

**MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING,
BOARD OF EDUCATION, SCHOOL
DISTRICT #225, COOK COUNTY,
ILLINOIS, APRIL 8, 2013**

A regular meeting of the Board of Education, School District No. 225 was held on Monday, April 8, 2013, at approximately 7:04 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:

Boron, Doughty, Hanley, Martin, Shein, Taub

Absent: Regalbuto (arrived 7:11 p.m. via telephone)

Also present: Caliendo, Frandson, Geddeis, Muir, Pryma, Ptak, Riggle, Siena, Thimm, Wegley, Williamson

APPROVAL OF AGENDA FOR THIS MEETING

Motion by Mr. Boron, seconded by Mr. Taub to approve the agenda for this meeting.

Upon calling of the roll:

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

nay: none

Motion carried 6-0.

STUDENTS AND STAFF WHO EXCEL

Ms. Geddeis introduced GBN DECA students led by Ms. Ingersoll who was named outstanding DECA advisor this year. Ms. Geddeis explained how GBN will compete in 19 out of 45 events at nationals. Ms. Geddeis stated the levels of achievement of DECA students at the state competition.

Ms. Ingersoll gave a brief explanation of the DECA program relative to membership across the world and how students engage in the program through competitions that are aligned with national learning standards. Ms. Ingersoll shared business plans designed by the students.

Students introduced themselves and described the categories that they competed in. Seniors shared their college plans.

Dr. Riggle commented on the phenomenal achievement of the GBN DECA team at state. He stated that it was unprecedented that one team swept state at the level that GBN did.

Dr. Riggle thanked Ms. Ingersoll for her and Mr. Rast's efforts. He thanked parents for their support.

Mr. Pryma wished students the best at the national competition.

Ms. Ingersoll thanked the Board for their support and shared continuing DECA alumni connections.

RECOGNITION OF COMMUNITY VISITORS

None.

BOARD AND SUPERINTENDENT REPORTS

Dr. Riggle stated that on a solemn note he gave credit to GBN staff and GBS for stepping up and supporting GBN in the recent loss of a student. Dr. Riggle spoke of efforts in the school to continue to educate parents, students and staff relative to the issue of student suicide.

Dr. Riggle stated that he received a letter today from Mrs. Snyder relative to the heart foundation which supplied 6 AED's to the Northbrook community. These devices will be demonstrated on earth day at the village green. These AED's will be placed in public parks where students would be engaged in activities.

MOTION TO APPROVE CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Doughty asked for clarification regarding item 6.9 and asked if this item could be amended orally.

Mr. Shein asked the administration to make the correction suggested by Mr. Doughty.

Motion by Mr. Boron, seconded by Mr. Taub to approve the following items on the consent agenda

- 1.) a. the appointment of the following certificated staff as recommended by the assistant superintendent for human resources

APPOINTMENTS

<u>NAME</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>EFFECTIVE</u>	<u>SCHOOL</u>	<u>SALARY</u>
--------------------	------------------------	-------------------------	----------------------	----------------------

Erwinski, English 08.19.13 GBN MA+15,
Jason Step 11

- 1.) b. no appointment of educational support staff
- 2.) a. the resignations/termination of the following certificated staff:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>EFFECTIVE</u>	<u>SCHOOL</u>
Matthew Hamilton	Teacher, Special Ed	06.07.13	GBS
Jason Heath	Teacher, Music	06.07.13	GBN/GBS
Hollie Saraswat	Teacher, German	06.07.13	GBN/GBS

b. the resignation/termination of the following educational support staff contained in the memorandum dated April 8, 2013.

Personnel - Resignations/Terminations

<u>NAME</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>EFFECTIVE</u>	<u>SCHOOL</u>
Toland, Careen	Parapro	03.20.13	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. 57083 through 57285 in the amount of \$707,034.69 as listed on the attached checks register dated April 3, 2013.

5. no payroll

6. the reimbursement of the Revolving Fund for Employees for the month of March in the amount of \$42,072.88 represented by checks No. 12962 through 13004, 13006 through 13036, 13062 through 13103, and 13145 through 13178. the reimbursement of the Revolving Fund for Vendors for the month of March in the amount of \$255,794.87 represented by checks No. 13005, 13037 through 13060, 13104 through 13141, 13144 and 13179 through 13201. Checks issued in March voided in March: No. N/A. Check issued in previous months, voided in March: No. N/A.

