MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING,
BOARD OF EDUCATION, SCHOOL
DISTRICT #225, COOK COUNTY,
ILLINOIS, MAY 10, 1999

A regular meeting of the Board of Education, School District No. 225 was held on Monday, May 10, 1999, at approximately 7:30 p.m. at Glenbrook High Schools Administration Building, 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: Lerner, Lyons, Rogal, Seymour, Shact, Wulf. Absent: Isenberg. Note: Mrs. Isenberg arrived at approximately 7:45 p.m. Also Present: Freeman, Gross, Hales, Herrick, Lacivita, Mallek, Rainier, Riggle, Schilling, Sennholtz, Smith, Taccona.

RECOGNITION OF COMMUNITY VISITORS

President Shact asked if any community visitors wished to be recognized. No member of the audience requested to address the Board.

MOTION TO WITHDRAW AND REJECT BIDS FOR STUDENT TRANSPORTATION FOR 1999-2002 SCHOOL YEARS

Motion by Mr. Lyons, seconded by Mr. Seymour, to allow Alltown Bus Service to withdraw its bid for a three year student bus transportation contract with District 225 and to reject the Ryder Student Transportation bid for student bus transportation.

Upon calling of the roll:
aye: Isenberg, Lerner, Lyons, Rogal, Seymour, Shact, Wulf
nay: none

Motion carried.

Note: See attached agenda item #5
MOTION TO AWARD BID FOR STUDENT TRANSPORTATION FOR 1999-2002 SCHOOL YEARS

Motion by Mrs. Isenberg, seconded by Mr. Lyons, to award a three year contract to provide student bus transportation to District 225 to Alltown Bus Service, 2345 W. Nelson, Chicago, IL 60618 at a not to exceed cost for fourteen buses of $572,477 for the 1999-2000, $585,365 for 2000-2001, and $603,265 for the 2001-2002 school years.

Upon calling of the roll:

aye: Lerner, Lyons, Rogal, Seymour, Shact, Wulf, Isenberg

nay: none

Motion carried.

Note: See attached agenda item #6

MOTION TO APPROVE LACROSSE AND WATER POLO PROGRAMS AT GLENBROOK NORTH AND GLENBROOK SOUTH

Motion by Mr. Wulf, seconded by Mr. Lerner, to approve the lacrosse and water polo programs at Glenbrook North and Glenbrook South as described in Dr. Hales' memorandum dated May 7, 1999.

Upon calling of the roll:

aye: Rogal, Seymour, Shact, Wulf, Isenberg, Lerner

nay: Lyons

Motion carried.

Note: See attached agenda item #7

PRESENTATION OF FACILITIES MASTER PLAN

Dr. Schilling reviewed the facilities master plan projects. He reviewed a GBS resource center proposal, computer space, large group instruction around English and Social Studies which would be similar to the facilities at GBN. By moving social studies, it would free up the social studies area and would allow special education to move from where they currently are to the second floor and would give them eight full sized classrooms. They currently have small classrooms. The proposed change would give special education regular size classrooms and office space. The classrooms could also be utilized by others when they are not in use.
The proposal includes expanding the mathematics offices, which was a high need for the department and would also allow them to expand their computer area. Science would move to social studies and into special education areas which would be vacated. Science would have computer lab and additional office space which they need. Where science has vacated would be renovated for guidance and Dean's Office. This would eliminate the need to build an addition for guidance. The main, nurse’s office, study hall, LAC, and large group instruction would be contained where supervision is high which also means during lunch and other periods students could be released to that area for individual and group instruction and there would be some way to guardon off the area to provide for a nice flow for students. In the area of vocational education, the main feature in the plan is removing the auto shop from the building. The current auto shop would become foods, sewing, and child development. The child development playground could be off the courtyard area which would be closed to traffic and more like the mall at GBN. The loading dock traffic could be routed to the back of the building so there wouldn’t be any truck traffic or cars; it would be pedestrian only. That would allow us to look at traffic patterns later through the building to have this as another main entrance type of drop off area. By tying this in with foods, etc. into the cafeteria, there is an opportunity for foods to have a small industrial kitchen and moving the faculty cafeteria where meals can be prepared several days a week. Music would have a new 4,000 square ft. band room which would accommodate 200 plus band members and is 1/3 larger than the current band room. The orchestra would move into the band room, the choral room would be expanded so they have sufficient space, and where the strings currently meet can be turned into an area for electronic music. Storage was added within the band room. The main contest room, locker room and offices, weight room, training room and staff wellness room area would be gutted in a similar fashion as was done at GBN and converted to offices and locker room space. The current round swimming pool would be filled in and a hardwood floor put over it and it would become a second contest area which could be used for wrestling, volleyball and other activities. The current wrestling area would then be vacated and could become wellness and weights. A new pool facility could be created with a moving bulkhead that would be equivalent to what was being proposed for GBN which is a 15-16 feet diving area and the 7 foot area moving back and the shallow end. Moving the bulk head would either give you that part of the pool that goes from 3-7 or it would go from 7 to deep for contests that swim either way. Some pools are all 7 feet because that’s where you get your fastest time for competition.

