

**MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING,
BOARD OF EDUCATION, SCHOOL
DISTRICT #225, COOK COUNTY,
ILLINOIS, FEBRUARY 11, 2013**

A regular meeting of the Board of Education, School District No. 225 was held on Monday, February 11, 2013, at approximately 7:00 p.m. at Glenbrook North High School Library, pursuant to due notice of all members and the public.

The president called the meeting to order. Upon calling of the roll, the following members answered present:

Doughty, Hanley, Martin, Shein, Taub

Absent: Boron, Regalbuto (arrived 7:03 p.m. via telephone)

Also present: Caliendo, Frandson, Nimke, Muir, Pearson, Pryma, Riggle, Siena, Wegley, Williamson

APPROVAL OF AGENDA FOR THIS MEETING

Motion by Mr. Martin, seconded by Mr. Doughty to approve the agenda for this meeting.

Upon calling of the roll:

aye: Doughty, Hanley, Martin, Shein, Taub

nay: none

Motion carried 5-0.

STUDENTS AND STAFF WHO EXCEL

GBS Titan Stars and coaches were recognized. Ms. Nimke explained that nine girls with special needs joined the junior varsity cheerleading team. Cheerleading coach, Ms. VanderPlas, introduced GBS cheerleaders who spoke about the Titan Stars program. One of the Titan Star cheerleaders spoke about her experience.

Cheerleading coaches spoke of the opportunity for leadership roles for the cheerleaders and how much the junior varsity cheerleaders learned from the experience.

Dr. Riggle thanked the parents for their support.

RECOGNITION OF COMMUNITY VISITORS

Johanna Hebl introduced herself as a parent of two children at Greenbriar Elementary School in Northbrook and a member of the Northbrook Anti-Violence Initiative. She stated that she wanted to start a conversation about gun violence and address mental health issues. Northbrook is listed as one of the top 100 safest places to live. District 28 recently held three community forums related to school safety. Ms. Hebl offered suggestions for the Board to consider. The district should invest more in addressing mental health issues. There is a lot of bullying happening via social media. She would like more reinforcement of positive messages. Ms. Hebl suggested that the FBI evaluate safety at the schools. She stated that after-hours the school is wide open. Northbrook does not require registration or the locking of guns. It is important to identify young adults showing anti-social behavior and follow-up with parents. Ms. Hebl stated that the schools should start a conversation and she would like to participate in it.

BOARD AND SUPERINTENDENT REPORTS

Dr. Riggle reported on a very successful Variety Show at GBN. He stated that Mr. Doughty's son performed in the show. There was a lot of investment of time, energy and resources in this event. Dr. Riggle spoke of the amazing talent of our students. The GBS Variety Show is next week. Both communities pay attention to activities outside of the core academics such as the Variety Shows.

Mr. Shein stated that he attended a political event where parents and students approached him with praise for the staffs at both schools and the experiences that their children have had. He stated that these comments were completely unsolicited.

MOTION TO APPROVE CONSENT AGENDA

Motion by Mr. Martin, seconded by Mr. Doughty to approve the following items on the consent agenda

- 1.) a. no appointments of certificated staff
- 1.) b. the appointment of the following educational support staff contained in the assistant superintendent for human resources memorandum

APPOINTMENTS

<u>NAME</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>EFFECTIVE</u>	<u>SCHOOL</u>
Pyun, Hae (Sara)	SPED IA	02.19.13	GBS - TR

2.) a. the resignations/termination of the following certificated staff:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>EFFECTIVE</u>	<u>SCHOOL</u>
Resnick, Jenifer	Teacher, English	06.30.13	GBN
Rosinski, Robert	Coach, Varsity Baseball	01.28.13	GBN

b. the resignation/termination of the following educational support staff contained in the memorandum dated February 11, 2013.

Personnel - Resignations/Terminations

<u>NAME</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>EFFECTIVE</u>	<u>SCHOOL</u>
Martell, Emma	English IA	02.20.13	GBS

3.) the Board of Education review of the FOIA request contained in consent agenda item #6.3.

4.) the issuance of Vendor Checks Nos. 56519 through 56722 in the amount of \$425,249.62 as listed on the attached checks register dated February 5, 2013.

5.) No Payroll

6.) the reimbursement of the Revolving Fund for Employees for the month of January in the amount of \$34,284.55 represented by checks No. 12516, 12520 through 12570, 12587 through 12611, and 12694 through 12730.
the reimbursement of the Revolving Fund for Vendors for the month of January in the amount of \$182,299.76 represented by checks No. 12517 through 12519, 12571 through 12586, 12612 through 12693, and 12731 through 12792. Checks issued in January voided in January: N/A. Check issued in previous months, voided in January: N/A.

