

Streamlining Illinois' Regional Offices of Education Commission

Thursday, March 15, 2012

Minutes

Attendance

Commission Members:

Dr. Norm Durflinger
Rep. Roger Eddy
Dr. Michael Jacoby
Dr. Michael Johnson
Dr. Vanessa Kinder

Scott D. Kuffell
John Meixner
Susie Morrison
Mike Nekritz

Dr. Darlene Ruscitti
Meredith Byers
Jane Russell

Representing Commission Members:

Diane Hendren (for Dr. Brent Clark)

Guests:

Dr. Robert Daiber
Dr. Marian Eaton

Dr. Tom Parrish
Nick Pinchok

Notetakers:

Sheila Rodriquez
Rachel Trimble

Welcome, Introductions, and Consensus Recap

The fourth meeting of the Streamlining Illinois' Regional Offices of Education Commission was called to order at 1:00 p.m. by Dr. Norm Durflinger, chair of the Commission. Dr. Durflinger welcomed everyone and had the Commission members introduce themselves because he saw new faces in the room.

Dr. Durflinger reviewed the list of mandates that the Commission had discussed during the last meeting. He asked Commission members to turn to page 18 of the Regional Offices of Education (ROE) report and look at the duties of the regional superintendents. Dr. Durflinger went down the list and stated that there was consensus from the Commission on all of the mandates that ROEs should continue with those duties. He then asked the Commission if they were all in agreement. Commission members were in agreement.

Dr. Durflinger wanted to clarify for the record what is a state duty and what is a local duty. He stated there were two exceptions, the schools served through the Regional System of Support Provider (RESPRO) services and schools served through the Statewide System of Support Services. Both of these services are federal mandates. He stated that he thought that the

Commission was in agreement that the vast majority of the duties of the regional superintendents are mandated by law. Commission members were in agreement.

Approval of March 5 Minutes

Dr. Durflinger asked the Commission members if they had received last week's minutes. Dr. Durflinger asked if there should be any changes or additions to the minutes. He asked the Commission for a motion to approve the March 5, 2012, minutes. Dr. Michael Jacoby motioned to approve the minutes. Scott Kuffel seconded his motion to approve.

Decisions on Boundaries of Educational Service Regions

Dr. Durflinger asked Dr. Robert Daiber to come and have a seat with the Commission members. Dr. Daiber passed out a copy of the recommendations regarding the boundaries of ROEs. Dr. Daiber stated that the Illinois Association of Regional Superintendents of Schools (IARSS) met and had a discussion on boundary lines. Dr. Daiber stated that they made five recommendations, as follows:

- Amend the Illinois School Code 105 Illinois Compiled Statutes (ILCS) 5/3A-4—Mandatory consolidation of educational service regions (Section 3A-4) to state that **–(a) After July 1, 2015**, each region must contain at least **53,000 inhabitants**. Regions may be consolidated voluntarily under Section 3A-3 or by joint resolution of the county boards of regions seeking to join a voluntary consolidation to meet these population requirements. The boundaries of regions already meeting these population requirements on the effective date of this amendatory Act of 1993 may not be changed except to consolidate with another region or a whole county portion of another region which does not meet these population requirements. If locally determined consolidation decisions result in more than **39 regions** of population greater than 53,000 each, the **Illinois Association of Regional Superintendent of Schools** shall direct further consolidation, beginning with the region of lowest population, until the **number of 39 regions** is achieved.”

This is a 13.4 percent reduction in ROEs to serve the 870 school districts in Illinois. This proposal far exceeds any reduction of state agencies or state offices. IARSS proposed this boundary change in accordance with language stated in Recommendation 1 in the document *ROEs—The Resource Office for Illinois Education*.

- This proposed census population change would affect six ROEs as currently provided for in the Illinois School Code:
 - a. ROE 14—Suburban Cook
 - b. ROE 27—Henderson/Mercer/Warren
 - c. ROE 22—Fulton/Schuyler
 - d. ROE 25—Hamilton/Jefferson
 - e. ROE 26—Hancock/McDonough
 - f. ROE 33—Knox

- Consolidation hearings would begin July 1, 2012, with local county boards.
- A revised map of ROEs would be completed by August 1, 2013, and submitted to the State Board of Elections.
- Consolidation would become effective July 1, 2015.