Glenbrook North will have to be completed in two phases. The greenhouse, Little Theatre, Dean’s area, and electrical system being one phase. The diving, lobby pool, HVAC upgrade would be the second
phase. The construction cost at GBN for those items is approximately $4,000,000. That is $1.4 million for new construction, $2 million for remodeling, and architect and general site work fees, etc.

Glenbrook South has two phases. A couple of Phase 1 projects can stand on their own, but for some a lot of coordination work would be needed. Athletics and PE can stand on their own. The highest priority would be getting new classrooms built to address the building capacity issue. The cost of the GBS work is $25.8 million dollars. The construction cost is about $13.5 million, remodeling is $7.5 million, general casework is about $1.5 million and the contingencies are about $3.3 million. About 15% was added for contingencies and AE fees, but we’ve been running a little under 7% for AE fees. We have been running as little as 1% or 2% for contingencies, so we could expect about 1/3 of that money would not be spent.

If we add to the District Office it would cost $2.3 - $2.8 million. If the District Office is converted it would cost $500,000, plus we would have to find a place for the District Office. If we do a second floor it would be $3 million dollars and operating cost that occurs each year.

The performance contracts basically range from approximately $9 - $10 million dollars at each school depending on how much of that work is completed. Most of the items will have a payback. Dr. Schilling stated that he was being conservative in saying 50% of the money will be saved per year over the course of the contract, which means if it is a 7 year contract on $10 million dollars, we would save $5 million of it. The savings go beyond that, so all these things will pay for themselves at some point in time because most of them have a useful life that is quite long.

Dr. Schilling stated that the total for everything is somewhere between $51-$56 million. GBS is approximately $25 million dollars, GBN is approximately $4 million plus and each of the performance contract maximums are around $10 million. Off Campus is about $2.9 million. Traffic and fields are potentially about $1 million dollars each. Forty-six percent of the money is for capital improvements at GBS, seven percent at GBN, and the performance contracts represent about nineteen percent each. The Off Campus solution would only represent about five percent of the total. The fields and traffic would be about two percent each.
There are a number of ways that this could be financed. Dr. Schilling stated that the district could sell the property the district owns near Sportsman's or a referendum could be proposed for March of 2000, use builders contribution fees, operating revenues, reserves, working cash capital improvement bonds and performance contract.

Our debt service was around $2 million and we could borrow an additional $10 million to keep it under the amount that we had set forth in the tax cap statute. This is basically a no tax rate increase scenario. Dr. Schilling stated that if you look at what would happen to our tax rate, right now our tax rate started out in 1994 somewhere around 8 cents and then it dropped down to around 5 cents. This would keep it at a nickle all the way through 2008 and a little in 2009 without raising the tax rate and issue another $10 million dollars to be able to finance part of the project.