7.) Special Open and Special Closed Session Minutes from the January 23, 2013 Regular Board Meeting. The Open January 28, 2013 Regular Board Meeting.

8.) District - NCLB School Improvement Plan for 2011-2013 as contained in consent agenda item # 6.8.

9.) GBS - NCLB School Improvement Plan for 2011-2013 as contained in consent agenda item # 6.9.

Upon calling of the roll:

aye: Doughty, Hanley, Martin, Regalbuto, Shein, Taub

nay: none

Motion carried 6-0.

DISCUSSION/ACTION: NSSED SERVICES AND COSTS OVERVIEW

Dr. Riggle introduced Ms. Pearson, Dr. Tim Thomas, NSSED Superintendent, and Mr. Seth Chapman, the NSSED Business Manager.

Ms. Pearson stated that the presentation is intended to respond to the NSSED budget process. She stated that in May she will discuss the NSSED FY14 budget.

Ms. Pearson explained the backward planning process for the budget as it relates to how to best prepare students for college, work and to live independently. Sometimes services can have an extraordinary cost, but schools are mandated to deliver services. NSSED has to balance between achieving goals for students and maintaining fiscal responsibility.

Ms. Pearson described the continuum of services offered by NSSED. She stated that there are some students that the district and NSSED do not have the capacity to serve, so private and public day schools provide services for these students.

Ms. Pearson stated that the program costs are the majority of the district costs to NSSED, but this does not define the partnership with NSSED. Students with greater needs require greater costs to serve them. Ms. Pearson reviewed the NSSED service delivery model and gave examples of services such as professional development and Response to Intervention coaching.

Mr. Martin asked what the range of students in the district has been relative to those who have an IEP.

Ms. Pearson stated that the percentage has been steady in the last five years at approximately 11% of the student population.

Mr. Martin requested the percentages.

Ms. Pearson stated that she can provide numbers from the dashboard reports that were presented to the Board last fall.

Mr. Martin asked about the number of students that are served by NSSED.

Ms. Pearson stated that this depends on the types of services that students' access. There are approximately 50 students in the TLS program. The number at North Shore Academy (NSA) varies with more transient numbers, but can fluctuate from 4-8 students.

Mr. Doughty asked how Ms. Pearson arrived at 11% of students having an IEP.

Ms. Pearson stated that there are about 550 students in the district who have an IEP, but not all are receiving services from NSSED. She stated that she can provide more information on numbers when presenting the NSSED budget this spring.

Mr. Martin asked if the number of students served by NSSED has remained steady.

Ms. Pearson stated that the numbers will go up steadily through the 2014-15 school year.

Mr. Doughty asked what percentage of the budget goes to the various percentages of IEP students.

Ms. Pearson stated that this will be covered later in the presentation.

Mr. Doughty asked Ms. Pearson about indirect supports.

Ms. Pearson stated that various members of Glenbrook staff attend professional development programs at NSSED. NSSED provides some vision support for students who are in mainstream courses. She described broad resources provided by NSSED.

Mr. Martin stated that it would be great to see the comparison with other districts that are part of NSSED.

Ms. Pearson stated that she will provide a comparison with other NSSED districts relative to student enrollment in programs when presenting the budget.

Ms. Pearson explained that Federal Law requires that schools make decisions using an RtI model. She explained the RtI continuum. Ms. Pearson stated that there are some aspects of tuition-based programs that the district does not have the expertise to support. She gave examples of occupational and physical therapy services. It would not be cost-effective for the district to employ its own occupational therapists.

Mr. Doughty commented that NSSED is filling gaps in services.

2/11/13

Ms. Pearson stated that NSSED creates an economy of scale for the member districts. NSSED provides us with training or offers services. The district used to contract speech services with NSSED, but now the district has enough students to the point of being in need of providing its own speech services.

Mr. Doughty stated that the district might choose services differently depending on the needs of the students.

Ms. Pearson confirmed that this was the case.

Ms. Pearson reviewed the continuum of services offered by NSSED both in general education through more restrictive services. She explained that the district uses NSSED to case manage some students placed in out-of-district programs. She provided some examples. NSSED's autism team helped build a structured teaching program at our Off Campus program. NSSED provides support for transition services, as well. She explained NSSED's role in vocational job coaching.

Mr. Doughty asked Ms. Pearson to give an example of where NSSED helps with RtI.

Ms. Pearson explained how NSSED helped obtain data from sender schools relative to students who need additional interventions.

Mr. Doughty clarified that students in the general education program, but not in special education, receive RtI services.

