

**Illinois State Board of Education**  
**Streamlining Illinois' Regional Offices of Education Commission**

**Monday, February 27, 2012**

**Minutes**

**Attendance**

**Commission Members:**

Rep. Linda Chapa LaVia	Dr. Vanessa Kinder	Mike Nekritz
Dr. Brent Clark	Scott Kuffel	Jane Russell
Dr. Norm Durflinger	John Meixner	
Dr. Michael A. Jacoby	Susie Morrison	

**Guests:**

Linda Miller  
Larry Pfeiffer

**Representing Commission Members:**

Dr. Gail Fahey (for Dr. Darlene Ruscitti)  
Ben Schwarm (for Mike Johnson)

**Presenters:**

Dr. Robert Daiber  
Dr. Lynne Haefele

**Welcome, Introduction, and Consensus Recap**

The second meeting of the Streamlining Illinois' Regional Offices of Education Commission was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Dr. Norm Durflinger, chair of the commission. Dr. Durflinger welcomed everyone and asked both Dr. Gail Fahey (representing Dr. Darlene Ruscitti) and Linda Miller (director of Great Lakes West Comprehensive Center) to introduce themselves.

Dr. Durflinger went over consensus items from the meeting that occurred on Wednesday, February 22, 2012.

1. **There is a need for a regional delivery system.** The commission agreed on this item.
2. **There should be a minimum size region, such as a population of 43,000 as stated in 105 Illinois Compiled Statutes (ILCS) 5/3A-4.** The commission agreed with this consensus.
3. **There should be recognition of the size of the region.** Dr. Durflinger asked if this was a concern. Scott Kuffel stated that the only concern he had had was limitations in parts of

the state where geography dictates population. Dr. Brent Clark stated that they may be boxing themselves too much; in his opinion, it should be taken off the table. The commission agreed to take this item off the table.

4. **Minimum population should be determined after the census is published.** Dr. Durflinger indicated that this statement means the number of regions would be reviewed a couple of years after every census. The commission agreed.
5. **It has not yet been determined whether or not counties should be divided.** There was a discussion among members on whether or not counties can be divided. It was decided that this issue will be discussed in the next meeting
6. **If there is a change in the number of regions, the new regional boundary map must be adopted by September 2013 and the terms of office would continue through June 30, 2015.** The commission agreed.

## **Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) Perspective**

Dr. Durflinger introduced Susie Morrison to present on the ISBE perspective.

### **Susie Morrison's Presentation**

- ***ISBE Mission and Goals***
  - Goals: adoption and implementation of the Common Core State Standards
  - Development of the Longitudinal Data System (LDS)
  - Supports for effective teachers and leaders
  - Support for the lowest performing schools
- ***Agency Centers Housed Under ISBE:*** Fiscal, general counsel, school support, teaching and learning
  - ISBE manages budget and finances for 869 districts; this is a challenge.
  - ISBE has external assurances to make sure they are fiscally responsible.
  - For funding and disbursement, ISBE oversees accounting claims, approves special education programs, and processes federal aid audits.
  - For school bus services, ISBE looks at school financial data, provides consulting services, and reviews all districts' annual financial reports.
  - For data systems, ISBE has established a robust LDS. ISBE is working on building the LDS with federal grants and expects it to be up and running by 2013.
  - ISBE's legal department develops and reviews external agreements.
  - The Government Relations office is the face of the General Assembly and provides support on bills and other activities.
  - ISBE also handles public school recognition and grants recognition to all public schools.
  - The ISBE School Support Services center ensures compliance of professional preparation programs.

- The ISBE Nutrition Program is the largest division in the agency and runs very smoothly because they have resources from the federal government to do their job.

In some cases, one or two staff members may be doing all of the work in an area of the agency.

ISBE has a shared learning infrastructure that was developed to provide a virtual space to house lesson plans. It is the hope of ISBE that it will be a robust learning opportunity for all 869 districts across the state. The virtual space is currently being piloted in Bloomington and Normal districts.

Ms. Morrison continued her presentation and talked about the Career & Technical Education division that currently is working on science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education, and that division also does the non-public school recognition. They are also handling technology and mathematics and talking about STEM learning exchanges in the Race to the Top (RTTT) work. She continued by stating that the state's Early Childhood program is one of the largest programs within the agency. This program has only seven staff, but it is very high profile. For the English Language Learning program, all of the staff members are in Chicago. Their Innovation & Improvement program has become the heartbeat of school improvement, and it houses other programs such as the Common Core State Standards, School Improvement Grants (SIG), Response to Intervention, and other interventions.