Dr. Schilling stated that the district has done a pretty good job of paying cash as we've gone along, with the exception of the $9.9 million dollars since he has been with the district. That means they have completed $20 million dollars of work in the last round and some other big projects before that. We've been able to accomplish this through using reserves and that $9.9 million dollars. Even when we did that we were able to come back and abate a lot of the money that we borrowed for several years. The magic number for borrowing is $10 million dollars because we get the best rate and it is something they call bank qualified and it allows the district to do a lot of different things. One financing strategy would be to do a performance contract which is borrowing and you pay for part of that out of savings that you generate in 1999, do some limited tax bonds in 2000, another performance contract in 2001, then we could sell the property that we own and escrow it. Some of this may be eligible under the life safety levy which we could issue an amendment for. We can use operating reserves to the point that the Board feels comfortable in what our reserves are for a number of years.

Dr. Schilling stated that the proposed implementation strategy for the Board's consideration is to sell property and escrow funds for Off Campus. If the Board decides not to build a new facility for Off Campus, we might find a nice facility with a long term lease and fix it up. Dr. Schilling recommends the Board consider selling the property and escrowing the funds. Then we could generate interest income, invest it, and if we can generate $150,000 a year and we decide to lease something, we could use the money for that and we would still have the balance. If the Board decides to build something, we would have $1.6 million dollars to use towards the cost. It also allows
use one other option. Dr. Schilling stated that he has been scouring the market and if we find a good piece of property to buy at a good price, we need to be able to move. Having a piece of property requires a three-way switch, it is very complicated, and it is not something that he believes we want to get into.

Next, Dr. Schilling recommended doing some sort of performance contract with GBS and GBN. There are some things that need to be done at GBN within the next year or so, such as the chiller, to avoid some environmental consequences. Life safety for roofs, that survey is being done this summer and updated. Capital program improvement program for GBS is probably going to take a period of between five and seven years. We could use a performance contract to pick up some of the things for GBS and GBN later and the Capital program at North. Some things we need to fit in earlier, but we just finished a pretty massive three year plan and somewhere in here we need to think about Summer School and if we remodel pools, having one available for Learn to Swim Programs. Dr. Schilling provided a fund analysis showing revenue reserves available each year starting in the budget year 2000 through 2006. These amounts were already included in Dr. Schilling’s projections in the fund balances that were shown in the projections during the last budget executive summary. These are the performance contract amounts which are really borrowing money on the performance contract to do the work. Dr. Schilling stated he was being conservative and using a 50% projected operating energy savings. We would have net available reserves of $21.5 million, plus we would have issued two ten million dollar performance contracts for a total of $41.5 million. This amount doesn’t include the sale of the property, it does include life safety, so these are all issues that can be brought into the mix when the Board evaluates the entire program.

The tasks necessary to complete with regard to the Off Campus, Dr. Schilling recommends looking at selling the property and that the Board seriously consider some of the options presented. Dr. Schilling would like to know which options the Board would like him to pursue so that an implementation and/or schedule can be developed.

On the performance contracts, Dr. Schilling stated that the scope needs to be more clearly defined. There is a maximum $10 million that you want to do in any one year because the implications for arbitrage and borrowing. An RFP would need to be developed. The scope would have to be defined, performance contract awarded, prepare to sell bonds and develop the construction schedules.

There are a number of rolling district five year plans which are the roof, traffic, parking, paving and site analysis which can be done simultaneously to all these other things.
A number of Board members would like to see a needs assessment.

Dr. Schilling thanked all the instructional supervisors and administrators at South, Siemens, and Stacey Mallek. This was meant to be a master plan because the idea was to be to lay out something that you would work at a little at a time, whether it would take one year or fifteen years to complete. Dr. Schilling stated he expected the Board to take their time looking at the options and discussing it.

Mr. Shact thanked Dr. Schilling and Mrs. Mallek for their work.