Ms. Pearson confirmed this and explained that RtI is an attempt to decrease the skill gap between students and their peers and explained how this is a temporary situation.

Ms. Pearson introduced Mr. Seth Chapman to review the district's access to services and NSSED cost structure.

Mr. Chapman thanked Dr. Riggle and the Board for the opportunity to share information. He reviewed the NSSED fee structure. Mr. Chapman explained that everything offered is not needed by all districts. NSSED is charged with staying ahead of best practices in teaching and learning and is also responsible for facilities and maintaining infrastructure.

Mr. Martin asked about the tuition rate.

Mr. Chapman stated that the rate is \$13.43 per student based upon total district population. The NSSED budget is built with the assumption of C.P.I. and the Board directs the NSSED administration in the development of the budget. He stated that Ms. Pearson is on the NSSED Finance Committee.

Mr. Martin asked if the fee is the same fee for K-8 and high school students.

Mr. Chapman confirmed that this is the case.

Mr. Martin asked about the districts who originally founded NSSED and current membership.

Dr. Thomas stated that eight years ago two districts left NSSED.

Mr. Doughty asked about the net cost for students who use NSSED services.

Mr. Chapman clarified that the tuition rate is multiplied by the total student population of the district.

Ms. Pearson stated that each district is assessed in the same way.

Mr. Chapman explained the fee structure for non-member districts.

Mr. Taub asked about the cost per student relative to the District 225 budget.

Mrs. Siena stated that tuition is based on a per-capita rate.

Mr. Martin asked about the number of districts that are not members that use NSSED services.

Dr. Thomas stated that ten districts access services that are not members of NSSED.

Mr. Martin asked why these districts choose not to become members.

Dr. Thomas stated that some districts are not geographically adjacent that access services.

Mr. Chapman described the recent NSSED billing study. He noted that no two cooperatives are alike. All cooperatives offer services differently and operate under different business models. NSSED did look at other cooperatives for the billing study. NSSED's goal was to have transparency and equity among member districts. He explained that in the previous model the high schools and elementary districts paid different rates. Currently, all districts pay the same rate, but not the same amount. He explained how IDEA grant money was used to help supplement needs for special education students. \$90k came back to Glenbrook from IDEA funds.

2/11/13

Mr. Chapman reviewed cost containment initiatives and NSSED fiscal responsibility. Tuition was not keeping pace with contract costs relative to healthcare and pensions.

Mr. Doughty asked if the bargaining agreement is for NSSED employees.

Mr. Chapman confirmed that this was the case.

Mr. Martin requested data on costs for NSSED compared to other cooperatives.

Mr. Chapman stated that there can be a comparison done for O.T. and P.T. services.

Dr. Thomas stated that it is possible to make comparisons, but it gets tricky because of differences among cooperatives.

Mr. Chapman explained that there are a number of differences between the cooperatives so there would be a lot of footnotes if a comparison was to be done.

Mrs. Siena stated that when NSSED went to the new budget structure, the NSSED Board was presented the different structure and compared inequities within the co-op among the member districts. Mrs. Siena stated that there are comparisons to other districts from the study that was done. She stated that it is more important to look within the 18 NSSED member districts.

Ms. Pearson stated that there are differences in the percentage of the NSSED budget that goes towards salary and benefits due to the numbers of years of experience of staff members.

Dr. Thomas stated that often the cost of a particular program is not the cost of certified staff.

Mr. Chapman provided historical information relative to budgeted expenditures. He stated that NSSED has become more operationally efficient. The majority of reductions are because of increased efficiencies.

Mr. Doughty clarified that the percentage of the overall budget that accounts for salary and benefits for NSSED is 91%.

Mr. Chapman stated that NSSED has had a decline in staff, but about 40% of cuts were operational.

Mr. Doughty asked how many staff members are employed by NSSED.

Mr. Chapman stated that NSSED has around 500 staff members.

Mr. Martin asked Mrs. Siena about the percentage of the District 225 budget in which 79-80% represents salary and benefits.

Mrs. Siena stated that district staff is all staff including general education and special education staff.

Mr. Chapman stated that the NSSED staff to student ratio makes a big difference in the percentage of budget spent on staff since there is a much greater number of staff to serve students in a purely special education program.

Mr. Chapman stated that between FY10 to FY13 NSSED reduced about 50 staff. In doing this NSSED did not want to lower the quality of services provided. Following the cuts in staff, more staff had to be added back in.

Mr. Doughty stated that after three years of cutting significantly, it appeared that NSSED had to right the ship in making staff adjustments.

Mr. Chapman reviewed implications for budget reductions. The goal of NSSED is to provide cutting edge services for member districts. NSSED has to maintain a new facility.

