

**MINUTES**  
**SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION**  
**LOCKPORT TOWNSHIP HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT 205**  
**Thursday, January 6, 2011 (7:00 PM)**

A Special Meeting of the Board of Education of Lockport Township High School District 205 was duly held at the Central Campus, 1222 S. Jefferson Street, Lockport, Will County, Illinois, and was called to order by President Ronald Svara at 7:05 p.m. The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag was led by Member John Lukasik.

**THE FOLLOWING BOARD MEMBERS WERE PRESENT:**

Michael Lewandowski  
 Cindy Polke  
 Angela Kamely  
 Lou Ann Johnson (arrived at 7:25 p.m.)  
 John Lukasik  
 Susan L. Forbes (arrived at 8:39 p.m.)  
 Ronald Svara

**Public Hearings and Petitions**

Name      Mike Petty  
 Address    Homer Glen, IL  
 Topic      Board of Education/Referendum

Mike Petty stated: “He would like to commend this Board. You have achieved a new level never achieved before by a Lockport Township High School Board of Education. You have become the laughing stock of boards of education in the State of Illinois. You have a meeting. You discuss something. You pass it and go on with your meeting; and then the next meeting you go back and reopen it again, and start discussing it all over again. It’s really becoming ridiculous. There was a piece in the *Homer Horizon* that had an article, Referendum Plans/Frequently Asked Questions Approved, and right underneath it, it couldn’t get any closer, was another article, School Board Waivers on East Campus Addition Plans. It couldn’t be worse for you. Mr. Svara, I have a real easy way for you to cut at least an hour off of your meetings. Anytime you have an agenda item, have your discussion, let everybody have their say, and then ask Mrs. Polke how she would like to have everybody vote. Then, you can vote that way and you don’t have to worry about it coming up two weeks later. If you are going to try and pass a referendum, you have to quit shooting yourself in the foot! It’s that simple! Thank you!”

Name      Lisa Mikolajczak  
 Address    Homer Glen, IL  
 Topic      Name for New School

Lisa Mikolajczak said, “She has always been in support of the high school and I’m ecstatic about the news with the scores for our students. Outstanding job with our academics for the teachers! I am here tonight to request that the Board, Mr. Svara, specifically, put on an action item for the

next meeting potentially to name the new school on the referendum we are seeking. I think we need to stay as a unit. I think we need to remain Lockport—Lockport North. I don't think we should divide and call it Homer. It's irrelevant that the land we've owned for 17 years resides in Homer Glen today. I think of some of the indifferences perhaps maybe from a student's perspective that if they were in Homer we said that the freshmen would be housed in the East Campus and that it would be the entire student body of upperclassmen would be divided between the two campuses, and I think that it would be unnecessary to call it Homer. I think it would be a more negative effect—not in a bad way—but I do think it doesn't show solidarity and unity within Lockport Township High School. And I also think of maybe minimally, if any, some of the financial burdens or difficulties for families who, we have freshmen buying uniforms for a kid, and I bought scarves and hats and stuff at the Sports Huddle or whatever the store is over there in Lockport, and I think as a freshman, it's exciting to get that custom shirt with all of the logos that Lockport has, and then if it's Homer, it would be a different color, it would be a different name, and then parents would have that expense and then sophomore, junior, and senior year, now they're buying Lockport-wear, or if they are going to be at this school or that school and I just think it causes a division and I'm not so sure that's a good idea. Lockport has a wonderful history and we should thrive on that history forward, and I think that people need direction, and I don't believe we have ever named a school before, and I think it's the due diligence of the Board to take a vote. Think about it before your next meeting and that way the public will know we have a vision—we have a true vision of what the school would be named. I think that's the direction we need to move forward. I live in Homer and I don't believe it should be Homer. So, most schools are all reflective of the school it originates from, and I don't believe we would change—I think the high school buses say Lockport Township High School, are we going to make them Homer High School buses to segregate them, if you will, for transferring students to Homer? I'm sure we would never do that. It's just respectful. I think the letterhead and a lot of office supplies—we'd have to do dual logos and things and I think we should just streamline it and keep it Lockport North, if that is acceptable, if you can come to an agreement, and it would remain with the name of Lockport. Thank you!"

Information Report #1101-01 – Construction Management Information – Henry Bros.

Superintendent Raymond introduced Bill Callaghan from Henry Bros. Mr. Callaghan thanked the Board for the opportunity to be here tonight to address any questions the Board might have regarding the two letters that he had addressed to Dr. Svara, Dr. Raymond, and to the entire Board. He said he is one of the co-owners of Henry Bros. and introduced his partner, George Ferrell, and Stan Jagielski, Vice President Henry Bros. and also the Senior Project Manager who oversaw the construction project in 1996. He explained that he thought it would be best to summarize their opinion and their position regarding the differences between the construction management and general contracting approaches. They have heard several discussions over the last three or four Board meetings, but unfortunately, have not been given an opportunity to give the Board their opinion and their position on it. He stated that he hoped the Board had an opportunity to look at those letters and if the Board had any questions, he would be happy to answer them. President Svara stated that in the letter it noted that there was an existing agreement between Henry Bros. and wondered if there was such an agreement. Mr. Callaghan stated that the item President Svara referred in the letter was correct. Rich Lesniak explained that there is an existing agreement from 2005. He said they did get an opinion from our attorney as to whether or not we were bound by that agreement, and his opinion was that for multiple