Note: See attached agenda item #8

MOTION TO APPROVE CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Shact asked if any Board member wanted an item removed from the consent agenda. Board members requested to have items #9.6 (Connections and Ombudsman Programs for At Risk Students) and #9.8 (Proposal to Evaluate Block Schedules) removed from the consent agenda.

Motion by Mr. Lyons, seconded by Mrs. Rogal, to approve the following items on the consent agenda:

1.) the minutes of the regular Board meeting and closed session of April 26, 1999.

2.) the resignation of the following certificated staff as recommended by the assistant superintendent for personnel:

RESIGNATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRENT, Virginia</td>
<td>English Instructor</td>
<td>End of 1998-99 South School Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.) the appointment of the following certificated staff as recommended by the assistant superintendent for personnel:

APPOINTMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>SALARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOAK, Daniel</td>
<td>Instructional Supervisor</td>
<td>1999-2000 School Year</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Step 10, Foreign Language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
193
5/10/99

McManamon, Rosanna
(rep. S. Steffey)
Business Education
Instructor
1999-2000 School Year
South BA,
Step 6

MONAGHAN, Ellen
(rep. J.
Bozacki-Rae)
Family & Consumer Sciences
Instructor
1999-2000 School Year
South BA,
Step 7

4.) the resignation of the following educational support staff as recommended by the assistant superintendent for business affairs:

RESIGNATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BURROWS, Carrie</td>
<td>Job Coach</td>
<td>6/10/99</td>
<td>North &amp; South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIBSON, John</td>
<td>Exec. Asst.</td>
<td>5/14/99</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOLDSTEIN,</td>
<td>Paraprofessional</td>
<td>6/10/99</td>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANTON, John</td>
<td>Paraprofessional</td>
<td>6/10/99</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIERRA, Kelly</td>
<td>Instructional Assistant</td>
<td>6/10/99</td>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.) the differential responsibilities appointment as contained in Mr. Lacivita's memorandum dated May 6, 1999.

6.) the reimbursement of the revolving fund for employees for the month of April in the amount of $55,784.23 represented by checks No. 084892 through 084995, 084953 through 085011, 085040, 085041, 085073 through 085109, 085160 through 085215, 085219 through 085221, 085274 through 085325, and 085327.

7.) the revolving fund for vendors for the month of April in the amount of $49,652.68 represented by checks No. 084890, 084891, 084896 through 084898, 084904 through 084950, 085042, 085047 through 085070, 085112 through 085144, 085217, 085218, 085224 through 085271 and 085327.
8.) the revolving fund for book buy backs for the month of April in the amount of $1,112.78, represented by checks No. 085019 through 085038. Voided checks No. 084899 through 084903, 084951, 084952, 085012 through 085018, 085039, 085043 through 085046, 085071, 085072, 085108, 085110, 085111, 085145 through 085159, 085216, 085222, 085223, 085272, 085273 and 085326. Canceled checks No. 084674 and 084841.

9.) the approval of approximately $3,600 for summer school courses for special education students as described in Dr. Gross' memorandum dated February 11, 1999.

10.) the capital outlay requests for the 1999-2000 school year as contained in Dr. Schilling's memorandum dated May 10, 1999.

11.) the acceptance of the following gifts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GIFT FROM</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCI Cable</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Athletic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Alexander Muster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemeinhardt Silver Flute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Low &quot;B&quot; Attachment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon calling of the roll:

aye: Rogal, Seymour, Shact, Wulf, Isenberg, Lerner, Lyons
nay: none

Motion carried.

Note: See attached agenda item #9

**DISCUSSION REGARDING PARTICIPATION IN CONNECTIONS AND OMBUDSMAN PROGRAMS FOR THE 1999-2000 SCHOOL YEAR**

Mrs. Isenberg stated that she is concerned that the transportation costs to Ombudsman and Connections could increase rapidly.