Mr. Taub asked what percentage of the NSSED budget is contingency.

Mr. Chapman stated that the NSSED Finance Committee will look at that again. Currently NSSED is operating with 12% contingency. They would prefer this to be between 15-20%.

Mr. Chapman reviewed NSSED revenue which is mostly locally funded. This is a challenge.

Dr. Thomas reviewed the key factors influencing the budget and budget process. He stated that the district is well represented by Dr. Riggle, Mrs. Siena, Mr. Taub and Ms. Pearson in the budget process. Dr. Thomas reviewed the draft budget process timeline and how input is garnered from member districts. Dr. Thomas encouraged the Board as a member district Board to have conversations about the NSSED draft budget.

Mr. Doughty asked about the team that negotiates the contract for NSSED.

Dr. Thomas described the team as the NSSED superintendent, business manager and director of human resources. NSSED did not employ an attorney. Contract negotiations were brought back to the NSSED Governing Board.

Mr. Martin asked for an explanation of the two layers of the NSSED boards.

Dr. Thomas stated that there is an Executive Committee and Governing Board. Mr. Hammer thought this was redundant, as well. The Executive Committee is comprised of three superintendents and three board members that meet prior to the Governing Board Meeting. NSSED is currently soliciting feedback on the process. Depending on feedback, NSSED may make a change to just having a Governing Board.

Mr. Doughty clarified that the contract goes to the Governing Board.

Dr. Thomas stated that this was the case.

Mr. Doughty clarified that every district has a member on the Governing Board.

Dr. Thomas confirmed this.

Mr. Doughty asked how much District 225 spends on NSSED.

Ms. Pearson stated that the district spends over \$3M on all services. She stated that NSSED provides a safety net when a new student with great needs unexpectedly moves in.

Ms. Pearson reviewed the next steps in the NSSED budget process. She stated that she will bring forward the NSSED budget earlier this year than in past years.

DISCUSSION/ACTION: COMMON CORE STATE STANDARDS PRESENTATION

Dr. Williamson and math I.S.'s Phil Gartner, Robin Levine-Wissing and English I.S.'s Dr. Ed Solis and Sue Levine-Kelley provided the Board with an update regarding the new Common Core State Standards (CCSS).

Dr. Williamson provided a general overview of CCSS including the timeline for implementation in Illinois.

Mr. Doughty asked for clarification regarding consistency of standards and assessments for the purposes of comparisons to other states and school districts.

Dr. Williamson confirmed that the standards are the same for the forty-nine states that have adopted them. The assessments will be the same for the twenty-six states that are part of PARCC so that comparisons could be made across these states and among districts within these states.

Mr. Doughty asked if the district would be assessed against all forty-nine states that adopted CCSS and the twenty-six PARCC states.

Dr. Williamson stated that only if the assessments developed by the remaining CCSS states can be aligned to the PARCC assessments; otherwise it would be difficult to compare. More will be known as the assessments are developed.

Mr. Doughty asked what will be done with the assessment data. He asked if our schools would be compared to other schools across the state.

Dr. Williamson explained the idea of a growth model and how this measures student growth as students' progress from one grade to the next. In this model the state will likely set some benchmark that students must reach to demonstrate growth from one grade level to the next.

Mr. Doughty clarified his question relative to No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and the frustration that can result when student achievement increases substantially from one year to the next, yet does not reach the threshold to be free of NCLB sanctions.

Dr. Williamson explained that under NCLB, by 2014 100% of students in all subgroups must meet standards as measured by the Prairie State Exam. NCLB is due to be reauthorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), but it is difficult to predict when this will be done.

Dr. Riggle stated that until the Federal government reauthorizes ESEA we have no idea how they want us to use the data. The two assessments, Smarter Balanced and PARCC, will emerge. Everything points to a growth model, but this is yet to be seen. We have no idea if schools will be compared to one another under the new assessment model.

Mr. Gartner and Ms. Levine-Wissing provided an overview of CCSS math. Algebraic thinking topics have been pushed to earlier grades.

Mr. Martin asked for clarification as to whether the algebra topics are being infused in high school courses or middle school courses.

Mr. Gartner explained that this will have an impact on middle schools where students will be exposed to these concepts even if they are not in an algebra class.

Mr. Martin asked if students are doing more algebra in sixth grade, what is taken away.

Mr. Gartner stated that some topics will become less important and others will become more important.

Dr. Williamson clarified that currently there is greater repetition of topics at the lower grade levels. With CCSS developing deeper understanding, there should be less need to repeat topics and thus more time to incorporate algebra topics at the lower grade levels.