7. the Open and Closed Session Minutes from March 18, 2013 Special Board Meeting.

the Open and Closed Session Minutes from March 18, 2013 Regular Board Meeting.

8. Release of Educational Support Personnel as contained in consent agenda item # 6.8.

9. Building Operating Budgets 2014 as contained in consent agenda item # 6.9.

10. the acceptance of the following gifts:

Gift From	Amount or Item	School	Department	Account
Exxon Mobil Educational Alliance, Buchanan Energy	\$200.00	GBN	MATHEMATICS	262410

Mr. Boron asked Mr. Wegley regarding the follow-up relative to the equalization of costs on the two trips.

Dr. Wegley stated that the two trips are being equalized.

Mr. Shein asked about the imprest payments of 74k and 28k and he stated that these were odd to be in here.

Mrs. Siena clarified that these were utility bills that had to be paid in of

Upon calling of the roll:

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

nay: none

Motion carried 7-0.

DISCUSSION/ACTION: GBS SCHEDULE REQUEST 2014-2015

Dr. Riggle stated that the Board will act on this item on April 29. Dr. Wegley presented follow-up information relative to Board questions.

Dr. Wegley shared information relative to the challenges of the A/B block schedule. He stated that the biggest issues are that courses don't meet daily and the total instructional time is less over the course of the year relative to individual courses.

Dr. Wegley reviewed the advantages of the A/B block schedule.

Dr. Wegley shared an estimate of the increase in FTE for GBS in moving to the A/B block schedule based upon student course requests. This took into account GBS' growing enrollment.

Mr. Doughty asked for clarification as to how much the increase in GBS' enrollment accounts for the increase in FTE.

Dr. Wegley provided clarification.

Dr. Riggle asked Mrs. Siena to provide information relative to the projection model.

Mrs. Siena stated that the staffing ratio is based upon GBN's staffing ratio, which would be on the high end. A large portion of the costs are already built into the projections. Mrs. Siena stated that the change in schedule should not impact financial projections.

Mr. Shein asked if the calculation assumes a staff increase each year.

Mrs. Siena stated that she has built salary increases into her projections relative to FTE.

Dr. Wegley compared GBS' current schedule to the A/B block schedule. He explained how the block schedule positively impacts the capacity of the building.

Dr. Riggle asked for clarification regarding the overall percentage of building utilization.

Dr. Wegley clarified and provided additional information in response to Mr. Doughty's question about building utilization.

Mr. Martin asked if the periods in the theoretical proposal rotate during the lunch periods.

Dr. Wegley clarified that every block has the same number of minutes and the lunch blocks have 90-minutes with 45-minutes set aside for lunch.

Mr. Martin asked if there is the same time scheduled for lunch under the block schedule.

Dr. Wegley stated that one of the lunch periods has 45-minutes and the others have the passing periods.

Mr. Doughty stated that he still does not understand the 100% utilization of the lunch block.

4/8/13

Dr. Wegley stated that if you look where students are assigned every block uses facilities in the same manner, regardless of the lunch period.

Dr. Riggle stated that all of the classes are available for all students at the same level every block, so it is accurate to say that 100% of the facility is available for use during the lunch period.

Dr. Wegley stated that during every block students have equal access to classes.

Dr. Riggle stated that enrollment capacity is increased by 12.5% with the block schedule.

Mr. Martin asked for clarification relative to classes that are split during the lunch period.

Ms. Frandson explained the rationale for split lunch classes at GBN.

Mr. Martin asked if teachers cited any concerns regarding freshman students' attention span being an issue for a 90-minute period.

Dr. Wegley stated that some expressed this concern, but upon further research the committee found that the opposite was true. He spoke of the benefits for student learning under the block schedule. The A/B block offers more support to students in comparison to the current eight-period day.

Mr. Boron stated that the A/B block is beneficial in preparing students for time management relative to students' transition to college.

Mr. Boron stated that the delivery of instruction is different under the block schedule. He asked about cost estimates for summer projects in comparison to work during the school year.