Dr. Hales stated that we are not legally required to transport any students, but if we can't get the students to these programs we would have a problem educating the students.
Dr. Hales stated that our position would be that we would not provide transportation, but if we pull the plug on the Glenview site, we might have some students who can’t access these services any other way.

Mrs. Isenberg stated that her concern is that we have no idea how many students will be in that position, and 13.5 could be a very low estimate. She said she didn’t know how we could tell one family we will pay for your transportation and another family that we won’t pay for their transportation. She stated that parents want equity and she is concerned because each child is about $2,300 per year for either one of these two places.

Dr. Hales stated that if he costed out what we are providing for special education students who are going to residential facilities about the same distance, that is about what the cost would be.

Mrs. Isenberg stated that $2,300 per year would allow us to pay for six students for the entire year or twelve students for one semester and there will probably be more students than that attending between the two programs. She stated that before the Board votes, she would like to discuss setting a limit on the amount the district would spend on transportation or only providing transportation in extraordinary situations. Based on the number of students participating in Ombudsman and Connections this year the cost for transportation could easily be $30,000.

Dr. Schilling stated that it is his understanding that students are not forced to go to Ombudsman. This is an optional program discussed with parents. Dr. Schilling stated that the only time we would pay for transportation is if the student qualified for free lunch.

Mr. Lerner asked if we would have to appropriate for transportation.

Dr. Hales stated we would not have to appropriate for transportation.

Mr. Lerner stated that we would just approve the program and if a student has need, we could approve it at that time.

Mr. Shact asked Mrs. Isenberg if she wanted to make a motion structured that way.

Dr. Schilling stated that the contract could be worded that way since it is an optional program. It is understood that they are providing transportation unless the family cannot afford to do so, and afford to do so is defined by our process for showing that.
Dr. Hales stated that his original thought was that we would absolutely not provide transportation unless we have students that meet our guidelines.

**MOTION TO APPROVE PARTICIPATION IN CONNECTIONS AND OMBUDSMAN PROGRAMS FOR THE 1999-2000 SCHOOL YEAR**

Motion by Mrs. Isenberg, seconded by Mrs. Rogal, to approve the participation in the Connections and Ombudsman programs for the 1999-2000 school year, with the elimination of the transportation portion of the contract. Only students who qualify as indigent and receive pre-approval from the Board will be provided transportation at Board expense.

Upon calling of the roll:

aye: Seymour, Shact, Wulf, Isenberg, Lerner, Lyons, Rogal

nay: none

Motion carried.

Note: See attached agenda item #9.6

**DISCUSSION REGARDING EVALUATION OF BLOCK SCHEDULES**

Mr. Wulf stated that he was not present at the last meeting when the discussion occurred regarding the firm to be selected for the baseline data and evaluation of the block schedule. He said it appeared the Board discussed the quality of the evaluation. Mr. Wulf asked if the Board reached any resolution indicating that the Board had a quality standard that they expected and that previous presentations would not be an acceptable level.

Mr. Shact stated the Board had the discussion. He stated that most of the Board members were satisfied with the explanation.

Mr. Lyons stated he would like to approve the first part which is to get the baseline data and hold off on the evaluation portion to look at other options. Mr. Lyons stated that he understands that two firms were considered, one submitted which we received a proposal from and the other was unresponsive. The contract was negotiated to our budget with the firm that is being recommended. Mr. Lyons called the State Board and was given a list of consulting firms that do program evaluations and there is a much bigger pool to follow-up on. He stated it may or may not come out any different, but he wasn't comfortable with the process. That was the reason for his question regarding approving the first portion because it seemed to be an issue to obtain the baseline data and then check on some of the other consulting firms. If there is nothing there, then go ahead and approve the evaluation.
Dr. Hales stated that he believes it would be very important to have the same firm do the baseline data that would do the evaluation.

Mr. Lyons stated that if it would be impossible to do it early, then he would be against approving it.