Ms. Morrison continued sharing information about Special Education Services. She stated it is not just an administrative special education grant but that the staff does a lot of monitoring. Staff also administer due process, and the afterschool, technology, and truant programs are housed under Special Education Services. Their Standards & Assessments division works primarily with assessments, Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT), Prairie State Achievement Examination (PSAE), and Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC). They have weekly meetings, and they have staff that goes to the monthly meeting that occurs in Washington, D.C. Ms. Morrison stated that anything that touches assessment is in this division. She also stated that this division is responsible for data analysis and progress monitoring, but the agency does not have a research arm or staff in place to do analysis of its data. ISBE is well aware of the challenges. The majority of the time, the agency collects data and develops a report that is requested by the federal government. She stated that ISBE has moved from being a compliant agency to more of a support to school districts. This approach is an expectation from the U.S. Department of Education, but it presents challenges to the agency because it has been hard to transition staff who have been doing this a long time.

### **Questions From Commission Members**

Dr. Durflinger asked the commission members if they had any questions for Susie Morrison. John Meixner asked Ms. Morrison if she had an organizational chart. She stated that the organizational chart has been taken offline because it is being changed; it will be finished in March. Dr. Durflinger told the commission to turn to page 14 of the ROE report and asked Ms. Morrison about the capacity of ISBE to do all the duties of the regional superintendents. Ms. Morrison stated that ISBE could not take on these duties with the staff it has at the present time.

Dr. Durflinger stated that one of the requirements of the commission is to review the duties of the state board.

A question was raised on what the ROE can do to help the state board. Mr. Meixner stated that they are looking at the effectiveness issue. Ms. Morrison stated that they need support on data analysis and are going to have an outside entity help them with data analysis; she hopes that will happen in the next few months. Dr. Daiber stated that his ROE provides customer service on certification. He then further stated that if a statewide coordinating council is established, they could collectively make decisions on the role that the ROE could play in regard to certification. Dr. Daiber also stated that they deal with area certifications; He has had some issues with that and is not sure if ROEs should deal with certification issues.

Dr. Daiber brought up some criticisms made regarding the duties of the regional superintendents. He stated that he reviews the 10-year surveys of the districts and tracks them. There's a Health/Life Safety survey that is filed that is approved by him and then approved by the state board. His ROE also issues building permits and approves the Health/Life Safety funds, which also have to be approved by the state board. Dr. Daiber stated that instead of having the state board approve it, that task can be given to the ROEs.

Dr. Daiber continued and talked about general compliance and suggested that ROEs can possibly handle that as well because he thinks the purpose of compliance is to make sure that schools are safe and teachers are certified. He suggested that the statewide coordinating council could review that and relieve the state board from doing those tasks, which may affect the general state aid formula, but it needs to be reviewed and made more efficient. These are examples of things that are being duplicated. The process needs to be streamlined. Dr. Daiber pointed out that the tasks that are listed on page 14 are done by ROEs to some capacity.

Dr. Daiber then talked about General Educational Development (GED) testing and stated that, in 2014, GED testing will be computerized and that the ROEs are the chief examiners. He stated that the rest of the general duties can be carried out by the ROEs as a regional delivery system in coordination with the state board and legislation. Mr. Meixner stated that some of the communication is missing and that if one can envision having one point person for delivery in each region, it would be more valuable. He suggested possibly having a one-stop shop and it would be wrapped around in the coordinating council.

Dr. Durflinger asked the commission if he can play the devil's advocate. He went down the list of mandates and asked if anyone else would be able to handle those mandates. He stated that for truancy and dropout students, some of the work can be transferred to the truancy division; the GED testing should go to the community colleges. He continued by stating that teachers and school personnel, substitute teachers, teacher endorsement/certification, and administration of academy workshops can go to either the ROE or state board or a combination of both. Criminal background checks can go to the school districts, state police, or state board. He stated that a lot of those things can be transferred to other groups, such as Gifted Education or School Statewide System of Support, or there may be another way of handling it. Dr. Durflinger stated that he would lean more toward having a five-year survey and not have the ROEs involved in it.

Compliance can go back to the state board; value-added measures can be given to someone else. Dr. Durflinger stated that there are things that can be taken off the table.

