

MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION
LOCKPORT TOWNSHIP HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT 205
Tuesday, August 03, 2010 (7:00 PM)

CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE TO THE FLAG, ROLL CALL

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

ROLL CALL

THE FOLLOWING WERE PRESENT:

BOARD MEMBERS:

Susan L. Forbes, Vice President
 Angela Kamely, Member
 Michael Lewandowski, Member
 John Lukasik, Member
 Cindy Polke, Member
 Ronald Svara, President

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT: Lou Ann Johnson, Secretary

ADMINISTRATORS PRESENT:

Garry W. Raymond, Ph.D., Superintendent
 Todd P. Wernet, Assistant Superintendent for Personnel
 Richard A. Lesniak, Director of Business Services
 K. Patrick Olmsted, Assistant Principal, East Campus
 Dennis P. Hicks, Principal, East Campus
 Paige A. Dague, Principal, Central Campus
 Matthew R. Dusterhoft, Director of Technology

Public Hearings and Petitions

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-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.

Name: Fran Fallon
 Address: 206 Bluff Street, Lockport Township
 Topic: Building an Addition onto LTHS

Mrs. Fallon suggested that the District/Board should research building an addition onto East because we really don't know how many children would be coming to the District or where the money would be coming from because of this recession. She felt that there was plenty of room here at East Campus. She felt that a good example of a high school that is very careful with their money is Lemont Township High School. All of their school is on one piece of property. They have a sports complex, but it is located at

131st and Bell Road. Whenever they needed room, they add on. They don't go and build a brand new high school. She stated that if you check the last two referendums, Homer Township voted it down—not Lockport. In the last one, they voted down District 33C and they voted down the high school. She took Homer voters staying away from voting as a statement that they don't want it. More research should be done about building right here and try to save the taxpayers' money. She asked that the District/Board look at all the options before running off and building a \$40 million high school. Also, what would the costs be to run/operate a new school? She wanted to know more about Homer Glen building a new high school and then leasing it to us for \$1.5 million. She suggested that some good lawyers were needed to figure out when the lease would end. She asked if the District would ever own the school or will it always continue lease it. She urged the Board to please do their homework for future generations

Name: George Offord
Address: 16953 Mohican Drive, Homer Glen
Topic: Foreign Exchange Students

He explained that since 2002, he has hosted several foreign exchange students. In 2005, he began placing foreign exchange students throughout the Chicagoland area. In early July he called the District and was informed that the District would not be accepting Foreign Exchange Students for the 2010-2011 school year. His questions were: a) was the Board aware of this? and b) can anything be done about it for this school year?

Name: Darin Deskin
Address: 1650 East Street, Lockport
Topic: High School Plans

He explained that he has spoken to the Board many times regarding the subject of a high school and one of the themes he has had throughout was just give people two or three things to vote yes for a referendum versus a million reasons to vote no. He stated that he was running for City Council and, he had been out in the 4th Ward since the end of May. He went through all of the Broken Arrow Subdivision and just finished up with Willow Walk. He surmised that he probably talked to about 800 people. He said he was glad that Dr. Raymond had given him an outline about the three proposed building options: build an addition onto East Campus; Homer Glen Proposal; or go for a Referendum, because when talking with people, the subject of the high school always came up. A huge issue was boundaries. Taxes were another big issue. Mr. Deskin asked the voters if they would support something like keeping the multiplier where it's at now and replace the old bonds with new bonds. Most answered that they would support something like that. The sad part was that a lot of those who said they would support something like that never voted in the last five elections according to the voter's list he had with him. He felt that the Build American Bonds proposal was the worst of the three options, and that perhaps we should wait until 2012 or 2013 and go for a referendum. He said the people do not want to have their vote taken away from them. In his opinion, building onto East was the best option. Now all that has to be figured out is how to get the people who have children in the high school to get out and vote.

