

MINUTES
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION
LOCKPORT TOWNSHIP HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT 205
Wednesday, May 5, 2010 (7:00 P.M.)

CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE TO THE FLAG

A Special Meeting of the Board of Education of Lockport Township High School District 205 was duly held at East Campus, 1333 East Seventh Street, Lockport, Will County, Illinois, and called to order by President Ronald Svara at 7:00 p.m. Member John Lukasik led the Pledge to the Flag.

Roll Call

1. The following Board Members were present:

BOARD MEMBERS:

Michael Lewandowski
 Cindy Polke
 Angela Kamely
 John Lukasik
 Susan L. Forbes
 Ronald Svara

The following Board Members were absent:

Lou Ann Johnson

Public Hearing and Petitions

2. Members of the public wishing to address the Board of Education under this portion of the meeting can do so at this time. Petitioners must complete all information requested on the sign-in sheet prior to speaking. (A five (5) minute time allotment is allowed for each speaker.) Although the Board does not immediately reply to the concerns presented at the meeting, it does not imply in any way that the public's comments are not valuable or important. The Board's policy is to listen to the public's concerns and then gather adequate information to objectively discuss them.

None

Information Reports

3. Information Report #1005-01 – Budget

President Svara stated that he asked Rich Lesniak, Director of Business Services, to put together a report that contains a list of “above the line” (adjustments) and “below the line” (costs) of 10 or 12 items that a year from now, if things don’t improve, we may have to look and possible cut for next year. President Svara wanted to let the public know about this ahead of time so there would be no surprises if these cuts (adjustments) would have to be made.

Member Lukasik felt we didn’t need a motion to discuss this but he was concerned that the list of items proposed for below the line might cause the public to fret over something that might not happen 12 months from now. He felt that 12 months was a long time to have this concern hanging over the public’s head. He asked how the concern could be balanced in the way we

have to approach this. Member Forbes used the example of the rumor about the electives being cut or the possibility of charging fees for elective classes that took off like wildfire. She was concerned that something like this might cause the same reaction, even though there is that reality that adjustments might have to happen.

MOTION: Member **Svara** made the motion to have Member **Lukasik** seconded the motion to make a list of adjustments that might need to take place to balance the budget and a list of costs of other items so if we don't have a good year and we're in trouble, we may have to address next year. He called it "above the line" and "below the line." He too felt that it was true that when people see this, the Board meetings will fill up. Member Forbes stated that it was okay for the Board meetings to fill up, but we would need to dispel any rumors that might come out of making the public aware of this, because, like last time, there was a lot of misinformation out there that got out of hand.

Member Polke felt that if someone internally knew what the rumors were last time, then those who had concerns could have been asked if they wanted to talk with the Board directly rather than go on a rumor and call previous graduates and call students on the osmosis of a rumor or partial conversation, then negatively stack the Board meeting when we could have had adult, professional conversations to dispel these rumors, which she thought was a leadership issue that could have occurred.

Superintendent Raymond asked if the inference Member Polke was speaking of was that he called students and asked them to come. He asked if that was what she was saying. Member Polke replied, no, but clearly department chairs or teachers did, because graduates would not have known of the issue if they had not been contacted or called. Superintendent Raymond stated that he had no clue that they were coming. To this Member Polke replied that month after month you witnessed it, so then she said after one month, she thought Superintendent Raymond could have contacted the staff and asked what was going on. Because when this all started to occur, the Board was puzzled as to why these individuals were coming forward. Member Kamely stated that unfortunately, no matter what the Board does or doesn't do, rumors are going to fly.

Getting back to the Budget discussion, Member Polke felt that it was proactive to discuss things that the Board might be considering openly so that everybody would be onboard with the Board's ideas should the Board have to make decisions to cut (adjust) these items. She added that she was just at a SCOPE meeting presentation and they said that the State is in bad trouble and schools are not going to see improvement on their budgets and they are asking school board members to be cognizant of the budgeting and to cut wherever possible, but not to affect student programming. She said—bottom line—the adjustments need to be made elsewhere. Mr. Lesniak stated that we could make further suggestions.