Dr. Wegley stated that departments are in the process of identifying curriculum and instruction needs in moving forward in the transition to the block schedule. A staff development plan for the transition will be in place by the end of the school year.

Mr. Boron asked if summer projects can be covered within the current budget.

Dr. Wegley confirmed that this was the case and the committee has identified experts to help in the professional development context.

Mr. Taub stated that this proposal provides equity in terms of the number of classes available to students at GBN compared to the number that students can currently take at GBS.

Dr. Wegley confirmed that this was the case and counselors will work with students to identify their passions in choosing an additional class.

Mr. Doughty asked if the loss in instructional time over the course of the year is a concern of the faculty.

Dr. Wegley stated that this is a concern, but the use of time under the block is more efficient and more meaningful. He explained how the common core standards will impact the curriculum review in the transition to the block schedule.

Mr. Martin asked about the plan in terms of Board action.

Dr. Riggle stated that this item would be on consent at the next meeting or could be done as a separate vote.

Mr. Shein asked if Board members had any concerns or questions in moving forward with the decision.

Dr. Riggle stated that this will be a separate item for discussion action at the next meeting and the administration will ask the Board to take action on April 29.

DISCUSSION/ACTION: TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS & BUDGET 2014

Dr. Riggle introduced Dr. Ptak and Mr. Thimm to present the technology budget. He stated that there is a connection to the digital pilot relative to a need to upgrade the wireless network with a greater need at GBN.

Mr. Thimm reviewed technology efforts and where the district has been relative to technology spending. He reviewed infrastructure upgrades.

Mr. Taub clarified that the district is moving from 10GB to 40GB.

Mr. Thimm confirmed that this was the case. He described a phased approach to enhancing switch closets.

Mr. Taub asked for clarification regarding bandwidth.

4/8/13

Mr. Boron asked how many access points would be added if there are currently 90 access points.

Mr. Thimm stated that there are over 300 classrooms and a detailed study would be done to potentially add 150 to 180 additional access points.

Mr. Boron asked if the plan was over-building access points.

Mr. Thimm stated that these additional access points would provide redundancy to wireless connectivity. Other districts have moved to this type of coverage.

Mr. Doughty asked if there should be more than one access point per classroom.

Mr. Thimm stated that if two access points are too close to each other that they may interfere with each other.

Mr. Boron asked the purpose of using two internet providers.

Mr. Thimm stated that as pipes were upgraded that the cost to stay with Comcast for both pipes was too expensive. The additional provider provides redundancy if one of the providers goes down.

Mr. Boron stated that he is concerned about the electric contract. Because of the differences in the timing of the contracts, this seems to establish a permanent commitment to a provider. Mr. Boron asked if the fiber work would be done with any other contract.

Mr. Thimm stated that this was the case.

Mr. Boron asked why the contracts would not be under the same length of term.

Mr. Thimm stated that he did not want to lock-in to a five-year contract.

Mr. Boron stated that one of the contracts is for five years. He stated that the district is locked into one provider for this extended period of time.

Mr. Doughty suggested two 36-month contracts rather than one five-year contract.

Mr. Thimm explained the benefits of the fiber connection going into Chicago.

Dr. Riggle stated that because tied to a tier one provider can provide internet to others in the township and defer/pro-rate some of our costs to another school district.

Mr. Boron asked if the 60-month contract allows for upgrades.

Mr. Thimm confirmed that this was the case.

Mr. Martin asked for clarification regarding some of the budget tables and the lack of change in staffing over the last several years.

Dr. Riggle explained that as services are becoming hosted not as much is required from the technology staff, but there are segments of the staff, such as network staff, that have to handle the load. The administration will be in discussions with GESSA relative to staffing.

Mr. Martin stated that the district has been around 3% of operating budget for technology.

Dr. Riggle stated that this is lower in comparison to national statistics.

Mr. Thimm stated that there have been efficiencies such as virtualization that have allowed the technology area to be efficient and cost effective. Mr. Thimm provided some examples where costs were reduced in the technology area over time.

Dr. Riggle stated that hardware has become cheaper over the years.

Mr. Martin stated that if the district is under budget in comparison to other districts, he asked if there are areas of need in the technology.