Name: Dave Pajeau
Address: 16935 Deerpath Drive, Homer Glen
Topic: High School Plans

Mr. Pajeau felt he came from a little bit of a different perspective, and thought that Fran and Darren's comments were great. He explained that he does have a family in Homer Glen. He has three young boys, and has been a little more vocal as of late on what's going on, and trying to educate himself, and people that he knows as to what's going on. He felt that first and foremost, there is a need. The issue is overcrowding, and the impact that it's having on our communities and our future growth. Property values

are being negatively affected because of this. Many people don't know what is being considered. Educating the public has to happen. The proposals have to be communicated to everyone. Lay everything out for the public. In his opinion, there is a lot of support in the Village of Homer Glen and City of Lockport for a solution—expand onto East Campus or build a new school. But there is uncertainty on what to do at this time. Homer Glen is trying to get Board's support to take that next step and consider an intergovernmental agreement. He concluded by saying that a decision needs to be made short-term or long-term.

Name: John Schultz
Address: 625 S. Washington Street, Lockport.
Topic: Support of the Strategic Plan

Because he had a prior commitment he was not able to stay for the discussion on the Strategic Plan, but stated he does support it. He felt that the experience he gained during this process was very beneficial and that the output of the Strategic Plan would benefit the District greatly. He hopes the Board continues that process, and that there were still things that could emerge from this type of collaboration. He stated that if he can be of any help in the future, to please let him know.

Action Considerations

Strategic Plan

Superintendent Raymond stated that considerable time has been put into developing a Strategic Plan with the aid of the Consortium for Educational Change (CEC). He introduced Dr. Allan Alson to present the final draft of the Strategic Plan and ask the Board's approval of the document.

Dr. Allan Alson thanked Dr. Raymond, the Administrative Council, and all people involved in the Strategic Planning process for the very hard work that was done. A collaborative approach was used to ensure all those involved had an opportunity to weigh in, and this document reflects that opportunity. He stated that this was a living document and should not end with this—but to keep it open to ways to make it better along the road. He explained that there were five major goal areas that came from this plan. He stated that the key is Student Learning—improving student achievement. That has to be what drives your work and drives the work of this plan. The other areas—Support Systems, Employee Development, Stakeholder Engagement, and Financial all impact, and should be used to impact student learning in positive ways. He focused his comments on three main areas: student learning, support systems, and employee development. He explained that the success of this plan is dependent upon all stakeholders to be informed and involved and to feel that they are a part of this as the process unfolds.

The overall goal is driving the improvement of student achievement. It's about building the structures and the processes that allow adults and students to be engaged in building student improvement. He emphasized that these three goals, in particular, have to work together to be successful, but all five are interactive in nature. We need to define the measures that will be used on a consistent and regular basis to define student achievement and to be able to collaboratively agree what those measures are and then set targets of achievement that allow for both qualitative and quantitative measurement of student performance on a quarterly and annual basis. It's critical that there be a study of some models of best classroom practices that exist in the country right now that would raise achievement for high-school-aged students. Once there is a collaborative agreement on what makes for best practices, then you have to look at evaluation systems from Administrators through teachers. How will they be evaluated and how does that align with what those instructional practices are? What will be the professional development that supports the adults to be able to do that? Teachers need to have collaborative time. That is what this report intends to do. There is also the issue of consistent grading policies and practices. What kind of feedback do students need to know regarding the quality and quantity of their work on a regular basis?

The last component is feeder districts. We need to focus on common standards for all students to achieve to enter and be prepared to succeed in high school. You need to define the meaning of common preparation. Templates and protocols need to be in place to discuss student success. It will take about a three-year effort to achieve all of this.

Member Polke said that she felt this was a great start and was very happy to be a part of the process. She felt that we are really going to be able to move forward as a District and was excited that we were going to get started this year. President Svvara stated that he thought the key issue was evaluation. We will need to look at the evaluations to see what is working and what is not and make changes accordingly. Dr. Alson added that he felt it was important for administration to give the Board quarterly progress reports, so the Board can see, to some extent, what the stakeholders are executing on this plan. He stated that Dr. Raymond was hoping that the Board would take a formal vote so that this work can be taken forward.

RECOMMENDATION: President Svvara recommends that the Board concurs with Administration’s recommendation to adopt this Strategic Plan as our Strategic Plan.

MOTION: Member **Angela Kamely** moved, Member **Susan Forbes** seconded the motion to concur with Administration’s recommendation to adopt this Strategic Plan as our Strategic Plan. Upon a roll call vote being taken, the vote was: Aye: **6** Nay: **0** Absent: **1 (Lou Ann Johnson)**. The motion **CARRIED 6 – 0**.