Member Lewandowski felt that the Board had this discussion at the April meeting and at that time, the Board asked the Administration to prepare a balanced budget and then show what adjustments could be made. The Board then asked the Administration to come back to the Board with a balanced budget and whatever adjustments they saw were reasonable for this year. Several members stated that what President Svara was talking about was FY12 budget, not the

FY11 budget. The FY11 budget is balanced. Superintendent Raymond felt that what President Svara was directing Administration to do was to start looking forward so if we have to do another round for FY12 what possibilities were there.

President Svara stated that he felt that if this gets out into the newspapers and the Board meetings start to fill up, that the Board could field the rumors by informing the public what the Board was actually planning to do. This could be proactive instead of reactive. Member Kamely said that she thought it would be nice to see public comments to hear what they would like to see done to get a little more public input; although Member Polke felt that this might not be a good thing to do because the public doesn't always have the same educated viewpoint that the Board has. Member Forbes added that there were just too many opinions and viewpoints out there.

Mr. Lesniak stated that his interpretation of this was that the Board was asking Administration to identify more expenditure cuts. He asked the Board to realize that we don't have revenue solidified for 2011 yet with the State, let alone for 2012, or know what the CPI is, or know what new property is. So when the Board says balanced, you're not just saying expenditures you have to match them up with the revenue. Rich explained that while it would be a relatively simple task to identify expenditure reductions—what would be difficult would be to go back and say balance these—when you are only dealing with revenue projections. To this President Svara said he was not looking for a 2012 balanced budget, he was just looking for a list of what things cost.

RESTATED MOTION: Member **Svara** made the motion to have Mr. Lesniak provide a report showing a list of adjustments—"above the line"—to balance the budget, and a list of costs of other items—"below the line"—so if we don't have a good year in 2011 and we're in trouble, we may have to address next year. This would be for one year only and if this passes, we could decide on a timeline to get this done. Member **Lukasik** seconded the motion.

Upon a roll call vote being taken, the vote was: Aye: **6** Nay: **0**. The motion **CARRIED 6 – 0**.

Angela Kamely	Yes
Susan L. Forbes	Yes
John Lukasik	Yes
M. Lewandowski	Yes
Cindy Polke	Yes
Ronald Svara	Yes

Regarding the 2012 budget, President Svara explained that he met with some department chairs and there seems to be some depreciation going on with some items in the building that are starting to age, and it's not buses—things such as floor tile, etc. He felt that in 2012 we might have to look for some depreciation support. Superintendent Raymond said that this information might have come from conversations with the PE and Athletic Department. Rich Lesniak stated that Bill Thompson, Director of Facilities Management, builds these types of expenses into a cycle and looks at them yearly to decide if something needs to be moved up or not. We budget for these types of expenses from the day these items are installed.

RECOMMENDATION: Member **Polke** made a recommendation that the Superintendent be responsible for a balanced budget extended for three years and that this be made part of the Superintendent's goals.

President Svava stated that he felt if that was the case, then the Superintendent should have two sets of goals—some that tie to his contract and some that don't.

Discussions regarding three-year projections and a five-year projection; how to measure these projections when projections are based on assumptions; and how you can hold someone responsible for them by making this part of the Superintendent's goals. Member Svava felt that there should be two sets of goals for the Superintendent. Those that tie into his contract and those that are not part his contract. Superintendent Raymond stated that if this was to be a potential Superintendent's goal then it should be discussed by both sides and not just a Board decision. He added that if the goal is tied to his contract that it can be discussed in Closed Session although he had chosen tonight not to do that. He explained that the three-year budget is already being done through the model with adjustments that are done every year.

Mr. Lesniak explained that it was a State law to have a balanced budget which means no deficit spending on an annual basis but on your fund balance. You cannot take a fund balance below zero. If our school district would start to deficit spend, then Rich would have to do a five-year expenditure reduction plan. The Board never sees those pages because Rich pulls those pages out of the legal budget document because we are not deficit spending. District 205 does not have to prepare an expenditure reduction plan because we are not deficit spending.

Member Polke stated that what she was asking was something we do anyway and this would add confidence to the community to see that Rich, Garry and the Board are doing a good job. Member Lewandowski felt that Administration has done this in the past and felt this was unnecessary. In reply to President Svava's question, Rich stated that we work on a five-year projection model that PMA has developed. PMA does not do this for the District. They look at it with Administration. They do not tell us what our assumptions are—we give that information to them. Student enrollments are tied into the projections.