Mr. Wulf asked if the Board was comfortable with the performance requirements that they set out and the assurance they received at the last meeting.

Mr. Shact stated that he doesn’t believe there were performance requirements set out.

Dr. Hales stated they were set out in the proposal.

Mr. Seymour stated that the Board was presented with only one option.

Mr. Wulf stated that when he gets a work product from an individual it is an indication of the quality of the work product. He would like to make sure that that individual understands that the standard to be accepted the second time around is going to be much greater. If they cannot give some assurance that is going to be met, then he wouldn’t go back somewhere we’ve already had a problem.

Dr. Hales stated the firm left several copies of similar studies they have done. Dr. Hales asked Mr. Shact if he wanted to look at them. Mr. Shact indicated he might want to do that. They are available in Dr. Hales’ office.

Mr. Seymour stated the report was prepared that way based on a specific request to do it that way.

Mr. Wulf indicated he understands those ramifications, but he is concerned about the quality of the work.

Mr. Smith stated Dr. Gatta did a study on the Advocacy Program and the quality of his work was excellent. ECRA is currently doing a block schedule evaluation for Homewood-Flossmoor.

Mr. Shact stated that based on what the Board discussed at the last meeting, he had the same reaction as Mr. Wulf. Mr. Shact was satisfied with the explanation and that what they saw was an exception rather than the rule.
MOTION TO APPROVE EVALUATION OF BLOCK SCHEDULES

Motion by Mr. Seymour, seconded by Mr. Wulf, to approve a two year evaluation of block schedules at Glenbrook South and North by Educational Consultants and Research Associates, 1807 Suffield Drive, Arlington Hts., IL 60004, at a total cost of $150,000.

Upon calling of the roll:

aye: Shact, Wulf, Isenberg, Lerner, Rogal, Seymour

nay: Lyons

Motion carried.

Note: See attached agenda item #9.8

DISCUSSION REGARDING PETITION FOR TAX ABATEMENT OF PROPERTY IN NORTHBROOK

Mr. Shact asked if Dr. Schilling had heard from the business managers or from the library or park district boards regarding the tax abatement.

Dr. Schilling stated the park district board discussed it and said no. The library representative said he believed their inclination was no, but they haven’t formally discussed it as a board. Dr. Schilling said his question is what he asked Beitler to do a moot issue if it is just feasible with the elementary and the high school and the village doing something in negotiating fees. He advised them they need to go back and determine whether it is feasible with only those two. At the same time they asked both of the other districts that indicated they were not inclined to do so to reconsider. Dr. Schilling said he would need to go back and talk to the board regarding whether District 225 Board’s position would still be the same. Obviously it will benefit District 30 and we would get some tax revenues, but as Dr. Schilling indicated in his memo, we are going to give back $15 million and those two districts would get their full tax amount. Dr. Schilling said we might want to subsidize those districts.

Mr. Shact stated that the Village’s position is they have to build a new fire station and add police infrastructure and that’s the reason the village is not interested in participating.

Dr. Schilling stated that they are going to participate in the fees.
Mr. Shact stated that was the question in front of the Board, whether the District 225 wants to be influenced by the Park District and Library District or we are going to decide this on District 225’s merits.

Mr. Seymour stated that the Park District, the Village and some of the other entities aren’t willing to accept the tax abatement.

Mr. Shact stated that the Village has real costs.

Dr. Schilling stated that they were asked to give it to us based on the same data requirements as Crate and Barrel and it parallels that pretty closely.

Dr. Schilling stated that he would go back and requested Board direction.

Mr. Shact asked for a motion to enable Dr. Schilling to continue negotiations.

Mr. Seymour stated that he would be willing to participate if everyone else drops out if the numbers are better.

Mr. Shact stated the builder came to us and said they want the participation of five governmental units and here’s what the dollar cost will be. Dr. Schilling has explained that three of the governmental units have dropped out. Dr. Schilling came to the Board with a memo that said I’ve gone to the builder and I’ve asked if they will proceed with just the abatements from District 30 and 225. Mr. Shact stated that he did not believe it is realistic that they would proceed with less than Districts 30 and 225.