Dr. Kinder stated that the money has to go to someone, and it seems more logical to work with what they currently have. Dr. Durflinger stated that he is speaking on behalf of the people who do not have all the information of the commission. Dr. Durflinger thinks that there is going to be a decrease in regional superintendents and it will be significant; some issues need to be addressed.

### **Lt. Governor's Classrooms First Commission Perspective: Presentation by Dr. Lynne Haeffele**

Dr. Durflinger told the commission that the minutes will be available for approval at the next meeting. He then introduced Dr. Lynne Haeffele, who presented on the Lt. Governor's Classrooms First Commission.

Dr. Haeffele stated that as a result of legislation, Illinois has the Classroom's First Commission in operation thanks to Rep. Linda Chapa LaVia. Dr. Haeffele updated this commission in particular, on shared services; Dr. Michael Jacoby is chairing the Classrooms First Commission, and Larry Pfeiffer is involved in the Education Shared Services. Illinois launched the first Classrooms First Commission in September 2011; a report is due to Governor and General Assembly on July 1, 2012. Lieutenant Governor Sheila Simon is chairing the commission, and she wants the commission to be very research based and open; therefore, they are looking at a lot of data. They also have comments submitted via the Web and a lot of presentations at their commission meetings. Dr. Haeffele explained that the commission has four groups that are looking at different areas such as consolidation and shared services.

Dr. Haeffele explained that for Education Shared Services, ISBE does not have a lot of staff support. With a large effort like the Common Core State Standards, they have determined that there will be a need for some ROE capacity and support. ROEs have a proven track record of providing good professional development, and their group has been in discussion on the role the ROEs can play in providing shared services. The Classrooms First Commission believes that one role of the ROE could be on virtual learning, but that commission sees logistics as a challenge and suggested that the ROEs could help districts with the coordination of their calendars. But if virtual learning is done with the community colleges, the ROEs could help provide dual credit/enrollment and promote learning exchanges, which would need to be coordinated on a regional basis.

Mr. Meixner suggested that ISBE could coordinate with ROEs across programs such as regular education and system support that can all reside in one place. He stated that there may be an opportunity to see how ROEs are designed and ROEs could play a role in realignment. Mr. Pfeiffer stated that the conversation has begun on the issue of opportunity and access and that they see some challenges for the small districts, especially access in their districts. In representing small rural districts, Mr. Pfeiffer does not know whether that is the role of the current commission; but they should consider the age of enrollment and are looking at requiring four years of mathematics.

## **Current Recommendations of the Classrooms First Commission**

Dr. Michael Jacoby presented on the current recommendations that the Classrooms First Commission is developing.

Dr. Jacoby stated that, operationally, the shared services workgroup is similar to others. He stated that they are looking at how to improve efficiencies. They have found some overlap with internal efficiencies, and they are looking at how to make efforts inside the school efficient and how to outsource. They also are recommending criteria in which best practices might be employed and what such practices look like. For example, should ROEs remain in operation (which is laid out in one of their recommendations)? Should there be a more aggressive approach as districts begin to have more financial difficulty, which would be based on certain financial ratings when a warning is reached? (See the handout on “Classrooms First Commission: Current Recommendations Under Development.”) Dr. Jacoby stated that an efficiency study should be done that can be directed by the regional superintendent or the Educational Service Center (ESC) and the district would be required to review the recommendations with ISBE and formulate responses. Dr. Jacoby stated that it focuses on the roles of regional superintendent. Dr. Jacoby then opened it up to questions.

Dr. Durflinger asked if they are on-track or off-track. Mr. Kuffel asked if the virtual learning and dual credit is going to be more synchronous. Dr. Daiber suggested that someone look at finances for virtual learning courses because, for students that are expelled, parents can ask that their child be placed in a regional safe school. Virtual schooling can be a good fit, but it may be a financial burden on the family. Dr. Haefele stated that the Classrooms First Commission will take a look at that.

Mr. Kuffel stated that there’s a concern regarding certification. He said that he is an advocate and thinks it’s a great idea. But as they look at the financial piece, he stated that it is more cost-effective for districts to pay a \$250 fee for a class then to have a teacher do it. He also stated that there could be some coordinating effort with ISBE. Dr. Jacoby stated resource management service and having a Web-based model for analysis are working. He also suggested the repeal of the outsourcing bill and having a repository of shared service agreements. He stated that the state of New Jersey is a good example. Finally, he mentioned how funds are used for consolidation and how to identify them. Dr. Durflinger asked the commission if they had any more questions.