Member Polke stated that the three-year projection recommendation came right out of a CEC report from another school district at a school board presentation. She felt that one year was not enough, three years would be better because five years is too hard to project. She felt that three years was a proactive, responsible way to set a goal. Do not eliminate the five-year projection but to just put it into the Superintendent's goal for three. It was asked how that could be measured and it was suggested that it could be done as a presentation.

MOTION: Member **Polke** made the motion that the Superintendent be responsible for a balanced budget extended for three years and that this be made part of the Superintendent's goals. Member **Kamely** second the motion.

Upon a roll call vote being taken, the vote was: Aye: **2** Nay: **3** Abstain: **1 (Kamely)**. The motion **FAILED 2 – 3**.

Susan L. Forbes	No
Cindy Polke	Yes
M. Lewandowski	No
John Lukasik	No
Ronald Svara	Yes
Angela Kamely	Abstain

Information Report #1005-02 - Goals

Superintendent Raymond provided a folder which included a draft copy of the 2010-2011 Superintendent goals and the April 2010 Goals Status for the Board to review. Listed on the April 2010 Goal Status were the five Superintendent goals adopted by the Board and the three goals adopted for the Board. Also listed were the additional goals that Member Kamely asked the Board consider. He explained that next steps that are usually taken. The Board might want to wait to hear the report from the CEC process. The goals were put into “SMART” nomenclature so they would be **S**trategic, **M**easurable, **A**ttainable, **R**esults-oriented and **T**ime-bound. Also, as with the Superintendent’s goals, a strategic plan would need to be developed denoting objectives, activities, data, persons responsible, target dates, and results. Once the strategic plan gets into its final stages, the Board would be asked to approve the plan. The plan would get implemented, the progress monitored, it would be reviewed, the results evaluated, and the process would start again. Regarding the DRAFT document, Dr. Raymond would like input from Board members to see what members would like in these goals and then refine them until they come to the Board for approval. He requested that the Board consider moving Goal #4 to a Board goal—not a Superintendent goal—because he felt that goal would needed to be Board driven. Finally, he stated that an update on Goal #5 – Continue with the Citizen’s Advisory Council process—will be given at the next Board meeting.

MOTION: Member **Polke** moved, Member **Kamely** seconded the motion to strike from Goal #1 the words, “Provided there are no substantial changes in the socioeconomic characteristics of the District,” so the Goal #1 would then read: The average ACT and related achievement test scores, as measured by the results of such tests, shall exceed the State average for such tests.

Upon a roll call vote being taken, the vote was: Aye: **5** Nay: **1 (Lewandowski)**. The motion **CARRIED 5 – 1**.

John Lukasik	Yes
Cindy Polke	Yes
Susan L. Forbes	Yes
Angela Kamely	Yes
M. Lewandowski	No
Ronald Svara	Yes

Some discussion took place regarding how the District should compare test scores—should they be compared to the State or National scores. Superintendent Raymond stated that focus needs to be on the goal, which is the ACT, and the underlining objectives would be worked on administratively to make sure the goal is met. Dr. Raymond felt that it was better to make a comparison of the District to the State rather than National, because not all states use the same

tests for comparison. Superintendent's goals in a multi-year contract are negotiated with the Board, and at least one of them needs to be tied to student academic achievement.

MOTION: Member **Polke** moved to add National to Goal #1 so Goal #1 would then read: The average ACT and related achievement test scores, as measured by the results of such tests, shall exceed State and National averages for such tests. Member **Kamely** seconded the motion.

Upon a roll call vote being taken, the vote was: Aye: **4** Nay: **2 (Lukaski, Forbes)**. The motion **CARRIED 4 – 2**.

M. Lewandowski	Yes
Cindy Polke	Yes
Angela Kamely	Yes
John Lukasik	No
Susan L. Forbes	No
Ronald Svara	Yes

Goal #2: Already discussed and the Board was in agreement with Goal #2 as stated: Facilitate the CEC process and help develop an appropriate plan of action.