Dr. Durflinger thanked Dr. Daiber for the work of IARSS and stated that all of the Commission members recognize the difficult task that was done in reducing the number of regions. Dr. Durflinger also stated that he was not sure that this will be a large enough number for the Legislature. Then Dr. Durflinger asked the Commission to discuss the recommendations made by IARSS. Dr. Jacoby stated that ROE 14 is not active right now but is still identified. Dr. Daiber responded and stated that ROE 14 would be dissolved and that this situation needs to be clarified. Dr. Jacoby asked the reasoning for choosing the population number 53,000. Dr. Daiber stated that IARSS had a discussion on what was a rational number; they didn't want to be conservative so they looked at cut-line census data. Dr. Durflinger thanked Dr. Daiber for doing this and added that he knew it was hard. He is not sure if this approach is going to be enough in the eyes of the Legislature, but it may help with some decisions they have. Dr. Durflinger asked the Commission if they had any other suggestions.

Dr. Jacoby wanted to know why was the focus on the number 53,000 because he looked at the census data and wanted to see what it would look like with different numbers, the highest being 250,000. He stated that with 250,000, you would retain the eight ROEs and three Intermediate Service Centers (ISCs), which would equal 11 total. He further stated that if the population number changed to 200,000, the number of ROEs would be reduced. He stated that they are used to operating with various numbers of regions throughout the state, which is around 22; we can also refer back to the original number of Educational Service Centers, which was 18. The idea of consolidation has happened before and has been successful, and Dr. Jacoby thinks they should look at a higher number such as 200,000 instead of 53,000.

Dr. Durflinger asked the Commission to discuss this proposal. Dr. Jacoby stated that he is looking at the size of ROEs that have more than 200,000 inhabitants and are operating just fine. Mr. Meixner stated that he doesn't think geography is being taken into consideration, which can make a difference. Dr. Jacoby stated that when one looks at the population base, you don't have to look at services; you have multiple counties involved. As they move more into using technology, they will be moving toward utilizing webcasts, which will cut down on traveling and reviews. Dr. Daiber stated that this situation is all about money and that he cannot see that this is saving money because there are 870 school districts that need to be served. He stated that you can make 10 offices, but the size of the office, staff, and payroll for those offices is going to increase because they will be serving more than 250,000 inhabitants. The issue is: How are you going to pay for it? How will you convince the county boards to support ROEs that are no longer local—especially when mathematically in numbers it's going to cost more, and operating costs will increase? Dr. Jacoby stated that may not necessarily be the case because they will only be paying for one regional superintendent and his or her staff.

Dr. Daiber asked if they were going to cut the salary line item from \$9 million to \$4.8 million. Dr. Jacoby stated that 10 ROEs are operating at populations of 200,000; the other piece you work

through is consolidation with the counties on providing the services and determining service levels, and you will have to work with the boards on consolidation. Dr. Ruscitti stated that they have not come to the outcomes of the ROEs. She stated that they can talk about numbers all they want, but the bottom line is looking at the value added. She is not sure how they are going to determine the numbers without looking at the responsibilities. It doesn't matter if you have 20 or 100 ROEs. She stated that she met with a superintendent in DuPage County and that they need a team to come to their school and assist them with a systems type of approach. Dr. Jacoby stated that he understood what Dr. Ruscitti was saying but that they were talking about what the minimum number of inhabitants would be for an ROE; he thinks 200,000 is a better number in terms of getting more equity.

Scott Kuffel asked why the alliance boundaries are not working. He stated that he thinks it's because there were counties that overlapped and that there needs to be a consistent alignment of communication and mission. Mr. Kuffel stated that he looked at page 14 and if those are the core services that are expected by the ROEs, then he doesn't see how it cannot be done on a regional alliance type of boundary that would allow for alignment and better communication. He posed this as an option to the Commission. Mike Nekritz stated that it may be an option but wanted to know how new ones would be formed; if the county didn't agree with the number, it would then go to legislation. Dr. Daiber stated that it is accounted for in the school code and is part of the IARSS recommendation. In the current code, the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) should determine consolidation, but the proposition is for IARSS to take on this task. If we are doing this by association boundary, they can do that, but he would like to see a map of what is being proposed by the two parties.

Dr. Johnson stated that he can provide a map for everyone. Dr. Jacoby stated that he did some mapping on 150,000, but it's just scratched on the map that he has on hand; there's no reason why they couldn't produce a map with 150,000 or 200,000 inhabitants. Dr. Durlinger stated that, in reality, if one goes with just a number, the process goes back to ISBE. Dr. Ruscitti stated that going back to the first Streamlining Committee and another one that Governor Pat Quinn had, if they are talking about efficiencies and effectiveness, they received a map that showed X amount of Education for Employment (EFE) systems and special education co-ops, so they can lay those out as well. If this is about money, then they need to be examined first. Dr. Jacoby stated that those didn't hold to the county lines and that if they start building up from special education groups, they will never be able to agree on a county boundary line.

