

**MINUTES  
GLEN ELLYN SCHOOL DISTRICT 41  
BOARD OF EDUCATION  
SPECIAL MEETING  
FACILITIES WORKSHOP  
MAY 13, 2004**

The special meeting of the Board of Education of Glen Ellyn School District 41 was held on Thursday, May 13, 2004 at Forest Glen School, 561 Elm Street, Glen Ellyn, Illinois.

**Roll Call and Call to Order**

President Vivoda called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. Members present were Mr. DiFabio, Mrs. Hoffman, Mr. Marcheschi, Mrs. McElvain, Mr. Ruckstaetter, Mr. Snodell and Mr. Vivoda.

**Pledge of Allegiance**

**Public Participation**

President Vivoda provided an overview of the process for public participation. He explained that at a regular meeting, this is the time for the public to address the Board on non-agenda items. This evening, the Board will discuss each agenda item and develop a motion with a proper second related to the topic. Before calling for a vote, a period of public input will be provided.

There was no public participation on non-agenda items.

**Welcome & Opening Comments**

John Vivoda and members of the Board of Education welcomed workshop attendees. The Board expressed their appreciation to the community for their input in the facilities review process whether it was through their attendance at meetings, phone calls, email, letters, etc., and to the Administration for their help and support during the process. It is confirmation of the passion and support of the District 41 community. The process has allowed all involved to be better informed about the enrollment challenges faced by the District 41 community. The Board is hopeful that under Dr. Barshinger's leadership, the District 41 community will trust the process and together will get to the "right" answer for the children.

**Background**

President Vivoda reviewed a map of the District 41 community via PowerPoint. The map demonstrated that the District's boundaries define a diverse educational community that includes parts of five towns. Our students, constituents, taxpayers and volunteers come from Carol Stream, Glendale Heights, Glen Ellyn, Lombard and Wheaton. (Exhibit)

Dr. Barshinger continued with a PowerPoint Presentation that summarized past facilities meetings, enrollment data, our program plan, building capacities and the process for the evening's proceedings. (Exhibit)

The purpose of tonight's meeting is to narrow the options currently being studied by the Board and to direct the administration to research specific topics for consideration at the fall workshop, tentatively scheduled for September 27<sup>th</sup>, 2004 at Hadley Junior High School.

**Demographic Study**

Dr. Barshinger provided a short overview of the past demographic studies that included:

- 1993 District Cohort Projections
- 1996 DuPage County Department of Planning and Development
- 2002 Ehlers & Associates Projection Tables and Graphs

*Mr. DiFabio moved and Mrs. Hoffman seconded that the Board of Education direct the administration to review and recommend a firm to conduct a new demographic study of District 41".*

Discussion: Dr. Barshinger explained that the Ehler's Study conducted in 2002 projects small increases over the next few years, but the recent activity in the District 41 community like teardowns and subdivision developments add to the uncertainty about the reliability of these projections. Dr. Barshinger will be looking for a firm with a fresh perspective.

The Board discussed the need for reliable enrollment data to support future facilities decisions. We need an accurate formula, one that considers intergenerational turnover and the District 41 tear down phenomenon. They also emphasized the importance of conducting the study often because of the changing demographics of the community.

Dr. Barshinger said that the Administration will put out RFP's and bids and plans to have a recommendation available for the Board at their June 21 regular meeting.

Public Participation: Approximately thirteen people offered their comments, perspectives and suggestions about past and future demographic studies and current variables such as intergenerational turnover and teardowns.

*Mr. Marcheschi moved and Mrs. McElvain seconded to call the question and end the discussion on the demographic study. Motion carried on a voice vote with no "Nays" recorded.*

*The discussion was ended and the motion to direct the Administration to review and recommend a firm to conduct a new demographic study of District 41 was carried on a voice vote with no "Nays" recorded.*

### **Finance Options**

- Annual Operating funds available for new facilities: \$100,000
- Unencumbered O & M Fund Balance: \$600,000
- Borrowing from other governmental bodies
- Bond referendum

#### Notification

August 30, 2004  
January 31, 2004

#### Election Date

November 2, 2004  
April 5, 2004

Discussion: The Board discussed the pros and cons of each of the finance options. They reiterated their belief that it is the public's decision to authorize increased taxes by passing a referendum. They also concurred that while some residents have suggested that the district borrow funds from other governmental agencies in lieu of a referendum, they believe that such an approach would put their financial stability at risk. If funds are needed to solve the overcrowding issue, the Board will ask the public for the funds via referendum. The Board determined that the earliest a referendum could be put on the ballot would be April 5, 2005.