Goal #3: **MOTION:** Member **Kamely** moved, Member **Polke** seconded the motion to add the words **and implement** to Goal #3 so Goal #3 would then read: Develop and implement a new administrative evaluation matrix using the Race to the Top Model.

It was explained that on the Administrative level, that the evaluation instrument is based upon their job description and artifacts are given to supported it.

Member Forbes commented that she liked the objectives that were provided and it is laid out very well as far as what is going to occur. She felt it was a good process. Member Lukasik also commented that he appreciated the effort that was put into the document and felt that it was not said enough to Dr. Raymond and the Administrative Team—you do a good job. Member Lewandowski also thanked Dr. Raymond and the Administrative Team—nice job.

Upon a roll call vote being taken, the vote was: Aye: **6** Nay: **0**. The motion **CARRIED 6 – 0**.

Cindy Polke	Yes
John Lukasik	Yes
M. Lewandowski	Yes
Angela Kamely	Yes
Susan L. Forbes	Yes
Ronald Svara	Yes

Goal #4: Superintendent Raymond recommended that Goal #4 be moved from under the Superintendent's umbrella and placed under the Board's umbrella because he felt that it was more under the Board's control than his control.

MOTION: Member **Lewandowski** moved, Member **Lukasik** seconded the motion to remove Goal #4 removed from the Superintendent’s Goals.

AMENDED MOTION: Member **Lukasik** moved, Member **Lewandowski** seconded the motion to amend the Original Motion by adding the words **to the Board’s Goals**, so the Amended Motion would read: to remove Goal #4 from the Superintendent’s Goals to the Board’s Goals.

Upon a roll call vote being taken on the Amendment, the vote was: Aye: **6** Nay: **0**. The motion **CARRIED 6 – 0**.

Susan L. Forbes	Yes
M. Lewnadowski	Yes
John Lukasik	Yes
Cindy Polke	Yes
Angela Kamely	Yes
Ronald Svara	Yes

APPROVAL OF ORIGINAL MOTION AS AMENDED: Upon a roll call vote being taken on the original motion as amended, the vote was: Aye: **6** Nay: **0**. The motion **CARRIED 6 – 0**.

Angela Kamely	Yes
Susan L. Forbes	Yes
John Lukasik	Yes
M. Lewandowski	Yes
Cindy Polke	Yes
Ronald Svara	Yes

Goal #5: Already discussed and the Board was in agreement with Goal #5 as stated: Continue with the Citizen’s Advisory Council process.

Closed Session

MOTION: Member **Lewandowski** moved, Member **Forbes** seconded the motion to enter into Closed Session to discuss collective negotiating matters between the District and its employees or their representatives, or deliberations concerning salary schedules for one or more classes of employees. 5 ILSC 120/2(c)(2); and to discuss appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of specific employees of the District or Legal counsel for the District, including hearing testimony on a complaint lodged against an employee or against legal counsel for the District to determine its validity. 5 ILSC 120/2(c)(1), as amended by P.A. 93-0057.

Upon a roll call vote being taken, the vote was: Aye: **6** Nay: **0**. The motion **CARRIED 6 – 0**. Closed Session commenced at 8:23 p.m.

John Lukasik	Yes
Susan L. Forbes	Yes

Cindy Polke	Yes
M. Lewandowski	Yes
Angela Kamely	Yes
Ronald Svara	Yes

Reconvene Meeting

MOTION: Member **Kamely** moved, Member **Lukasik** seconded the motion to reconvene the Open Meeting at 8:53 p.m.

Upon a roll call vote being taken, the vote was:

M. Lewandowski	Yes
Angela Kamely	Yes
Cindy Polke	Yes
John Lukasik	Yes
Susan L. Forbes	Yes
Ronald Svara	Yes

Announcements

Member Lewandowski informed the Board that an IASB Governing Board Meeting will be held on June 29 at 6:30 p.m. at Prairie Bluff Golf Course. Even though it is a Governing Board meeting, all Board members have been invited to attend. Anyone interested in attending should contact Gloria.

Adjournment

MOTION: Member **Forbes** moved, Member **Lukasik** seconded the motion to adjourn the meeting. By voice vote all members present voted aye and the Meeting was adjourned at 8:53 p.m.

Ronald Svara, President

Lou Ann Johnson, Secretary