Susan Forbes	Yes
Michael Lewandowski	Yes
John Lukasik	Yes
Cindy Polke	Yes
Angela Kamely	Yes
Ronald Svvara	Yes

Presentations

Comparison of the Three Building Options

President Svvara explained that some time ago the Board gave Administration the task of comparing the three building options that came out of the Summit Meetings that were held—an addition onto East Campus, a referendum that would freeze the tax rate so there would not be an increase for bonds, and the Homer Glen Proposal (Build America Bonds). He stated that only Homer Glen was able to spearhead the Build America Bonds Proposal because they have Home Rule. Superintendent Raymond publicly thanked the three mayors for holding the Summits that brought out these three options. He stated that if the Board would choose to go the route of the Build American Bonds Proposal, the District would request that input would be received from the City of Lockport, the City of Crest Hill, District 205 and Homer Glen, and that all four entities would sign the agreement as well.

Dr. Raymond gave a “hats off” to Rich Lesniak and Bill Thompson who put together the side-by-side analysis of the three proposed plans for easy comparison. The analysis gave a description of each of the projects, the total project costs, the cost to District 205, financing options of the facility, capacity of new facility, Central Campus status, future expansion, net new seats, cost per new seat, who pays, tax burden (per \$300,000 home), Build America Bonds, Illinois School Construction Bonds, FF & E, future referendum(s), ground breaking date, opening date of facility, ownership of land, outstanding liability, ability to operate in current economy, status of architect, status of construction manager, intergovernmental agreement, attendance/boundaries, and LASEC status. Additional information was provided regarding the School Construction Grant Entitlement Program, an update on the School Construction Grant Entitlement Program, and information regarding the areas of interest for LTHS and

Homer Glen regarding the Build America Bonds Proposal, and a bulletin from Sruga and Hauser, LLC, regarding a change to the election filing dates (the deadline for putting a question on the November ballot is now August 16).

Superintendent Raymond stated that if the Board decides to go with an intergovernmental agreement, the next step would entail some expenditure of funds because we would have to sit down face-to-face with Homer's legal representatives and our legal representatives, along with members from the Illinois State Board of Education and the Capital Development Board, because it's the Capital Development Board that administers the School Construction Grants, and we would want to protect the Board's right to those grants should they become available. Right now, it looks like the chances are very good that those grant funds would be available.

Mr. Lesniak explained the analysis document and some of the brainstorming that transpired regarding these three options. He felt that all three options have merit and all three have difficulties. The Board looked over the analysis page-by-page and Mr. Lesniak answered the Board's questions.

Member Polke stated that a lot of the answers to the concerns that were addressed during Public Hearings tonight are found on our web site. The proposals are also found on our web site and they were very clearly addressed in a presentation about the Homer Glen Proposal. Why would a Homer Glen resident want to consider this proposal? It was Member Polke's understanding that with the Build America Bonds, it would lower the interest rate in such a way that it would actually lower the payment—lower than what was proposed in the past—to the Homer Glen resident portion of the their tax bill, and we would have a new high school. Even though all communities weren't paying the same portion, those Build America Bonds made it such an attractive option that it brought that plan to the table. Member Polke felt that this was an incredible opportunity for the entire District, because if Homer Glen puts this on the table upfront and everyone bought into this plan down the line, everybody in the community would be taking advantage of that. She added that through the Summits, we were able to hear what the communities had to say, but at the end of the day, it's the Board's decision to come up with the best solution for the entire District. She noted that Homer Glen's option to use Home Rule will end in December 2010.

President Svava supports a new school but was recommending that we wait until the bonds become due in 2013, a \$5.3 million payment that is already in place. He distributed a plan that he drafted and explained the information in his plan for the Board and Administration. He stated that perhaps we could combine a couple of proposals to come up with a short-term and a long-term solution, but felt it might be best to wait until the current bonds come due and then replace those bonds with the new bonds and keep the tax rate the same. We could go to the taxpayers for approval to keep the same tax rate every year after the 2013 tax is paid. However, it is unknown whether this plan has a chance to pass. With the Homer Glen proposal, a school would be built in Homer Glen. With an addition onto East, it would be an intermediate solution to the current problem, and we could build onto the school without going to a referendum. The Board has the ability to tax without going to the taxpayers for a referendum to build an addition onto a school.