Mr. Wulf would like to see if a better negotiation can be reached. If Dr. Schilling comes back and says absolutely not, then we can make a decision.

A majority of the Board indicated they wished Dr. Schilling to go back and determine if a better deal could be negotiated.

Dr. Schilling would like to speak with Chris Young at District 30 and will report back to the Board.

Note: See attached agenda item #10.

**DISCUSSION REGARDING INSURANCE RATES FOR 1999-2000 SCHOOL YEAR**

Mr. Seymour submitted a list of questions regarding insurance prior to the Board meeting. The questions are:

What is the participation in the insurance plans? Dr. Schilling stated that approximately 33 percent in the Glenbrook Plan have family
insurance. Two thirds have single coverage. Approximately half of the teachers take the $3,000 cash option in lieu of family coverage.

Is it necessary to offer two HMO’s? Dr. Schilling stated he would prefer that we did not because there is duplication of the same providers. This is an issue that would have to be negotiated and the Board would probably want to grandfather the people who are currently in Humana. At one time HMO Illinois didn’t include Glenbrook Hospital and many of the key area hospitals, but now that they do. The hospitals are duplicated and there is no reason to offer both HMO’s.

Why don’t we have one of the HMO’s administer the Glenbrook Plan? Dr. Schilling stated that he wasn’t sure if Humana HMO did the third party stop loss or if they self-insure. Dr. Schilling stated that if everyone had HMO Illinois we could combine all the HMO people and all the Glenbrook people into one big plan and self-insure the whole thing. In that way we would have rates that would be the same across the board. We would have a bigger group and it would be more stable.

What employee plans are almost identical to HMO, what are the contributions? Dr. Schilling stated that each employee pays nothing for single insurance and the Board pays 80% of the difference between single and family, so the employee pays 20% of the difference between single and family. The Board pays 88% of the whole premium because 80% of the difference comes to 88% of the entire amount for family.

Dr. Schilling stated that the quote the Board received a couple of years ago skyrocketed because we had three or four unfortunate faculty deaths which caused severe rates. Canada Life’s rate was actually the lowest, with a two year guarantee. It was bid a year ago and that’s why we’re staying with it because we had some very adverse claims.

Mr. Seymour stated that administration looks high. Dr. Schilling stated that is true. Last year we had immature claims, this year we have mature claims, so the rate is going to be different. Primarily when we did the analysis in December and provided it to the Board he indicated that even though their administration rates would be significantly higher because they have a much larger PPO network and the discounts are much larger, that they would save their rate, plus some, so we actually expected to save money making the move.

Dr. Schilling stated that the renewal date is September 1 and is when we start our new plan year. As far as teachers’ cash option, that is a negotiated item, so that couldn’t be changed unless it goes through negotiations.

Mrs. Isenberg asked if the Glenbrook Plan is an HMO or a PPO.
Dr. Schilling stated that it is a PPO, hospital only.

Mrs. Isenberg asked if the Glenbrook Plan allows for doctor visits. Dr. Schilling stated PPO is only hospital and employees can go to any doctor they want. Dr. Schilling stated that you get a larger discount if you go to a PPO hospital, you pay more if you don’t.

Mrs. Isenberg asked if most people are in the Glenbrook Plan. Dr. Schilling stated that there are about 200 people in the HMO and the rest are in the Glenbrook Plan, which he believes is approximately 415 people. Ideally Dr. Schilling stated if we could insure everyone in one plan it would be more stable, because the misconception is the healthiest people stay in the Glenbrook Plan. A lot of the healthiest people move to the HMO.

Mrs. Isenberg asked if we legally have to offer employees more than one plan. Dr. Schilling stated we used to, but he doesn’t think that is still the case. He said that almost nobody in the area would offer anything less than one of each because if you have children the HMO is a great deal because it provides well care.