Mr. Doughty asked if the district will have to work more closely in coordination with the sender districts.

Mr. Gartner explained that this has been ongoing through the Northfield Township Math Articulation Group and it will be important to work with sender districts as we all implement CCSS.

Ms. Levine-Wissing presented information regarding new types of application problems that relate to the eight standards of mathematical practice.

Mr. Doughty asked for clarification regarding the higher cognitive demand tasks mentioned by Ms. Levine-Wissing.

Ms. Levine-Wissing and Mr. Gartner explained and gave examples of lower cognitive demand tasks and higher cognitive demand tasks (those that are multi-step and unfamiliar to the student). She also clarified how student responses may be scored with more emphasis on the problem-solving process compared to the final answer.

Mr. Doughty asked if this represented a change for the Glenbrooks.

Ms. Levine-Wissing and Mr. Gartner stated that this is not a significant change in approach for the schools.

Mr. Doughty indicated that his son has experienced story problems in his math class at GBN.

Mr. Martin commented that these types of problems seem more difficult to assess.

Ms. Levine-Wissing concurred.

Mr. Martin asked if this will take more time for teachers in grading student work to maintain a program like this. He asked if this new initiative is going to change the approach in any way.

Ms. Levine-Wissing and Mr. Gartner stated that because teachers have always given students problems similar to those suggested by the eight standards of math practice, this should not be an extra burden.

Mr. Doughty asked what would have to be given up in the implementation of CCSS other than teachers putting time in to develop things.

Ms. Levine-Wissing stated that teachers are working more in their course teams to be more deliberate about students having similar experiences with high cognitive demand tasks.

Mr. Shein asked if the model extends up to the higher level complex courses such as AP.

Ms. Levine-Wissing stated that advanced algebra/algebra II is the most advanced part of the testing and most of our students take advanced algebra by 9th or 10th grade and some in grade 11. Topics are being moved down to courses lower in the math sequence. Some topics are being moved down from pre-calculus.

Mr. Shein asked if there is a benefit to applying the model to some of the upper-level classes or if we are doing this out of compliance. He asked if there are advantages such that higher-level classes should be incorporating the standards.

Ms. Levine-Wissing stated that the eight standards of math practice do have application in higher-level classes.

Dr. Williamson made a distinction between the eight standards of math practice and the Common Core State Standards which are content and skill based.

Mr. Martin asked if the math departments have any criticism of CCSS.

Ms. Levine-Wissing stated that it is positive. Being deliberate about the standards and giving students' opportunities to experience high cognitive demand tasks is positive. She stated that there are still some unknowns in terms of the assessments because these are still being developed. Glenbrook students will be well prepared for the new assessments given what is currently being done and what has been done in the past.

Mr. Shein asked how open-ended questions will be scored online.

Ms. Levine-Wissing indicated from recent information that this has not yet been determined.

Mr. Gartner stated that some items could be graded by computers, even extended response items.

Mr. Doughty asked if having the standards will restrict how teachers teach.

Ms. Levine-Wissing stated that this is not the feedback that she has obtained from her teachers. Teachers have been positive about the standards.

Mr. Doughty asked if teachers are feeling like they will be teaching to the test.

Ms. Levine-Wissing stated that she did not believe this was the case.

Ms. Levine-Wissing provided an update relative to professional development that is taking place with Northfield Township sender districts that will facilitate the transition to Common Core across the Township. It will be important to stay in close contact with sender districts as things evolve. She explained the two math pathways that are options with CCSS. Illinois has not yet determined the pathway.

Mr. Martin asked if there will be any costs related to this initiative.

Mrs. Siena stated that she did not anticipate any additional costs as part of the move to CCSS.

Ms. Levine-Kelley and Dr. Ed Solis presented an overview of changes in English as a result of CCSS. There will not be deep instructional changes in this area. The curriculum is literature-based. More non-fiction texts are being incorporated. There is more skill development pushed down to lower grade levels. Professional development has taken place over the past two years in working with Township sender districts.

Dr. Solis described professional development that has taken place across the Township. He spoke of how CCSS has helped with articulation efforts.

Mr. Doughty asked about the gaps in the curriculum that are being identified and asked if they relate specifically to the Common Core or are more general.

Dr. Solis stated that these relate to the Common Core. He provided some examples of skills that may need to be looked at in the transition from 8th to 9th grade.

Mr. Doughty asked if CCSS affected the choice of literature for the students.

Ms. Levine-Kelley explained that there were early misconceptions that CCSS did dictate literature; however, the novels associated with CCSS are only meant to serve as exemplar texts. It is very clear that CCSS is not dictating what or how.