*Mr. DiFabio moved and Mr. Marcheschi seconded that the Board of Education would not go to other governmental bodies for additional funds. If additional funds are needed, the Board agreed they would ask the public for the funds via referendum.*

*Motion carried on a voice vote with no "Nays" recorded.*

### **Program Approaches**

- ♦ Portable Classrooms

*Mrs. Hoffman moved and Mr. Marcheschi seconded that the Board of Education direct the Administration to develop a cost analysis of the use of portables over a 10-year time period.*

Discussion: The Board currently has a 2-classroom portable unit at Forest Glen and Lincoln School. In the fall, the District will add a 4-classroom unit at Churchill and a 4-classroom unit at Hadley. The Administration reported that the complete cost has averaged \$60,000 - \$130,00 depending on the age and size of the unit and the required site preparation. The annual costs for the portable units are utilities and requirement maintenance. Board members shared their views on the pros and cons of portable classrooms and the rationale for developing a cost analysis for their use over a 10-year time period. Mrs. McElvain suggested that a "value" analysis be added to the motion.

Public Participation: Approximately ten people addressed the Board on the short and long term implications of portable classroom units. While some of the parents gave testimonials on the wonderful experience their children have had in portable classrooms, there were others who were opposed to portables as a long-term solution and expressed concern as to the short and long term health implications to the children.

*There being no further discussion, the motion was amended as follows:*

*"That the Board of Education direct the Administration to develop a cost and value analysis of the use of portables over a 10-year time period, incorporating the specific discussion points related to short and long term health implications.*

*On a roll call vote answering "Yea": Hoffman, Marcheschi, McElvain and Vivoda. Answering "Nay": Ruckstaetter, Snodell and DiFabio. Motion carried.*

- ♦ Staffing patterns

*Mr. DiFabio moved and Mr. Marcheschi seconded that the Board of Education direct the Administration to explore and analyze staffing patterns that might be employed with limited classroom space availability.*

Discussion: Dr. Barshinger explained that this process could mean such options as using aides, team teaching, increasing class sizes or looking at multi-grade approaches.

*There being no further discuss, motion carried on a voice vote with no "Nays" recorded.*

- ♦ Multi-track, Year Round Education (MTYRE)

*Mr. Snodell moved and Mr. DiFabio seconded that the Board of Education direct the Administration to continue to evaluate and analyze multi-track, year round education.*

Discussion: The board expressed their appreciation to the public for their role and valuable input on multi-track, year-round education. After considering the matter and evaluating a great deal of opposition by District 41 residents, most board members felt that the option of multi-track, year-round schools offers little educational value and was too disruptive in the community.

Public Participation: The public commended the Board on their efforts and expressed their appreciation for taking into account the resident's opinion on MTYRE. They appreciated the opportunity to provide participate in the democratic decision-making process.  
*There being no further discussion, motion failed on a voice vote with no "Yeas" recorded.*

**Bricks and Motor Approaches**

Dr. Barshinger explained that during previous public facilities workshops, a 5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> Grade Center and new elementary school are the two options that received the most positive response from workshop participants. Dr. Barshinger recommended that the Board investigate these two options. Location of the buildings was not specified. The Administration would like to investigate the feasibility of Omni Center at North Avenue and Bloomingdale Road for a possible 5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> grade center and/or an elementary school of K-5.

*Mr. Snodell moved and Mrs. McElvain seconded that the Board of Education direct the Administration to determine programmatic impact and architectural study of the following building options:*

- a. *Establishment of a 5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> grade center;*
- b. *Establishment of a new elementary school"*

Discussion: Board members discussed the pros and cons of adding the establishment of a Pre-Kindergarten Center as a third option.

*Mr. Marcheschi moved and Mr. DiFabio seconded to amend the motion on the floor as follows:*

*"That the Board of Education direct the Administration to determine programmatic impact and architectural study of the following building options:*

- a. *Establishment of a 5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> grade center;*
- b. *Establishment of a new elementary school*
- c. *Establishment of a Pre-Kindergarten Center"*

*On a roll call vote answering "Yea": Mrs. McElvain, Mr. Snodell, Mr. DiFabio and Mr. Marcheschi. Answering Nay: Ruckstaetter, Hoffman and Vivoda. The vote to amend the motion carried.*

*There being no further discussion, President Vivoda called for a vote on the amended motion. Motion carried on a voice vote with no "Nays" recorded.*

**Timelines for Administration:**

This item was tabled due to time constraints.

**Adjournment**

*There being no further business, Mr. DiFabio moved and Mr. Marcheschi seconded to adjourn the special meeting of the Board of Education at 10:40 p.m. Motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.*

Recorded: May 13, 2004

---

Deborah M. Hoffman, Secretary

Approved: May 17, 2004

---

John J. Vivoda, *President*