Dr. Haefele wrapped up and stated that they have been finding out with their research that consolidation is not always intended to save money but to shift the resources to the classroom. She felt that their overarching recommendations are to shift things in a better direction and that they are working in workgroups. Dr. Jacoby added that the commission will work with the recommendations and have a statewide hearing to allow people to respond to those recommendations.

## **Illinois Association of Regional Superintendents of Schools (IARSS) Follow-Up**

After a short break, Dr. Robert Daiber gave a follow-up presentation to last week’s meeting. Dr. Daiber referenced code 105 ILCS 5/4-2, which looks at monetary compensation to offices, and

code 105 ILCS 5/4-4, on providing ROEs a suitable office. He mentioned that no dollar amount is specified in these codes regarding the population size of 2 million. He stated that the size of the region may be impacted by square miles or density. He then moved to code 105 ILCS 5/3A-7, which focuses on the regional office budget, addresses the dimension of having more than one county, and indicates how those counties share the expenses. He stated that once again there is no set dollar amount. The last paragraph is significant that by Oct. 1<sup>st</sup> regional superintendents shall prepare a budget, with secretarial service, personnel expense, and office space and submit to the county board for each region for approval. The budget can be amended by a 2/3 majority.

Dr. Daiber stated that those budgets may be different. County boards typically honor those budgets. In some cases, office space is budgeted; and in some cases, it is looked at from the general auditor. Some regional superintendents have to pay rent and lease out space out of their county fund, and the same is true with furniture, travel, and hiring of staff, so that's what shapes the budget. There is nothing in the code by student enrollment, by school district, or square area, or population that there is a dollar amount given in budget. Dr. Durflinger asked if there was any need for the commission to point some of the problems that the ROEs have in inconsistencies on the county in getting funds.

Mr. Meixner stated that he thinks part of the problem is how it's structured; it may be different in some counties because those employees are part of the contracts. He stated that in his region, they pay for their employees' salaries' and some budgets may be larger because of that. He stated that his county supplies them with framework and foundation to support their office.

Dr. Durflinger made a correction to something stated at the February 22, 2012, meeting: Section 5/4-10 of the school code does address removal from office.

Dr. Daiber stated that this budget is part of their annual report that is presented to each county board by September of each year and they do that to make them aware of their budget, revenues and expenditures, which is shared with the county board. Dr. Brent Clark asked if the budget is from December 1 to November of the next year. Mr. Kuffel asked that in the 2010 report, how will the regional offices see that process of design? Dr. Daiber stated that he thinks that came from the Governor's office to establish the commission, and that it would be a collected initiative. Dr. Daiber asked Susie Morrison how she sees it. Ms. Morrison stated that ISBE would convene the coordinating council and do it collaboratively. Dr. Durflinger asked if this commission should support the concept of the other commission. Dr. Daiber stated that this concept is in Recommendation 5.

Dr. Jacoby stated that the more they can provide guidance on that, the better it will be. Dr. Durflinger thinks some of the problem is the lack of communication between regional superintendents and the state board; he does not know how to stop it without some sort of mandate. He then asked the commission if they have consensus on putting the statewide coordinating council in their report. Everyone agreed to this. The state board also is on board.

Mr. Nekritz stated that part of it has to be the question of equity and what money is being generated for different programs; he thinks that definition would be pretty important for him to understand, and there needs to be better understanding of fair service. Dr. Durflinger stated that

he too had a concern of inequity between the regions caused by the politics of county boards. Ms. Morrison stated that it evolved when there were service centers and they ran a budget based on population. When the ROEs came about, the budget went down from \$18 million to \$2.2 million; the level of service was affected, and that's an issue. From 1865 to 1970, there was a county superintendent, so that office was there. Then in the '70s when it was regionalized, the 102 became 57 and now it's down to 44. Dr. Durflinger asked Mr. Nekritz if he wants something put on the next agenda. Mr. Nekritz stated that he would because he is having a hard time grappling with the disparity of funds. Dr. Durflinger made the decision to put it on the next agenda. Mr. Nekritz also added that federal mandates should be discussed as well.

Dr. Jacoby stated that he feels that goes to the core role issue and that it would be nice to have a matrix that indicated that "yes, we believe this is a core role" and "yes, this should not be a core role done by the regional office." Ms. Morrison stated that in addition to that, they need to think about what should be on the mandated list that is not there. Dr. Durflinger stated if the core role should be tied to the recommended list to the coordinating council; if there needs to be a core role, someone has to put it together. He stated that the commission should verify Recommendation 2, and everyone agreed.