Mr. Meixner stated that he still thinks the services provided by ROEs are much different than the others and that Dr. Jacoby's efficiency model will drop with the 200,000 amount. Dr. Jacoby stated that he is not interested in saving money; he is interested in equity. Mr. Meixner stated that the three measures of accountability will eliminate those inequities. Dr. Jacoby stated that one gains efficiency in the coordinating council dialogue with 20 people at the table instead of 40 people. He stated that he would be curious about members of the equity groups and what the accountability measures are, so that they are not reinventing the wheel. Mr. Kuffel stated that he thinks if EFE and special education cooperatives all aligned with ROEs, it would work. He stated they are looking at options because the chair of the Commission asked for options and that it doesn't have to be aligned with the 2010 task force; a model like this may fit some components.

Mr. Kuffel asked if the \$10 million from the county is money that the regional superintendent asks for and is not based on per student or per faculty. He stated that he assumed the process is the same when going with a budget to a county board and that, regardless of boundary, they don't do that anymore. He asked if there was an amendment code of what county boards must do. Dr. Daiber stated that he will speak from a political platform; if he puts an office in St. Clair County, he will get full funding, but he will need to go to Madison County to ask for funding. He stated that the sheriff's department and public works department would like to have the half million dollars. Mr. Kuffel stated that, regardless of any change in boundary lines, it seemed that all or some of that county money will go away. Dr. Daiber stated that many people who work in the offices are union employees for the southwestern region. He asked if, in East St. Louis, is ISBE going to take care of those students or is he responsible for them? Dr. Jacoby stated that he would take care of the East St. Louis students. Dr. Daiber stated that he is speaking to it because he's from that environment and that there are challenges with the map, but it may have legitimacy with some schools that work well; it's constituent service or public official service. There's a complicated factor that goes far beyond school association thinking—it's the political climate.

Dr. Jacoby stated that they need to make this a nonpolitical climate and asked if the multiple counties in ROE 20 are providing resources. Mr. Meixner stated that every county is providing resources but not equally. Dr. Jacoby stated that the Commission may need to look at ILCS Code 2 and see the consistencies across the counties. Dr. Kinder asked if a county could choose to not give any funds, so that if six counties are condensed, it can have a real impact on RESPRO and the Regional Safe Schools Program. She stated they have to be cognizant of what programs they are looking at, and if and how they can be delivered before determining a number. Dr. Jacoby stated that they would need to look at the ROEs and list the services provided by each, and if two counties have safe schools, then he doesn't see why they can't both keep the Regional Safe Schools Program.

A member of the audience stated that they have five counties and had four safe schools, but they have lost some and are now down to two safe schools. The county will not bus their students to the other county that has the safe school, so those students are not in school and their dropout rate is going to increase in that region. Dr. Jacoby stated that those districts are the ones that made the decision to not bus those students and that it's not the ROE's fault. The audience member stated that this particular county has decreased its transportation funds, so it already has a tight budget.

Dr. Kinder stated that they need to be cognizant of those specific programs because it will have an impact on our students. Dr. Durflinger stated that he understands where Dr. Daiber is coming from on politics; he thinks it would be much better if there would be more involvement by county government on what the map should look like. If that is not done, then they will need a change of the law that will state what they need to have. He stated that if they stay with the map, there needs to be some legislation change. Susie Morrison asked Dr. Jacoby if the minimum population number of these regions is 200,000, then what will the maximum be? Dr. Jacoby stated that DuPage has 900,000 inhabitants and that the map has 19 regions with 200,000 inhabitants; therefore, they would end up with 21 or 22 ROEs. Dr. Durflinger asked if there was another proposal. Dr. Jacoby stated that he liked the idea of adding the qualifier that the counties

have the responsibility and there is some formula, so if there is a change, people aren't just left hanging; we are looking for equitable distribution throughout the state.

