



Glen Ellyn School District 41

Dr. Ann K. Riebock, Superintendent

MINUTES

**GLEN ELLYN SCHOOL DISTRICT 41
BOARD OF EDUCATION
SPECIAL MEETING
SEPTEMBER 14, 2009
CENTRAL SERVICES OFFICES
793 NORTH MAIN STREET
GLEN ELLYN, ILLINOIS**

Call to Order

Following an informal dinner and socializing, the September 14, 2009 Special Meeting was called to order at 5:26 p.m.

Roll Call

Upon the roll being called, the following answered present: Drew Ellis, Erica Nelson, Dan Smith, Terra Howard, Bob Solak and Steve Vondrak. Mr. Kahler arrived at 6 p.m.

Others present: Superintendent Dr. Ann Riebock; Communications Director Julie Worthen; Assistant Superintendent for Facilities, Finance and Operations Bob Ciserella; and Recording Secretary Maureen Stecker.

Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Solak led the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Public Participation

Kevin Fry inquired about current District enrollment and asked when the next monthly enrollment report would be available. Superintendent Dr. Ann Riebock said that the information will be available at the September 21, 2009 Board meeting.

Discussion Items

- A. Review of Meeting Norms: The Board reviewed meeting norms that it identified at a special retreat workshop held earlier in the year.
- B. Master Facility Plan: Board discussion focused on the Master Facility Plan and determining next steps. Discussion included the following:
 1. Review of Responses to Master Facility Plan (MFP) Reflective Questions: Dr. Riebock provided a synthesis of Board member responses to a list of reflective questions relative to next steps and timelines for the Master Facility Plan.

- Is there a fundamental belief in the recommendation that we should build/retrofit District 41 schools to place all students under permanent roof and to prepare our schools to meet the educational needs of learning in the 21st century?

There was consensus among Board members that students should be under permanent roof; that any long-term solution should eliminate portable classrooms, and that educational priorities should serve as the primary driver for the facilities solution. However, the combined priorities must be affordable.

- Does the Board accept the recommendations of the MFP Steering Committee which means we do not go back through myriad of other options that were rejected by the group?

Board responses to this question were mixed. Some Board members felt that while they may not all agree at this time which solution is best, they believe we should move forward with the current recommendation and then adjust the final recommendation to fit the financial parameters. Other Board members felt that we need to re-visit all options with an eye to the criteria and parameters. Re-examining all options would help the Board point to rationale and documentation for not pursuing various options.

- Do we accept that the recommendation does not include a re-visitation to a K-6 configuration or a 5-6 or 5-8 configuration?

The Board did not reach consensus on this question. Some Board members felt that we should continue to consider both the K-6 and 5-6 configurations; others were in agreement with not re-revisiting any of the above options.

- Do we believe in the long-range view of this plan rather than short-term fixes that may replace the portables but not create a 21st century learning environment?

The Board supported the concept of the integrated resource (IR) learning areas and its desire to have a more inclusive model with small flexible work spaces where services and opportunities occur closer to the classroom. However, it wondered about the overall costs of creating such areas and discussed alternative possibilities such as building those resource areas over time.

- Can we agree on one concept in the option A series or B series developed by FGM, District Architects? Board discussion centered on ways in which to revisit Series A and Series B options. The Board discussed its level of comfort in using previous assumptions used by the MFP Steering Committee and noted that the Steering Committee did its work and developed recommendations without a cost criteria. This may have led the committee down paths that may otherwise not have been pursued. Additional Board comments included how revisiting all of the options with different criteria would be a good will gesture and might generate different outcomes.

2. Next steps and timeline:

Revisit alternative options from original MFP recommendations including:

- Establish Board specific parameters/criteria that include costs
- Brainstorm options identified
- Presenting options via Concept Evaluation Matrix

Dr. Riebock will develop a spreadsheet template with new criteria and certain assumptions for Series A & B options that will be completed by each Board member. Criteria will include (e.g. adding operational cost; construction cost (low-medium-high); can all students be housed under one roof; does it maintain educational values; does the solution preclude attaining the long term MFP solution in its totality; does it meet the vision of the MFP). Board members will submit their individual analysis to Dr. Riebock for her synthesis with a final review by Board members so that they can reach consensus on whether to move a solution forward and how best to accomplish this.

The Board also discussed what it felt was necessary to prepare for stakeholder engagement relative to a referendum. It discussed the need to look at non-traditional strategies for gaining voter support. Getting voter support may be even more difficult now for a number of different reasons, beginning with the current economic climate. The Board determined January 15, 2010 as a deadline for identifying feasible options of Series A and Series B options and deliverables and to develop a timeline for next steps to move forward.

The Board also discussed the potential conflict of interest in using the District's architect of record as a consultant for the Master Facility Plan project. Some Board members expressed concern about using a vendor who has a vested financial interest in the project and felt that there is a potential for less than objective recommendations when a firm is paid based on incentive(s). Dr. Riebock explained that if the Board has an interest in pursuing another architectural consultant, the District must conduct a Request for Proposal (RFP) process of architectural firms. If the MFP recommendation of the Board includes a design/construction package, the District could go out to bid for architectural work. Dr. Riebock noted that it is certainly a discussion that the Board can have about re-evaluating the District's architect of record, but it is customary for the District's architect of record to help facilitate the building of a Master Facility Plan.

Adjourn Special Meeting

There being no further business, Nelson moved and Ellis seconded to adjourn the special meeting at 9:06 p.m. Motioned carried on a unanimous voice vote.

Respectfully submitted,
Maureen Stecker, Recording Secretary



Steve Vondrak
President, Board of Education



Erica Nelson
Secretary, Board of Education

Minutes approved: September 21, 2009