Dr. Riggle stated that everything is on a five-year cycle and described the lease on teacher computers. He described recent technology initiatives that provide a more predictable technology budget while keeping pace with recommended standards on bandwidth and how the expanded bandwidth is beneficial.

Dr. Riggle stated that this budget does not include where the district is going relative to the digital pilot and the potential purchase in mobile computing. The district is adequate in FTE, but a more advanced skill set may be needed on the network level.

Mr. Doughty asked if professional development for technology staff is in the budget.

Mr. Thimm confirmed that this has been built into the budget.

Mr. Doughty asked if staff are taking advantage of those opportunities.

Mr. Thimm confirmed that this was the case, but there will be a shift in the type of work that tech staff are involved in. Establishing a level of redundancy is important.

Dr. Riggle stated that there will be a focus on assistive technology in the future. This may require additional staffing in the area of technology.

This item will be on the consent agenda for the next meeting.

Dr. Riggle stated that there will be a report on the digital learning pilot at an upcoming Board meeting.

DISCUSSION/ACTION: PRELIMINARY REVIEW FOR TEXTBOOK CHANGES

Dr. Williamson introduced the preliminary review of textbook changes for 2013-2014. Ms. Frandson and Mr. Muir reviewed textbook changes at GBN and GBS, respectively.

Mr. Boron asked about the dropping of a newer text to pick up an older text for the Material Science class.

Ms. Rockrohr explained that previous students were able to sell back their textbooks. During the review of texts Mr. Untermann, the Material science teacher, found a book that provides sufficient math content and concept coverage that will meet the needs of both honors and regular students.

Mr. Boron asked why this book was not chosen the first time when the course was originally proposed.

Ms. Rockrohr stated that the teacher did not anticipate that the math level of the original book was too difficult for students.

Mr. Boron asked about the copyright on the GBN social studies book.

Ms. Sheperd explained the copyright of the social studies textbook.

Mr. Doughty asked about the English 363 novel that was being added and if anything was being dropped.

Dr. Solis explained that the novel, Catcher in the Rye, is optional and would be replaced by the pilot novel.

Mr. Martin asked how much the cost of the books factored into the administration's decision.

Ms. Rockrhor explained that the physics book has been used for five years and teaching methodologies are different. There is a need for a book that provides better coverage of mathematical concepts. Ms. Rockrhor stated that in light of the *Next Generation Science Standards* this book will better align to these new standards.

Mr. Martin reiterated his question relative to how the cost of the textbook is a factor as books are selected.

Ms. Frandson stated that there have been conversations regarding watching the cost of new textbooks.

Ms. Rochrohr stated that a number of teachers live in the district in her department and are sensitive to parents' concerns about cost.

Dr. Riggle stated that the Board will be provided with an update regarding textbook costs in August. Information can be shared in an information packet as a review.

Mr. Martin asked how much independence there is for the schools in terms of textbook selection.

Mr. Muir stated that there is no best textbook.

Ms. Frandson stated that there is communication between the schools relative to textbook selection.

Mr. Martin asked if there is independence among the teachers relative to textbook selection.

Mr. Muir described the structure of course teams and how textbooks are selected. There is one text by course. In the area of English a core set of novels are selected and there are some choice novels where teachers have flexibility.

Mr. Muir reviewed GBS' textbook proposal.

Mr. Doughty commented on the dropping of *Hamlet* and asked if other Shakespeare readings are available in that course.

Ms. Levine-Kelly stated that she wanted every senior to read *Hamlet*, but rhetoric has been transformed over the years to become more focused in the curriculum. She mentioned courses that still teach *Hamlet*.

Dr. Riggle stated that textbooks will be on display at the district office through the next Board meeting on April 29.

DISCUSSION/ACTION: REVIEW OF DRAFT OF THE 2014-2015 SCHOOL YEAR CALENDAR

Dr. Williamson provided an overview of the 2014-2015 school year calendar.

Mr. Martin asked if the calendar had been shared with feeder districts for feedback.

Dr. Riggle stated that he met with feeder district superintendents and shared the calendar. There was a request from elementary districts to start earlier. Dr. Riggle described why this would be difficult to achieve. He explained challenges in coordinating with elementary districts on calendars relative to summer school and graduation.