Dr. Riggle made the point that this is not changing the way the Glenbrooks are functioning because we have paid attention to The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) and the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) positions and what colleges and universities are looking for. We feel less behind than others do. Standards are being driven by the leaders of these content areas.

Mr. Martin stated that one potential outcome of the CCSS initiative seems to be closer coordination with the middle schools. He asked if this was the case or if this is something that we have done for a while.

Ms. Levine-Kelley stated that we work very closely and have good professional relationships with feeder districts. CCSS is helping to create common language and rubrics that drive instruction. This will help for a smoother transition from 8th to 9th grade.

Dr. Solis stated that this will also help with coordination within other departments in the high school.

Mr. Martin stated that when he was on the District 34 Board, the question was raised regarding how District 34 students performed academically at GBS relative to the other students at GBS. He asked if the district has a sense that there are some of our feeder districts that are better with this integration. He asked if the district does a comparison of how the feeder districts are doing in preparing the students that they send GBS and GBN.

Dr. Riggle stated that some informal studies have been done in the past. Dr. Riggle stated that he can very strongly say that there is not much difference across the feeder districts because of the articulation that happens and how closely they pay attention to what the high school is looking for. There has been a strong position among superintendents, boards and principals that it is not a fair standard to apply. Dr. Riggle cited a variety of reasons why this is not a fair comparison. This affects real estate values and how people look at different segments of the community. Dr. Riggle stated that he personally does not want to enter into making these types of judgments about the elementary districts. He also stated that it is not fair to

compare GBS to GBN. He stated that he would not be in favor of that type of comparison.

Mr. Shein asked how it would be known if there was a deficiency if this information is not reviewed.

Dr. Riggle explained the type of information the district has looked at to support articulation efforts. The articulation is very strong among districts.

Mr. Doughty stated that we want to be sure that we are getting the best articulation and communication that can happen. As long as the articulation works well and is in place, then this addresses the question about the comparison.

Dr. Riggle stated that the district provides statistics to feeder schools relative to student performance. All feeder districts want their students to be fully prepared to do well in our high schools. He described the articulation and communication process with feeder districts. Dr. Riggle stated that he is critical of making these types of comparisons among feeder districts. There is no equalizing factor relative to demographics or sample size.

Mr. Taub stated that he does not get a sense that students in the community are unprepared for high school.

Dr. Riggle stated that there are differences in the approach to foreign language among Township schools and this is an area that is being discussed among districts.

DISCUSSION/ACTION: CURRICULUM REPORTS

Dr. Williamson introduced curriculum reports.

Mr. Muir provided an overview of GBS reports referencing the backwards-design model.

Mr. Doughty asked for clarification regarding essential questions and big ideas.

Mr. Muir explained that what you want students to know starts with big ideas, then moves to essential questions & understandings that are part of those questions, and then the work progresses to the skill level.

Mr. Doughty asked how this differs from previous models.

Mr. Muir stated that previously GBS used curriculum maps that were a more basic version of backwards design.

Mr. Doughty asked if GBN is doing this too.

Ms. Frandson stated that GBN is using similar types of processes.

Ms. Frandson highlighted the GBN curriculum reports. She stated that as part of the school improvement plan there has been collaboration and articulation relative to IEP students.

Ms. Frandson made reference to the GBN literacy initiative and the new Common Core State Standards.

Mr. Doughty asked for an explanation of the Academic Resource Center (ARC).

Ms. Frandson stated that this helps students with reading and writing in different academic areas. ARC staff teach reading strategies to students in a variety of classes and provide staff development to other departments.

Mr. Doughty asked if there are comparable programs at GBS.

Mr. Muir described the Titan Learning Center (TLC).

Mr. Doughty asked about the references to the need for new GBN language textbooks.

Dr. Williamson and Ms. Frandson explained that new textbook proposals will come to the Board in April. The majority of GBN world language textbooks have been used for at least five years.

Mr. Taub asked how students get connected to the learning center if the student does not recognize that they have a problem.

Ms. Frandson described the referral process to the ARC. Teachers and counselors refer students for help.

Dr. Wegley stated that the TLC will call the student in and set up some help and will e-mail the teachers as to what is being done.

Ms. Frandson stated that the school looks at grade data at progress report time, at the quarter and semester.

Mr. Taub asked if I.S.'s are reviewing progress reports to identify students who need help.

Mr. Muir explained how guidance counselors help identify students who need help.

Ms. Frandson described the problem solving team process.

Mr. Doughty commented that these are elaborate reports with extensive recommendations. He asked who makes sure the recommendations are followed through on.

Ms. Rockrohr, GBN science I.S., spoke about the collaboration occurring between science and math. She described how there is follow-up. She mentioned the new Next Generation Science Standards that are being finalized.