Mr. Meixner stated that equity is taken care of with accreditation and accountability. Dr. Jacoby stated that he cannot get his head around it because all superintendents are getting paid the same even though the services may be different. Rep. Eddy stated that when you talk about county government, they are interested in local services; whether or not they contribute, you want to look at whether they are going to be constituents. Considering the geography is larger, they are going to be more intent on providing some type of service, local constituent service. They will continue to do this because of the geography, and may end up providing more support to the ROEs. He stated that he has concern with the special education piece, especially in rural areas; he doesn't think they want to send a student 100 miles to a district that provides the service. He doesn't think most special education co-ops serve the geography they are able to serve. To enter into those existing ones and broaden those, you may not be serving the children that need to be served. It makes sense to align the services delivered; micromanaging does not make sense.

Dr. Ruscitti agreed with Rep. Eddy and stated that DuPage has at least five special education co-ops. Rep. Eddy stated that if these became larger areas, those counties will have larger offices and may provide more support. Dr. Daiber stated that the Southwestern ROE has five counties, some smaller ones, and asked if it makes sense to have five local offices—probably not. Rep. Eddy stated that he thinks the counties will want to have those local offices open because they are serving a larger area. Dr. Daiber stated that he fought hard for his budget and lost 2 percent of it. He stated that the ROE funding at the county level is at the same place as it is in the state, which is last, and he doesn't feel that the county is going to give them more money.

Dr. Jacoby stated that if ROE 40 is split, then two counties move to one; he feels the better methodology would be to raise the number from 53,000 to 150,000, which would leave 14 ROEs and three ISCs that would stay the same. He stated that county responsibility should be specified. Mr. Nekritz stated that one of the charges of the Commission was to look at the funding mechanism. He stated that the county boards are closest to the ROEs when it comes to state funding and they couldn't convince them to support the ROEs. Mr. Nekritz stated that there needs to be something added that tells the counties what they need to contribute. Dr. Ruscitti stated that she is opposed to it and that counties should not be forced to contribute.

Rep. Eddy stated that clearly the duties of the ROEs are state services; the recommendation should be that if funding is going to be reduced, then the Corporate Personal Property Replacement Tax (CPPRT) should not be used, and the funding should come from the general funding line item. Dr. Durflinger stated that he would like to see some statement from the Commission on whether there should be corporate funding or state funding. Rep. Eddy stated that CPPRT should not be used after a certain number. Dr. Jacoby stated that IARSS proposed the 150,000 number. Dr. Durflinger requested a roll call vote. Dr. Jacoby brought up a motion stating that he would propose that the Commission use all language that the minimum population would be 150,000 inhabitants, with 17 existing entities that would not change; the other 30 would dialogue on how to consolidate. He further stated that language should be presented that would require counties to contribute funding using a formula based on the equalized assessed valuation (EAV) between levels of support and that the funding should come from the general

fund, not CPPRT. The remaining ROEs that consolidate can consolidate to larger numbers, or just the 150,000. There isn't a proposal for a set number on the rest of the ROEs, and county boundaries would be respected. The recommendation would take effect after July 1.

Dr. Durflinger asked if there's a second for that motion. Mr. Kuffel asked if Dr. Jacoby is looking at census data. Mr. Nekritz asked what the fail-safe is if counties don't approve it. Dr. Jacoby stated that if this proposal goes through, the ROEs would figure it out among themselves. Dr. Daiber stated that they would follow the school code process and that counties would have the option to choose the region. It states in the proposal that ISBE determines consolidation. Dr. Kinder stated that she would propose how that would fall out and thinks they need to look at ramifications of that, and that there shouldn't be a vote yet. Rep. Eddy stated to table Dr. Jacoby's motion and wait until next week because they need Sen. William Haine and Rep. Linda Chapa LaVia to be present, especially since legislation may be affected. Rep. Eddy made the motion, Dr. Ruscitti seconded the motion, and the Commission agreed to wait until the next meeting.

Discussion and Decisions on Duties and Responsibilities for ROEs and ISBE

Rep. Eddy asked if the next meeting can be moved to the Capitol since legislators have committee meetings at the Capitol. Dr. Durflinger asked the Commission if that was okay and they agreed they would move the meeting to the Capitol next week. Before they moved to the next item on the agenda, Dr. Durflinger asked Rachel Trimble if she would have some of the report ready for review at the next meeting, or shortly thereafter. Ms. Trimble stated that she showed Dr. Durflinger the current draft and it depended if he wanted that shared. Dr. Durflinger stated that he wants the report e-mailed to everyone soon after the next meeting on March 22, 2012, because during the final meeting he would like to go through the report so that everyone is comfortable with it. The next meeting is very important, and everything needs to be finished by then.