Mr. Martin asked if final exams would take place the week of January 20th

Dr. Riggle confirmed that this was the case. He stated that there are 89 days in each semester. The calendar will be on the consent agenda for the next meeting.

DISCUSSION/ACTION: GLENBROOK ACADEMY PRESENTATION

Mr. Whipple, Director of the Glenbrook Academy, described his role in the Academy and provided an overview of the history of the Academy how the Academy operates.

Mr. Taub asked about normally covering AP curriculum in one year, but in Academy this is done in a two-year World Civilization Curriculum.

Mr. Whipple explained the difference in World Civilization Curriculum structure in the Academy relative to AP. He emphasized the importance of collaboration among staff.

Mr. Doughty asked if the integration of the curriculum has been successful.

Mr. Whipple stated that this is a challenge, but time is made to plan and collaborate. Mr. Whipple provided examples of the benefits of an integrated curriculum.

Mr. Doughty asked why this approach is not done on a larger scale.

Mr. Whipple and Dr. Williamson reviewed the logistical limitations of the Academy schedule and the cost structure.

Mr. Whipple stated that as Common Core Standards come into play the Academy focus on global competency fits well with this initiative.

Mr. Taub asked about the type of student who applies to the Academy program. He asked if this program gives the student a leg up in applying to more exclusive colleges.

Mr. Whipple stated that there are a variety of reasons that students apply. Some students have had siblings in the program others apply because of the discussion-based approach. He characterized the perceived advantage in applying to college as not a good reason for students to apply to the Academy program.

Mr. Doughty asked about the criteria to get into the Academy.

Mr. Whipple explained test scores used for placement, the application essay, the teacher recommendation process, writing sample and student interview. From the applicant pool, there are a balance of students between GBS, GBN, the various middle schools and balance by gender.

Mr. Taub commented in terms of engagement and critical thinking that the Academy has been doing this for a long time.

Mr. Whipple stated that this has been a goal over the course of the program. He provided some examples.

Mr. Taub asked if the number of students accepted to the Academy could double or triple based upon applicant pool.

Mr. Whipple stated that in some years there could be up to 60 students who would be successful in the program, but it would be difficult to fill up to 80 slots.

Mr. Shein asked if students take multiple languages.

Mr. Whipple indicated that some students do take multiple languages.

Mr. Taub asked about involvement of other departments in the Academy.

Mr. Whipple stated that a math-science Academy would be more difficult to standardize.

Mr. Martin asked Dr. Riggle for his philosophical opinion as to whether a public school system should have a program for an elite group of students such as the Academy program.

Dr. Riggle asked Mr. Martin about the basis of his questions. He stated that he can't answer the question without knowing a little more in context as to where Mr. Martin or the Board is interested in going relative to programs in the district. Dr. Riggle stated that one area in which the Glenbrooks are lacking is in the area of gifted education. These should be the top 3% of students academically. Dr. Riggle stated that the gifted portion of the Glenbrook population base is higher than the national average of 3%. This is a complex question that goes beyond the dollar figure. Dr. Riggle stated that he would rather look at this issue in the context of a larger question.

Mr. Taub stated that the community fosters the idea of gifted in the elementary districts.

Mr. Martin stated that when he was on the District 34 Board there was a debate about how generous the district should be relative to special needs students. He stated that same applies to gifted programs. He stated that it is the same issue relative to the Academy. Mr. Martin stated that he has learned more about the Academy. He stated that he thinks his question is a legitimate question.

Dr. Riggle stated that he is concerned about several of programs earmarked by the district as static no matter how large the student population has grown over time. The district used to have 4,000 students and now we are close to 5,000 students. He stated that the district used to get gifted dollars. The logistics of going back and forth between the schools cuts some students away from the Academy program. Dr. Riggle stated that with the void of gifted dollars the district still needs to determine what is best for gifted students.

Mr. Taub suggested that if there were two teams of Academy students there could be one group that studies German and one that studies French if the pool could be expanded to 60.

Dr. Riggle stated that he has a concern about how the question is framed. He stated if the question is should we have an Academy program or not - this does not serve us well in our decision making. Dr. Riggle stated that he would welcome a discussion of gifted education in general.