Mr. Doughty commented on the candid report from GBS PE in the review of aerobics.

Mr. Muir explained that teachers and course teams meet regularly to review the curriculum.

Mr. Martin commented that, with a few exceptions, there are very elaborate recommendations; some reports are shorter on recommendations. He cited the GBS World Language report. He stated that it seems that different people are conducting the reviews. Mr. Martin asked what has changed in the process.

Dr. Williamson stated that there are differences in some reports because of different groups conducting the review and writing the reports.

Mr. Muir stated that there is independence and autonomy in what is being done. He reiterated that GBS is using the Understanding By Design process to review the curriculum.

Dr. Wegley stated that the process is designed to keep curriculum up-to-date.

Mrs. Hanley commented positively on the fact that student views are taken into account in the reports.

Mr. Doughty commended the linear algebra teacher at GBS who went out of his way to help students fit the class in their schedule.

DISCUSSION/ACTION: CERTIFIED STAFF AUTHORIZATION FOR 2013-2014

Dr. Caliendo reviewed the recommendations for staffing for the 2013-2014 school year. He stated that this will be on consent at the next meeting.

Mr. Martin questioned how an increase of 11 students at GBN resulted in an increase of 1.3 FTE.

Dr. Caliendo stated that the number of courses per student accounts for the statistical factor resulting in the total FTE.

Dr. Riggle stated that the formula is one year behind. Dr. Riggle explained the calculation for determining FTE.

Mr. Taub asked Dr. Wegley if he was moving ahead with a block schedule.

Dr. Wegley stated that shortly this will be determined.

Mr. Taub asked if this would be for the next school year.

Dr. Wegley stated that any change would not come until the 2014-15 school year.

Mr. Shein asked how the block schedule would affect the numbers.

Dr. Riggle stated that this would result in an increase of around 5.5 to 6 teachers.

Dr. Wegley stated that a decision will be made by April 1.

Mr. Martin asked about the process that is being used to reach a decision on the schedule. He asked when the Board must make a decision.

Dr. Riggle stated that there will be a need for professional development, so there will need to be Board approval by mid-August if this is the decision. He reviewed the timeline from when GBN went to the block schedule.

Mr. Taub stated that he is happy with the block schedule.

Mr. Pryma stated that GBN has had discussions with Dr. Wegley about the schedule.

Mr. Taub asked if going to a block schedule further limits the facility capacity of GBS.

Dr. Riggle stated that this actually increases capacity by 12%.

Dr. Wegley stated that enrollment increases will be helped by the block schedule. Dr. Wegley described the process of determining the schedule for GBS.

Mr. Martin asked how parents were involved.

Dr. Wegley stated that the Parents' Association has 33 members who have students of different grade levels and they have been involved in discussions relative to the block schedule.

Mr. Taub asked if moving to the block will accommodate the Academy to a better degree.

Dr. Wegley stated that this could help with Academy, but there is still a need to think through some details. There will be a lot of staff development to do if the decision is to move to the block.

Mr. Shein expressed concern about reaching the savings goal that the Board laid out, given that moving to the block requires additional FTE.

Mrs. Siena stated that this has been discussed already and built into the projections. Some of the increases in FTE have been built in for pure enrollment increases.

Dr. Riggle explained that to determine FTE, the district looks at registrations per student. If GBS moves to the block, course registrations will be close to those of GBN. Dr. Riggle described the process at GBN for registrations. He stated that it would be predictable to determine future GBS registrations.

Dr. Wegley spoke of the benefits of the free period that students at GBN currently have under the block schedule.

Dr. Riggle stated that students at GBN have to apply to get an 8th class. The block schedule gives flexibility at crucial times. He provided some examples. Anecdotally, students say that one of the benefits is that it is similar to a college schedule.

DISCUSSION/ACTION: INFORMATION REGARDING PROPERTY TAX BILLS

Dr. Riggle mentioned that there has been confusion regarding new information contained on recent property tax bills.

Mrs. Siena provided a property tax bill as an example. She reviewed the data, where it came from and what it means.

Mrs. Siena stated that there is new mandatory district debt disclosure required by Cook County. The County selected certain segments of data and this is the first time that this data appears on property tax bills. The new field is called Total Pension Liability. Mrs. Siena reviewed total debts contained in this number which includes liabilities such as long-term bonded debt. She stated that for District 225, 80% of the figure is voter-approved referendum debt and reviewed the other debt that comprised this number.

Mrs. Siena explained the pension amount contained in this number is approximately \$13M which represents current retirees carrying medical insurance and life insurance benefits.

