

MINUTES
BOARD OF EDUCATION
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETING
COMMUNITY UNIT SCHOOL DISTRICT 200
April 22, 2015

The Committee of the Whole meeting of the Board of Education of Community Unit School District 200, DuPage County, Illinois, was called to order at the School Service Center, 130 W. Park Avenue, Wheaton, IL, by Board President Barbara Intihar, on Wednesday, April 22, 2015, at 7:30 PM.

ROLL CALL

Upon the roll being called, the following were present:

Board Members: Barbara Intihar
 Jim Vroman
 Brad Paulsen
 Joann Coghill
 Jim Gambaiani
 Jim Mathieson
 Rosemary Swanson

Also in Attendance: Dr. Jeff Schuler
 Mrs. Faith Dahlquist
 Mr. Bill Farley
 Mrs. Erica Loiacono
 Mr. Rodney Mack
 Dr. Joanne Panopoulos
 Dr. Robert Rammer

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Member Swanson led the Board and community in the Pledge of Allegiance.

MOTION

Member Paulsen moved, Member Swanson seconded to suspend the rules and adjourn to workshop setting. Upon a voice call vote being taken, all were in favor and **the motion carried 7-0.**

Education

Professional Development Update

Faith Dahlquist presented information regarding the 2015-16 professional Development Plan:

- How the plan fits into Vision 2018
- D200 Professional Development Plan – Big picture focus
- Future of Instruction and Technology (FIT)
- Big Picture Focus – 3 Areas
- More Detailed Plans
- Process for Developing Plan
- Chance to Dream

A handout of the 2015-16 Professional Development Plan was distributed.

Discussion included the following:

- There are financial incentives for teachers to get more education. How does this link to this process? How does it relate to this cost?
A. It comes back through the PLCs and workshops, most of the classes offered are led by our teachers
- Are you asking for more time for our own people to go out and coach in the field versus money to spend on outside sources?
A. Yes, this plan would require more staff and money to provide this.
- Do we not have curriculum leaders anymore? Is this request to have them again?
A. This plan included things we wish we could do, not things we are going to do next year. This plan would be for coaches that would go into the classroom and coach teachers.
Jeff Schuler stated that research shows the impact of instructional coaches is one of the most successful approaches out there. It came out during Engage 200 that the community felt staff development was important to provide for staff. This is similar to how we looked at technology; what does the model need to look like and then decide how to implement the idea with the funds available.
- If instructional coaches are the ideal situation, have we considered outside partners to help with coaching?
A. Yes we could look into it but a full time coach that did this would be a good match for this approach. Many of the outside coaches are targeted areas only.
- Can PLC's enhance coaching?
A. Yes, over time.
- Over the past few years PD has been cut for budget reasons. Glad to see this back on the radar and planning.
- This plan will be put into a video for School Instructional Teams with instruction on how to present this to the rest of their staff. All School Improvement Plans will be based on the same 4 goals.
- How do the funds for PD get to the buildings? Are they part of their budget allocation or do they come from the Ed Services Department?
A. As the grants are built, much time is spent looking at how the money will be spent and what programs we can offer based on that money. The district does not spend a lot on outside conferences.
- Could we track PD funds? Would we be better off to track man hours instead of focusing on the money spent?
A. Jeff Schuler responded that he would rather track by goal and outcome - what does it do for teaching?
- This was a topic at the Google seminar today that Faith Dahlquist and Rod Mack attended. Trying to make PD not something we go to on a schedule but things that can be used any time any place. Guide teachers to be self-directed learners too. We need to find a way to get people excited and passionate.
- Find a way to offer incentives for PD
- Why does the instructional team training need to be done by level instead of all together?
A. Because the levels are not all at the same place in using certain components.
- How do we track the success of this?
A. The Ed Services Department staff conduct walk throughs in all the classrooms across the district to track if certain things are included in the classroom, staff surveys are conducted, comparison of data at schools, and other accountability measurements.

- What is the current experience with new teachers and how well versed are they on new standards? Which colleges are best to recruit from to find the candidates most versed in what the district is looking for?
 - A. Since the district hires a limited number of staff each year it is hard to determine which colleges send the best candidates into the work force. It is hard for the colleges to teach to the different ways districts implement the standards and the college professors are just learning the standards as well. This is all new for everyone.
 - A. The district gets a very competent pool of new teachers because of the selective process used to find the best from each college. With the changes to the law to obtain an Illinois teaching license, students must attend an Illinois college.
 - A. One of the initiatives of the Vision 20/20 is to look at this issue

Business Services

Facility Update

Mr. Farley stated that this update is different than the Facility Master Plan that will be talked about at a later date. Handouts were provided with updated information regarding the following:

- District Wide Facilities Category and Condition Ranking
- District Wide Facilities Category and Condition Ranking – buildings not previously included in the report (Hubble, School Service Center, Woodland, Jefferson)
- 2015 Potential Projects
- Capital Facilities Plan Overview – Narrative
- Flash Drive of expanded District Wide Report (110) pages

The Board was reminded that these documents are drafts and are living breathing documents that change frequently.

John Robinson reviewed the reports and clarified what some of the information meant.

Discussion included:

- Jefferson building is an issue. The boiler is 58 years old and its life expectancy was 35 years
- Condition numbers can change at any time if something unpredictable happens or fails
- When do we talk about how to pay for these things?
- Why are numbers listed on the Jefferson items less than the numbers that were part of the previous referendum
- This suggested work at Jefferson does not consider needed program changes to the building or any soft charges. These repairs will not bring the building to the needs of the students housed there. This plan only repairs things that are already broken or are approaching the end of their life expectancy.
- The master plan has to be looked at because these are just numbers and Jefferson is not the only focus of this topic tonight
- The financial discussion will not happen until the needs and programmatic elements are talked about. It is too early in the Master Facility Plan work to have an exact timeline.
- Staff is getting bids out for the summer 2015 projects so that they can be brought to the Board for approval to get these condition 1 needs done over this summer.
- Work for this summer has a funding plan and the district has the funds to cover these costs. The work will still come to the Board for funding approval.

- The process to select the architectural firm to work with the district on the Master Facility Plan is in the final stages. There will be a very involved and inclusive process with the community to develop the Master Plan. Once that is complete the Board can decide what needs to be done and how to pay for it. The plan will be more defined over the next few weeks.
- The Facility Committee interviewed 4 architectural firms for the selection process. Staff will bring a recommendation to the Board in May to move forward with a firm to work with the district on Focus Areas 2 & 3.
- Once the entire plan is completed it will include an estimate to execute it

PUBLIC COMMENTS – Non-Agenda Items

None

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION

There being no further business to come before the Board in Open Session, Member Vroman moved, Member Swanson seconded to adjourn the meeting. Upon a voice call vote being taken, all were in favor and **the motion carried 7-0.**

The meeting was adjourned to Closed Session at 9:11 PM.

Brad Paulsen, Secretary

Barbara Intihar, President