities and Operations (\$ denotes financial attachment)*
 - (a) *Treasurer's Report* \$Attachment 1
 - (b) *Cash Balances Report* \$Attachment 2
 - (c) *Investment Schedule* \$Attachment 3
 - (d) *Monthly Budget Report* \$Attachment 4
 - (e) *Accounts Payable and Payroll (Amended)* \$Attachment 5
 - (f) *Vandalism/Damage Report* \$Attachment 6
 - (g) *Disposal of Surplus Property* \$Attachment 7
 - (h) *2006-2007 FOIA Report* \$Attachment 8
 - (i) *SportLink USA Facility Use Contract for Hadley* \$Attachment 9
 - (j) *Renewal of Storage Lease with D93 for Science Kits* \$Attachment 10
 - (k) *Prevailing Wage* \$Attachment 11
 - (l) *2007-2008 Tentative Budget and Budget Display* \$Attachment 12

3. *Other Matters*
 - (a) *Board Regular & Special Meeting Minutes*
June 11, 2007 Regular Meeting Minutes

Upcoming Meetings

Mrs. Howard reported that there are currently no Board meetings scheduled in the month of July. The next Board meeting is a special workshop/retreat session that is scheduled for Thursday, August 9, 2007 from 5:30 -8:30 p.m. Location to be determined. The next regular meeting of the Board of Education is scheduled for Monday, August 13, 2007, 7:30 p.m. at the Central Services Office.

Discussion Items

The Board discussed no additional matters.

Public Participation

There were no members of the public who wished to address the Board.

Closed Session

At 8:21 p.m. Kenwood moved and Vivoda seconded to adjourn to Closed Session to discuss:

The appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of specific employees of the District or legal counsel for the District, including hearing testimony on a complaint lodged against an employee or against legal counsel for the District to determine its validity.

On a roll call vote answering "Aye": Solak, Cosgrove, Kenwood, Vivoda, Nelson and Howard; answering "Nay": None. Motion carried.

Return to Open Session

After returning from Closed Session, the Board took action on the following matter(s):

A. June 25, 2007 Personnel Report

Vivoda moved and Nelson seconded to approve the June 25, 2007 Personnel Report as presented on the attached. On a roll call vote answering "Aye", Solak, Cosgrove, Vivoda, Nelson and Howard; answering "Nay": Kenwood. Motion carried.

Adjourn Regular Meeting

There being no further business to come before the Board, Nelson moved and Vivoda seconded to adjourn the regular meeting of the Board of Education. On a roll call vote answering "Aye": Solak, Cosgrove, Kenwood, Vivoda, Nelson and Howard; answering "Nay": None. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,
Maureen Stecker, Recording Secretary

Terra Costa Howard,
President, Board of Education

Erica Nelson
Secretary, Board of Education

Minutes approved August 13, 2007

**Glen Ellyn School District #41
Board Report**

Date: August 13, 2007
Title: Local Election Official
Contact: Dr. Ann K. Riebock, Superintendent

Background: District 41 School Board Policy #2:30, states that "the Board clerk or secretary of a school district serves as the local election official, assisted by designated representatives appointed by the Board of Education." The duties of the school board secretary in the capacity of the local election official are set out in Article 9 of the School Code and various sections of the Election Code.

Discussion: In January 2005, the Superintendent recommended and the Board approved the appointment of Patricia A. Menges as the local election official designee for Glen Ellyn School District 41. Due to Ms. Menges' resignation on July 20, 2007, the District is obligated to notify the DuPage County Election Commission of the vacancy and furnish it with the name of the new appointee.

Recommendation: The Administration is recommending the appointment of Maureen S. Stecker as the local election official for Glen Ellyn School District 41.