Mr. Shein stated that there was discussion of Academy before the referendum was passed with the idea that substantial cuts may need to be made.

Dr. Riggle stated that the Academy program was considered during the referendum relative to potential cuts.

Mr. Boron stated that the district standard has been that each child reach their full potential. He stated that the issue is that the Academy may be too small, not too large.

Dr. Riggle stated that the Academy program does not address all areas of giftedness. There has not been anything for math and science students.

Mrs. Hanley stated that the components used as part of the selection criteria in determining those selected and not selected to the Academy under the criteria all had outstanding high school experiences. She stated that not just test scores go into the selection process. Students in the Academy should have a comfort with discourse as part of their learning style. She stated that 30 students is a good number of students. She stated that the size of the program is integral.

Dr. Riggle stated that there can be follow-up conversations about this topic for some future work to see where there may be gaps for high achievers in the district.

Mr. Shein asked if AP and math and science would not meet these needs.

Dr. Riggle stated that some students go beyond AP math following the junior year.

Mr. Taub stated that it is a great problem to have a large number of high achieving students.

Mr. Shein asked how many students fall into the top level that are maxed out relative to the AP curriculum.

Dr. Riggle stated he will put this on the agenda for future topics.

DISCUSSION/ACTION: APPROVAL OF AUDIT FIRM

Mrs. Siena provided an updated memo relative to approval of audit firm.

MOTION TO APPROVE AUDIT FIRM

Motion by Mr. Boron, seconded by Mr. Taub to approve the audit firm.

Upon calling of the roll:

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

nay: none

Motion carried 7-0.

**DISCUSSION/ACTION: TERM EXTENSION OF THE SSCRMP RISK
MANAGEMENT POOL**

Dr. Riggle stated that out of greater transparency this item is being brought to the Board.

Dr. Riggle stated that the contract with the SSCRMP risk management pool is up for renewal every 5 years. The consortium was formed in 1987 as the insurance component for litigation and workman's compensation. The district has substantial capital invested in the consortium. The District 211 business official functions on behalf of SSCRMP. There have been massive improvements in workman's compensation. The renewal in question relative to SSCRMP is a renewal of liability, safety and the workman's compensation portion. The health insurance aspect of SSCRMP will be up for renewal in July. The district can make a determination on health insurance later.

Mr. Taub asked for an explanation of the investment capital that the district had to put up to be part of the pool.

Mrs. Siena stated that the pool shares cost of coverage, but not the risk.

Mr. Taub asked if the pool maintains a reserve.

Mrs. Siena stated the district has equity to part of the pool.

Mr. Taub clarified that the district shares expenses in running the pool.

Mrs. Siena stated that this was the case.

Mr. Taub stated that he likes the shared cost of running the pool. He asked if the district were to pull out of the pool if the equity invested would come back to the district.

Mrs. Siena confirmed that this would be the case following a period of time for run-off on claims.

Mr. Taub stated that if the district does not renew with SSCRMP, that we don't lose our investment.

Mrs. Siena confirmed that this is the case.

Mr. Taub stated that the value of the pool is risk management.

Mrs. Siena referenced the SSCRMP presentation that was made to the Board in January.

Mr. Taub asked why the district would commit to another five years with SSCRMP.

Mrs. Siena stated that for continuity with the structure of the pool, a five year agreement is entered into.

Mr. Doughty asked if alternatives have been considered.

Dr. Riggle stated that the district did not know that this agreement was due for renewal and the administration was surprised by the renewal letter. It would be difficult to consider alternatives at this short notice.

Mrs. Siena reviewed the organizational chart for SSCRMP showing many layers of insurance.

Mr. Taub asked if the district has been asked to put money in the reserve in the past.

Mrs. Siena stated that this has not been the case.

Mr. Taub asked how much is in the reserve, what the average number of claims are, and how long the reserves are held relative to adjudication of claims. He stated that he still wants to know if the cost SSCRMP is charging is appropriate to the market. He stated that it is difficult to make a decision with little information.

Mr. Taub stated that he is uncomfortable with a five-year term.