Mr. Taub commented that those are insured benefits so should not be considered debt.

Mrs. Siena stated that this does not matter in terms of what must be reported.

Mrs. Siena stated that \$30M represents IMRF and the rest is other liability. This does not represent all pension and does not contain any TRS.

Mrs. Siena stated that the number contains snippets of data with no context. The district pays the current year liability every year.

Mrs. Siena stated that the numbers represent real, audited data, but the context is difficult to understand relative to what the County considers debt, pension and other benefits. She stated that the debt is levied and IMRF is actuarially calculated.

Mr. Doughty asked how best to communicate this to the public.

Mrs. Siena stated that she worked with Ms. Nimke on a press release.

Mr. Doughty commented that it is difficult to understand the number with no context.

MISCELLANEOUS TOPICS

Mr. Martin requested information regarding policies related to non-school employment. He provided a hypothetical example of a coach who owns a store and suggests to the students that he coaches that they purchase cleats at his store. He asked if there would be a problem with this scenario under current policy.

Dr. Riggle stated the policy referenced by Mr. Martin does not address this issue. Dr. Riggle stated that public employees have to submit a statement of economic interest with Cook County every year.

Mr. Martin asked if anybody had ever raised an issue with this before.

Dr. Riggle stated that he would have to look at the district's ethics policy.

Mr. Martin asked if there was any problem with district staff making money on the side because of their connection with our students.

Dr. Riggle stated that he will look at additional policies. If there is not currently a policy for behavior that the district would not condone, it does not mean that we don't need a policy. Dr. Riggle stated that he will look closely at existing policies.

Mr. Doughty asked if carrying out their contract speaks to an ethical code that our teachers must adhere to.

Dr. Riggle explained that teachers are under contract relative to certain hours in the school day.

Mr. Doughty asked if there is a separate ethical code.

Dr. Riggle stated that he would have to see if there is a policy that covers the situation Mr. Martin referenced. At the high school level we have IHSA rules and these restrictions can be looked at, as well.

Mr. Martin asked if there is a preference given to inside teachers for coaching positions.

Dr. Wegley and Mr. Pryma spoke to the benefits of current teachers coaching rather than individuals who do not work in the schools.

Dr. Riggle stated that the GEA contract speaks to that fact that the GEA member will be considered for a coaching position.

Mr. Martin asked who is responsible for making sure that non-teaching coaches are aware of district policies.

Mr. Pryma stated that the Athletic Directors and head coaches are responsible.

Dr. Riggle stated that it is sometimes difficult to find coaches for new and emerging sports.

Mr. Martin asked about the cost, if any, of the Academy Program. He stated that he is curious to have a discussion about why there is an Academy and what it costs.

Dr. Riggle stated that the cost is primarily in staff. The most expensive program in the district is driver education. Dr. Riggle stated that all of this can be quantified.

Mr. Martin stated that a lot of Boards are asking if they support tackle football.

Mr. Taub stated that the Debate Team is an expensive program.

Mr. Shein asked about receiving programmatic costs relative to cost reduction.

Mrs. Siena stated that \$536k is the total cost of the Academy program.

Mr. Martin asked why we have the Academy. He stated that it may be a great thing, but he is not sure why we have it.

Dr. Riggle stated that a review of the Academy Program can be presented to the Board this spring.

MOTION TO MOVE INTO CLOSED SESSION

Motion by Mr. Martin, seconded by Mr. Doughty to move into closed session at approximately 10:25 p.m. To consider the appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of specific employees of the public body or legal counsel for the public body, including hearing testimony on a complaint lodged against an employee of the public body or against legal counsel for the public body to determine its validity; collective negotiating matters between the public body and its employees or their representatives, or deliberations concerning salary schedules for one or more classes of employees (Section 2(c) (1) and (2) of the Open Meeting Act).

Upon calling of the roll:

aye: Doughty, Hanley, Martin, Regalbuto, Shein, Taub

Nay: none

Motion carried 6-0.

The Board returned to open session at 11:29 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Mrs. Hanley, seconded by Mr. Taub to adjourn the meeting at approximately 11:29 p.m.

Upon call for a vote on the motion, all present voted aye.*

Motion carried 6-0.

* Doughty, Hanley, Martin, Regalbuto, Shein, Taub

24
2/11/13

CERTIFIED TO BE CORRECT:

PRESIDENT - BOARD OF EDUCATION

SECRETARY - BOARD OF EDUCATION

UPCOMING BOARD MEETINGS:

Thursday, February 21, 2013	7:30am	Finance Committee Meeting (GBS Rm 128)
Monday, February 25, 2013	7:00pm	Regular Board Meeting (GBN Library)