Member Lukasik agreed with some of the principals, but felt there was no need for a new school right now. The short-term solution would allow the District more time to plan to get the ultimate solution. He felt that it was not right to take away the opportunity for taxpayers to vote on this plan. He said we just need to work harder to pass a referendum. We need to communicate more with the voters to see if they would support a referendum if we went for a referendum in 2012. Member Lukasik also asked about the use of mobile units to address the immediate concern.

President Svava asked if it was true that the District would have to own the building in order to be qualified for the State construction grants. Mr. Lesniak stated that we were told that the building could

not be owned by a municipality, it must be owned by the District. If Homer Glen goes out for a bond issue, the people who buy the bonds would need a capital asset to back it up, and if it was signed to us, then how would the bonds be floated? Tom Polke stated that this question was addressed at the Village Board meeting last week. He said there would be some basis for the payment, because, essentially, the ground lease for the land would cover and provide significant ability for that. It was not seen as an impairment in terms of the ability of Homer Glen to float the bonds in that situation. Regardless of title passing upon completion, they felt they could overcome all of those hurdles and still issue the bonds. The bonds would be backed up by the lease agreement. He added that this information came from a letter that the mayor had read from Chapman and Cutler. President Svava requested a copy of that letter. Mr. Polke said he would ask the Village to forward a copy.

Also, President Svava would like to see a letter from someone in Springfield that states if the School Board does “a, b, c,” then we will be eligible for the Construction Grants. He stated he did not want to take any action that would make the District ineligible for \$35 million.

Superintendent Raymond stated that the question might go back to Homer Glen, if the Homer Glen Proposal is what the Board might want to pursue. He didn’t think they could get all that work done in a week or week-and-a-half—get the letter that we need, get all four legal departments at the same table, and to bounce the drafts of an intergovernmental agreement back and forth as it’s negotiated—all of that, and still meet Homer Glen’s timelines. Mr. Polke suggested that the question could be put on the ballot and then remove it if need be. Dr. Raymond stated that he didn’t know the exact timeline for doing that, and that was a real concern in order to be able to give this due diligence. Based on the best information that we have at this time, all three of these plans could still qualify us for school construction money. So, whatever direction the Board ends up going, we really need to put at the center of the radar screen that we might have an opportunity to build a \$100 million school and still get a \$35 million rebate back from the State. This would be very significant. If an addition was built, we would get back approximately 35% of that cost, or we could blend a couple of these proposals; however, the Homer Glen’s Proposal has more sense of urgency.

MOTION: President **Ronald Svava** made a motion that the District’s attorneys meet with Homer Glen’s attorneys to come to some kind of resolution (intergovernmental agreement) and that that resolution must include the District’s ability to access the State’s money. Member **Angela Kamely** seconded the motion.

President Svava stated that we need the intergovernmental agreement. Member Forbes stated that even with that agreement, all three options would still be open for consideration. Dr. Raymond stated that all four entities would need to be in agreement with the intergovernmental agreement for it to become a legal document, which could be extended to 99 years, if need be. To take away reasons to vote no, you can put some really strong language in it, and to have all four entities sign it, it becomes more robust, because it would then take at least three signatures to break it. Member Lewandowski requested that the most current enrollment figures be sent to him.

VOTE: Upon a roll call voted being taken, the vote was: Aye: **6** Nay: **0** Absent: **1 (Lou Ann Johnson)**. The Motion **CARRIED 6 – 0**.

Angela Kamely	Yes
Susan Forbes	Yes
John Lukasik	Yes
Michael Lewandowski	Yes
Cindy Polke	Yes
Ronald Svava	Yes

Announcements

Dennis Hicks stated it was an exciting night, no doubt, and that he was very pleased about the CEC Strategic Plan. He is looking forward to collaborating with the staff and going forward with that plan.

Member Lukasik announced that he has made arrangements with John Cassel from the Illinois Association of School Boards to facilitate the Board's Self-Evaluation Process on Thursday, September 2, 2010. Member Polke stated she would be out of the country until the 4th. Consensus of the Board was to tentatively set the time for 6:00 p.m. The cost will be \$400.00.

Adjourn

MOTION: Member **Michael Lewandowski** moved, Member **Angela Kamely** seconded the motion to adjourn the meeting. By voice vote all members present voted, aye, and the Motion **CARRIED 6 – 0**. The meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Ronald Svara, President

Lou Ann Johnson, Secretary

gkm