Dr. Durflinger stated to the Commission that they look at the roles and responsibilities stated on page 14, and asked if they feel they need to be mandated. Mr. Meixner stated that those cannot be mandated because they are value-added services. Dr. Durflinger stated that they had a discussion on the duties and responsibilities of the state board and asked if there were items that the regional superintendents need to take over from the state board. Dr. Jacoby asked Susie Morrison if there are any areas that the Commission would need to talk about in moving the duties. Dr. Durflinger stated that the Commission can look at the list and come up some recommendations for the next meeting. He stated that in the next agenda they will have action on boundaries and discussions on duties and responsibilities of the ROEs and ISBE. Dr. Durflinger stated that they can move on to the next item on the independent review of ROE funding.

Independent Review of ROE Funding: Presentation by Dr. Tom Parrish

Dr. Tom Parrish asked the Commission if they had received a report and a copy of his PowerPoint because he had some technical difficulties, and that he will walk them through it. Handouts were passed out. He stated that they did a unit analysis of how ROEs use state funds. He stated that this is not an audit and what they attempted to do is a descriptive analysis with the

data they received. He stated that Dr. Marian Eaton, his colleague, will answer questions on data since she was the one who crunched the numbers. He also stated that if there were other measures out there, they would be open to suggestions and that they did their best with what they could find. ISBE was helpful.

Dr. Parrish continued with his presentation and stated that they were asked to look at funding levels of the regional service providers and ways to ensure equitable quality assurance. The study looked at funding and how it may be helpful in thinking about equity and accountability in quality assurance. There could be multiple phases: the first one on accumulating and analyzing data, what data are available, to help them think about the question, and then how they are organized and interacting with one another. He stated that one could go beyond this and look at ISCs and other state educational service agencies. He stated that they didn't find as much rich information as they thought they would. The third step would be to obtain case study information.

He told the Commission to look at Slide 4, which is an overview. When given this broader charge, they looked at seven questions that they thought would be interesting to people:

1. What revenues are ROEs receiving and from what sources?
2. What funding formulas are used to distribute ROE funds?
3. To what extent does ROE funding appear equitable?
4. How many and what kinds of students are ROEs serving?
5. How are ROEs spending the funds?
6. What services are ROEs providing?
7. What is being produced by ROEs?

Dr. Parrish told the Commission members to look at Table 1 at the back of the report, which states the revenues that the ROEs are receiving and from what sources. He stated that this is an overall picture and that they saw many revenue sources. They can consolidate it so that it's not 300 lines of items, but Dr. Eaton did a good job at putting them into categories. The table is divided into three groups of categories, and most ROEs received general state aid. Mr. Meixner stated that the third line down on supervisor expenses was not received by the ROEs. Dr. Daiber stated that number is not correct. Dr. Eaton stated that she went by a file of disbursements from the state chief financial officer, which was 3 years of disbursements. Dr. Daiber stated that it was a very misleading line item, especially as a legislator, and they only got \$300,000; because of perception, he would separate those. Dr. Parrish stated that some combining would still be helpful and thinks that labeling would be important. He stated that they talked about putting ~~draft~~ on the report because the numbers and how they were accumulated or given would be inaccurate.

There were more discussions on some of the line items in Table 1. Dr. Parrish then pointed to the second page, in the last row, which shows a drop in funding and in the number of categories for which they received funding. He asked if there were any questions or concerns with Table 1. He stated that Table 2 takes some of that same information and tries to compile and equip per capita

information. The table shows revenues per capita for total students enrolled in a district given what the ROE serves. Mr. Meixner asked if the numbers are just public school numbers. Dr. Eaton stated that they were and the alternative would be to go to fall enrollment counts, but they went with the report card file. Dr. Parrish pointed to the last column on percentage of low-income students in the districts that is aggregated, which the ROEs serve. He stated that one of the things they see at the top is general state aid per capita that the ROEs receive. He stated that equal does not necessarily mean equitable and that the one rationale for the difference in funding is the percentage of poverty students. He stated that they also put the correlation between low-income students with each funding source, and the variation does not correlate with low-income students.