Note: See attached agenda item #11

DISCUSSION REGARDING THE PROPOSED GLENBROOK NORTH BAND EDUCATIONAL TOUR TO OSLO, NORWAY, MARCH 31-APRIL 9, 2000

Mr. Shact asked if the Board had any questions or comments. No questions were asked.

Note: See attached agenda item #12

DISCUSSION REGARDING RENEWAL OF WORKMANS’ COMPENSATION INSURANCE

Dr. Schilling stated that he provided the Board with a write-up last December asking that he be permitted to look at other alternatives and test the market. Notice was provided to our self-insurance pool. Dr. Schilling provided an analysis of each of the different options. The lowest proposal with adequate coverage is the program which is managed by AON Risk Resources. We have been experiencing some losses that may result in our premiums going up in another year, but in looking at the rates and discussing it with our broker, as long as we are willing to reevaluate this in a year we will save $14,000 to $15,000 during the next year. We can do some things to get our losses under control and we reevaluate all three programs again in twelve months. Self is changing the way they are doing their funding so it might be a good time to sit on the sidelines and wait and see what happens.
Mr. Wulf stated he was concerned about the line, losses have increased in each of the last five years from $6,400 in 1993 to $300,000 in 1998. Mr. Wulf asked what caused this increase. Dr. Schilling stated slips, trips and falls.

Mrs. Isenberg asked if we have risk management. Dr. Schilling stated we do. Mrs. Isenberg asked, "Who is evaluating this, who is our risk management team?" Dr. Schilling stated we have been getting risk management control through the SELF co-op. Dr. Schilling stated if the Board approves the recommendation he would take part of what we save and hire someone to come in specifically target the areas with the largest losses and conduct a staff inservice.

Mr. Wulf asked if we have an analysis. Dr. Schilling stated he has an analysis and will provide it to the Board.

Dr. Schilling stated we have safety committees.

Mrs. Isenberg stated the increase is large and she is interested in seeing what sort of things happened that got us from $60 to $300,000. Dr. Schilling will provide the information.

Mr. Olson asked why we would like to renew for one year is because our claims history would be different a year from now; therefore you believe we would be in a better position to get a more favorable contract, or is it always an annual renewal. Dr. Schilling stated he would like to renew for a year because of our experience and because what is happening in the market, that may not be the best place to be in a year. It is the best place to be right now. He said the overall analysis right now is that there isn’t a good place to be long-term and that is why he would like to look at renewal year by year.

Dr. Schilling will provide the information requested.

Note: See attached agenda item #13
MOTION TO MOVE INTO CLOSED SESSION

Motion by Mr. Wulf, seconded by Mrs. Rogal, to move into closed session at approximately 10:30 p.m. to consider the appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of specific employees; to consider student disciplinary cases; and litigation which has been filed and is pending or is probable or imminent (Sections 2 (c) (1), (9) and (11) of the Open Meetings Act)

Upon calling of the roll:
aye: Shact, Wulf, Isenberg, Lerner, Lyons, Rogal, Seymour
nay: none

Motion carried.

The Board returned to open session at approximately 11:50 p.m.

MOTION TO EXTEND FOUR STUDENT SUSPENSIONS

Motion by Mr. Wulf, seconded by Mrs. Rogal, to extend four student suspensions.

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

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Mr. Seymour, seconded by Mr. Wulf, to adjourn the meeting at approximately 11:55 p.m.

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

Motion carried.

* Means Isenberg, Lerner, Lyons, Rogal, Seymour, Shact, and Wulf all voted aye.

CERTIFIED TO BE CORRECT:

PRESIDENT - BOARD OF EDUCATION

SECRETARY - BOARD OF EDUCATION

NEXT REGULAR MEETING: MAY 24, 1999 7:30 P.M.
Glenbrook Admin. Building 1835 Landwehr Road
Glenview, Illinois