Dr. Jacoby asked if there is a benefit in mandating the budget at the county level and wondered what that budget is based on. Mr. Meixner stated that is based on what the regional superintendent believes is appropriate. Dr. Clark asked if the population of the students drives the ROE salary. Dr. Daiber responded by stating that the census population drives the salary. He stated that Tier 2 is the majority of ROEs that have a medium population, and the Tier 3 salary is for the large population areas. The Tier 1 salary is around \$90,000, the largest one (Tier 3) is \$104,000, and the medium population salaries would be in between. Dr. Clark asked about the ISC's salary. Dr. Kinder stated that their salary is determined by the governing board; it could be below or above the salaries of regional superintendents. Dr. Clark asked Dr. Kinder how he could find out about the salaries of the ISCs because it would be interesting to see how they align with the ROE salaries.

Dr. Kinder further stated that the governing board oversees the salaries and does not receive any county money at all. School districts do not pay the ISCs any annual fees, but they may pay for services they provide. Dr. Jacoby asked if the ISCs price services so that they make some revenue. Dr. Kinder stated that approximately 70 percent of their funding is through grants, and there also are local services of revenue. All three ISCs charge tuition for their regional safe schools, and they rent out rooms to bring in more revenue. A portion of their salary funds comes from grant money. Dr. Daiber stated that they cannot use any grant money for salaries. He thinks there's a misunderstanding in a piece of the legislation, but it is prohibited by the grant. Dr. Durflinger stated that the commission agrees to support Recommendation 2.

## **Discussion on Elected vs. Non-Elected Issue**

Dr. Durflinger facilitated a discussion on the elected versus the non-elected superintendent. He indicated that he hears it both ways on which way to go. He said that there are only three states that elect their regional superintendents: Montana, Arizona, and Illinois. He stated that Illinois is either extremely innovative or being close to the last one on a dead horse. He feels there should



be a discussion on this issue. Dr. Durflinger stated if superintendents are elected should it be nonpartisan. He asked the question of how ISCs and school boards are elected. Dr. Kinder stated that the ISCs are appointed. Dr. Durflinger then posed to the commission the question of whether the regional superintendents should be appointed, like the ISCs. Dr. Kinder stated that their governing board appoints the directors for ISC. They have 66 school districts, and the governing board members represent those 66 districts; they also have five special education cooperatives, three superintendents, three teachers, a community college member, and an administrative agent. Dr. Kinder indicated that each ISC has to have an administrative agent, which is the overseeing body; then their board approves, and then it goes to the township.

Dr. Jacoby asked Dr. Kinder if she sees problems with the current governing board. Dr. Kinder stated that it does work with suburban Cook County; they love it, but suburban Cook County looks different than other counties, and they feel they have a voice. Dr. Daiber had a clarification question regarding the funding of the ISCs. He wanted to know how the ISCs operate without enterprise funds and how they obtain grant money. Dr. Kinder stated that their districts do not pay a yearly fee; they pay for workshops, professional development, and classes. It was stated that when an office was taken apart, the salary money that was originally for the regional superintendent was divided among the three ISCs, which was about \$92,000. Dr. Kinder stated that when the change went through, they got \$92,000 to spend on Health/Life Safety.

Dr. Jacoby stated that the ROEs are always trying to tweak and make things fit. If they were building a system today from scratch, what would it be and how would it be funded? He feels they have a lot of Band-Aids on everything. Mr. Meixner stated that their system has been in place since 1865. Dr. Jacoby stated that if they were building a system they would not have a discussion about an elected regional superintendent; they would be talking about ISBE appointing someone for the ROE. A statement on who would appoint a regional superintendent came up, and Dr. Durflinger stated it could be a combination of ISBE and someone at the local level. Dr. Durflinger stated he would want a combination of the two and somehow have that local relationship but allow the state board to have much more control; the ROE and the state board should have some accountability. Dr. Durflinger asked Susie Morrison if there is a group out there that looks at accountability for these services. Ms. Morrison stated that there is one that does accreditation of intermediate service units. Dr. Durflinger asked Susie Morrison if it would be possible to contact them and have them attend the next meeting. Ms. Morrison stated she will try to have someone come in for the next meeting and present on accreditation.