Mrs. Siena stated that this item was brought forward in the spirit of transparency. She did not anticipate that bringing the agreement to the Board would preclude the administration from entering into an agreement. She did not anticipate that she would need to shop insurance pools.

Mr. Doughty stated that he is concerned that this was a surprise and asked if there are there are other sorts of agreements that we have as a district that could be surprises. He stated that he is wondering if there are other things that we have not shopped.

Dr. Riggle stated that there is a need to know about contracts and agreements with consultants, vendors, etc... He stated that

if everything has to be brought to the Board level for vetting, this would be all that we are doing.

Mr. Doughty stated that he is concerned with larger ticket items where the Board has an interest in the administration shopping programs when expensive programs are in play.

Dr. Riggle stated that this was brought to the Board in the spirit of being transparent. He stated that stepping away from this portion of the pool would be a mistake. Dr. Riggle asked the Board to allow the administration to move forward with this renewal.

Mrs. Siena stated that a contract of less than five years can be explored.

Mr. Doughty stated that he is not suggesting something different in this case. He stated that just because we have been doing something for a period of time does not mean we should continue to do so.

Mr. Doughty stated that he applauds the administration for bringing this to the Board at this time.

Mr. Boron stated with a \$100M budget this type of thing will happen. The presentation in January showed great savings. The district may save another 1-2%.

Mr. Taub stated that he doesn't know anything about this pool, but learned that there is a reserve. He asked what would happen if there was not enough in the reserves to cover a claim.

Mr. Boron stated that he assumes that the reserve is adequate.

Mr. Martin stated that the questions raised by Mr. Taub should be considered as suggestions for the future in terms of reviewing options.

Mr. Taub stated that it was a Board directive that the administration shop the other part of SSCRMP.

Dr. Riggle stated that he did not believe that this is the way it occurred. He stated that he recalled it was Mr. Taub's idea to shop the pool. Dr. Riggle stated that he did not believe it was a Board directive to shop SSCRMP.

Dr. Riggle stated that because SSCRMP would be meeting to approve contract extensions, he asked for Board action on this item.

**MOTION TO APPROVE TERM EXTENSION OF THE SSCRMP RISK
MANAGEMENT POOL**

Motion by Mr. Boron, seconded by Dr. Regalbuto to approve the extension of the SSCRMP risk management pool.

Upon calling of the roll:

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

nay: none

Motion carried 7-0.

MISCELLANEOUS TOPICS

Dr. Riggle sent a sheet around for graduation commitments. Graduation is the first Sunday in June. The GBE graduation is the Friday before that.

Mr. Martin asked about a Board meeting on May 6.

Dr. Riggle confirmed that there would be a meeting on May 6.

REVIEW AND SUMMARY OF BOARD MEETING

President Shein reviewed the following:

Additional information was presented on the GBS schedule change. The Board will take a vote on April 29 on this issue.

There was discussion of technology programs for the summer that will advance the network backbone and increase bandwidth.

The Board took a first look at calendar for 2014-15. Concerns or questions should be passed along to the administration. Holidays are concurrent with the sender districts.

There was a presentation on the Academy. There will be a follow-up on this topic at the retreat.

The Board approved the audit firm and SSCRMP risk management pool extension.

There will be a special Board meeting on May 6.

Mr. Martin asked about a date for the Board retreat.

Dr. Riggle stated that the retreat will be Saturday, May 11 starting at 8:00 a.m.

MOTION TO MOVE INTO CLOSED SESSION

Motion by Mr. Boron, seconded by Mr. Doughty to move into closed session at approximately 10:53 p.m. to consider 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)(2) of the Open Meeting Act).

Upon calling of the roll:

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

nay: none

Motion carried 7-0.

The Board returned to open session at 11:53 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Mr. Boron, seconded by Mr. Martin to adjourn the meeting at approximately 11:53 p.m.

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

Motion carried 7-0.

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

CERTIFIED TO BE CORRECT:

PRESIDENT - BOARD OF EDUCATION

SECRETARY - BOARD OF EDUCATION

UPCOMING BOARD MEETINGS:

Upcoming meetings will be held at
Glenbrook North High School
Library
2300 Shermer Road
Northbrook, IL 60062

Monday, April 29, 2013 7:00 p.m. Regular Board Meeting