Dr. Eaton explained the general state aid line and stated that the line they got was allocated as general state aid. Dr. Daiber asked if they took the money that actually went to the ROEs or did they take the money that went to the districts? He stated that they took the money that went directly to the ROEs for their general safe schools program. Dr. Daiber stated that if they take the general state aid, in their region, there's no correlation with low-income students. He stated that it is invalid and for it to be statistically significant the two sets of data must be from the same factor. Mr. Meixner states that there are some ROEs that collect all the money from their region and disburse it to their districts. Dr. Parrish stated that maybe the average number of students would be the better number, but they don't think they have that. Dr. Kinder stated that they can get that number through the Student Information System (SIS). Dr. Parrish stated that it may be better to have the SIS count but it may not be the best denominator. He stated that Table 3 presents disbursements sorted from high to low and all the disbursements they saw in Table 1, less the category, are sorted so that one can see the amounts in 2009, 2010, and 2011. Hamilton County appeared to be the highest and McHenry County the lowest. Dr. Parrish listed the categories and went on to Table 4; he asked how they could think about what is being produced by the ROEs. He asked the Commission what their thoughts were on other measures. He then pointed to some maps that showed percent of proficiency. He stated that in trying to answer the fourth research question, it didn't yield counts. Mr. Meixner stated that he thinks it would be all students and there is a count for each school district, which they have to report to the state. Dr. Parrish then stated that they may have individual counts that they weren't able to find and that some of the Commission members may be able to point them to places where they can find those numbers.

Dr. Parrish then continued on to the fifth question and asked the members where they would be able to find that information. Mr. Meixner stated that they can find it in the attorney general's audit report. Dr. Parrish stated that they couldn't find the information to answer the sixth question and asked the Commission where they could go to find that information. Mr. Meixner stated that they could also find that in the attorney general's audit report. Dr. Daiber stated that every ROE is a statutory office that carries out enumerated duties, which are consistent in every office; there's no discrepancy. But there's a category called "services," so there are some discrepancies, but what the ROEs do is similar, and we presented a document to the Commission that identifies the services we provide.

Dr. Parrish asked if the answer is that the ROEs do the same thing, then why is the funding so different? Dr. Ruscitti stated that it is needs based, so if you have a large English language

learner population, then the ROE provides services in that area. Dr. Kinder stated that it is numbers-based. Dr. Ruscitti stated that the bottom line for her is whether it is per capita per student or per capita for every successful student. Dr. Jacoby stated that it seems that they were looking at each individual stream and the number of students served, and it's generated on the number of students that exist in that region who need that service. Dr. Parrish stated that he is trying to figure out the best denominator and that they may want to self-evaluate, and they can help with that. Mr. Meixner stated that they tried to look at a statewide model; Illinois is so diverse that trying to lock into one formula will be hard to do. Dr. Parrish stated that the more they can measure, the stronger the argument would be.

Dr. Jacoby stated that, in terms of equity, they are looking for how well they do that service and now they are getting into a qualitative analysis, which is difficult to do outside of doing interviews with people that do those services. He stated that if Dr. Parrish had an account model that included that qualitative analysis, and there was a standard review, they could probably get what they need. Dr. Parrish stated that there should be other ways to measure success. Dr. Jacoby stated that another way would be to look at revenue for the staff of each ROE; it would be more interesting to look at a particular program and staffing for that program and compare that across the ROEs. Dr. Parrish then asked how they know they are succeeding.

Dr. Ruscitti asked why Chicago Public Schools (CPS) was left out of the study. Dr. Parrish stated that they took it out because of the detail. Dr. Eaton stated the file they got did not include CPS. Dr. Parrish stated that CPS could be brought into the larger analysis. Dr. Parrish stated that they are open to suggestions and that not everything could be measured. He went on to possible next steps. Nick Pinchok stated that this was a start and they were given three years of data, and it's very complicated. He stated it is here for their purposes and they would welcome any opportunity to improve the analysis. Dr. Durflinger stated that Great Lakes West has three good sources with Dr. Ruscitti, Dr. Daiber, and Mr. Meixner. Mr. Meixner stated that, with no disrespect, he doesn't know if the report is accurate; two good sources should be contacted, one being the ROEs. Dr. Durflinger thanked Dr. Parrish and Dr. Eaton for coming. Mr. Nekritz stated that CPS was not included in the study and that they are looking at ROEs and the state board; they need to look at how money is being spent and the state board and what they spend. He stated that they have revenue sources that are left out, such as local money.

Wrap-Up and Closing Comments

Dr. Durflinger stated that they have a room for next week's meeting; it holds 60 people but it doesn't have a telephone. Therefore, all Commission members need to be physically present for the next meeting. The next meeting will be at 9:30 a.m. on March 22, 2012, in the Stratton Building in Room A1.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m.