Dr. Clark asked if the ISC governing board can rule on annexation detachment. Dr. Kinder stated that they have not had that happen. Dr. Daiber stated that they would have to have the regional board and state board attend the hearing since the ISC board is not a regionally elected board. Dr. Clark asked if there is a statutory issue with the idea of an appointed person, such as an ISC director removing a board member. Dr. Durflinger stated that it would have to end at the end of the term of the regional superintendent. Dr. Kinder stated that one has political ties; the neutrality issue is not different for the ISC than for the regional superintendent. Mr. Meixner stated that he has not seen any data that ROEs are inconsistent. Dr. Kinder stated that they need to see what is not happening that should be happening and that is the real issue—not the elected versus non-elected issue. Mr. Kuffel stated the issue may be in the core services because there are going to be inconsistencies, and sometimes the timing seems such that they could go on a pattern for a

decade. Again, if we knew exactly what the expectations were, we would all be on the same page. Dr. Kinder stated that their role could be year-to-year—and not four years like the regional superintendents—and could be revisited each year.

Dr. Daiber stated that any time there is a petition for consolidation or transfer of boundary lines, the regional board of trustees is involved; they do not act like a school board acts with a superintendent. Mr. Nekritz asked who should ensure the districts, helping districts navigate that legislation, besides their attorney. Dr. Jacoby stated that it's the law; if there's a coordinating council, they may be able to give some council. Mr. Nekritz stated the problem is that districts need guidance.

Dr. Fahey asked that in regard to the issue raised on compliance, what services can the ROEs and ISCs do? At the systems level, it's more than just awareness and bringing people together; it's formalized on bringing human resources together because they are at the community level. She then stated that in terms of awareness and all the way up to implementation, principals are pre-working with their districts, so what can the ROEs do? Do they flip the law? There's a huge distance between the law and implementation with fidelity, and she can talk about expectations, what are the accounting mechanisms and how the information gets back to the entity providing services to the law and implementation. She stated that if they can frame the expectations and account within that box, she thinks it's a pathway to efficacy for the issue the commission is struggling with.

Dr. Daiber wanted to address what Mr. Nekritz said about systems. One of the places they need to provide support is on school board training. Once we identify an entity that can facilitate that, we can offer Senate Bill 7 training to deal with the issues of training because the ROEs do not have the capacity. Mr. Nekritz asked what the system should be doing.

Dr. Durflinger asked Dr. Fahey about the efficiencies and asked the group if they are aware of DuPage County's concept of regional delivery. Dr. Durflinger asked Dr. Fahey if she would be willing to present for 15 minutes on DuPage County's concept of regional delivery. Dr. Fahey agreed to present at one of the future meetings. Dr. Daiber also stated that the commission can review pages 6–7 of the ROE document, which has a summary of that document.

Dr. Durflinger stated that the issue of elected versus non-elected is difficult. He would like to put it on the agenda for next week and determine if they want to move forward with this; if so, a decision will have to be made.

Dr. Durflinger stated that he personally believes there should be 18 to 35 ROEs: 18 is based on the original delivery system, and 35 goes back to what was in the law. He stated that there is no research base to these numbers, but he feels that there is some or a good portion of legislative feeling that there should be a decrease in the number of ROEs. He asked the commission to think about that this next week. He asked John Meixner to come up with a number. Based on the 2010 commission, the Iowa group came up with reductions. Mr. Meixner asked if they are looking at number of offices or the population. Dr. Durflinger stated that during the last meeting, they would look over the final report and the meeting before that they would vote and come to a consensus so that the Great Lakes West Comprehensive Center could have a week to put the

report together. Dr. Durflinger stated that they are starting to close in on some of the discussion and believes that by the third and fourth meeting, they will come to consensus. Dr. Clark had a clarification on the number of offices that Dr. Durflinger stated. Dr. Durflinger told Dr. Clark that they can look at numbers that fall between 18 and 35, but that politically he does not know if that will work. The final decision will be made by the Legislature and Governor.

## **Wrap-Up and Closing Comments**

The next meeting will be held at 9 a.m. on Monday, March 5, 2012, at the Illinois Association of School Boards.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:50 a.m.

## **Upcoming Meetings**

- Meeting #3, Monday, March 5, 2012, 9:00 am–Noon, Illinois Association of School Boards, Springfield
- Meeting #4, Thursday, March 15, 2012, Time and Location TBD
- Meeting #5, Thursday, March 22, 2012, Time and Location TBD
- Meeting #6, Wednesday, March 28, 2012, Time and Location TBD