reasons, he did not think it was. Everybody/Henry Bros. has their own legal opinion that may be different but attorney for District 205 was that we were not necessarily bound by it for this project. President Svvara stated that the agreement for the addition was separate from the other projects. Attorney Hodges stated that her understanding was that they were to be proposing a new agreement. Rich explained that how the conversation was left by the Board was giving us direction for CM, because when you are working with a large project versus a small project, some of the terms are different, so we wanted to know whether or not we were bound by that agreement, so we had the attorney look it over and he didn't think it was.

#### MEMBER LOU ANN JOHNSON EXITED THE MEETING

Attorney Hodges said now they were to propose a new agreement. Mr. Callaghan interjected by saying that actually, it was requested that it would be an amendment to our existing agreement. He explained that their existing agreement signed in 2005 was for construction management services specifically for the additions and renovations of East Campus and construction of the new high school. At that time that agreement scheduled the work to be concurrent but because of the situation right now with the existing East Campus plans to be renovated in the summer, they were asked to submit a proposal for those staffing general conditions that were included in the overall proposal. It was going to be done at a cheaper expense because of the concurrent/overlapping supervision and management that would have occurred at that time. Because this was going to be a separate phase the Board had ahead of the new school, we were asked to submit the general conditions cost, so we broke that out of the original proposal and have offered a very fair and reasonable discount off of the new high school, when or if that occurs. President Svvara and he said the Board asked for a copy of the agreement but were told that the contract was going to be updated but he had not seen it yet. Rich stated that the contract was in the last Board packet. It was on the agenda to approve. Member Polke explained that the contract was in the last Board packet, but what President Svvara was referring to was the reference to a proposal that was made at the December 2 meeting, and that was when she asked Rich to check with our law firm because she was unclear about the process listed in the State Statute. President Svvara asked if we did or did not have a contract. Attorney Hodges stated that it was her understanding that there was a contract in 2005 but because of this particular project, the contract was updated by an attorney in her office, and it was sent back to Henry Bros. for approval. Mr. Callaghan stated that they did receive it and it was under review and it was to be an amendment to our existing contract where we pulled out the general conditions to be specific to this summer's project. Member Lewandowski stated that Henry Bros. already agreed to do the project at the price that we had given them and that they would get the project done by the opening of the coming school year. So, we had an ongoing, verbal agreement based on discussions that we have had with Henry Bros.

Member Polke stated that back in October Administration recommended to do this project using a general contractor—period. She said we have gone and vacillated about something that she believes some people are referring to as steering agendas, but in public we were recommended by Administration—period—to use a general contractor for the low cost of the project. She has since looked over the contract herself and she sees that Henry Bros. is responsible for a flat fee back in 2005 for a 12-month contract for \$35,000, for a lump sum of the estimate. The rest of the items are on the contract were under previous preconstruction services. We had a failed

referendum. So how can you do preconstruction services if we had a failed referendum? She sees on the contract that \$35,000 for a lump sum estimate of which Henry Bros. suggested that they did. Additionally, part of the Henry Bros. contract stated that they have a Local Government Prompt Payment Act. In that paragraph, Section 3, the appropriate government official or agency receiving goods or services must approve or disapprove a bill from a vendor or contractor for goods or services furnishing a local government agency within 30 days of goods or services furnished in the local government agency for the date on which the services were received, whichever is later. The contract states between the dates of 10/01/05 and 12-months later for that particular contract. She said she did not like the tone of these meetings—it's depressing. We have a relationship with Henry Bros. and it's very good, and none of these conversations would have come about had we not done what was originally recommended to the Board which was to use the lowest cost—and you are a general contractor. Henry Bros. stated that 50% of your work is that. You are a great and reputable company. I don't know why we are going back and forward on this particular topic because we have lessened the scope of the project and it resounds well with the taxpayers when you go out to a public bid. Since all this rhetoric has happened she went ahead and started talking to different construction people and architects and asked them if this (general contractor) a more costly or less costly thing to do, and is it more costly for architects or less costly. She said she has quotes from various firms that tell her that is this is the most responsible, least cost way to bring a job to closure. She also has quotes from architect that they do not charge more. Their fees are constant for either a GC or CM. She was most confused about was that Rich has the District carrying a liability on the books from 2006. She said four audits have been completed since then, and she believed that if we had unpaid obligations, the auditors would have brought it to our attention.

Rich stated that first of all, the contract calls for pre-referendum services that are at no charge. There is a part in the contract for pre-referendum services that they will not bill for until after the passage of a referendum. So, that is what their contract calls for and that is what the dollar amount that Member Polke referenced, and that is what Item #2 is about, the \$153,000. It is not for pre-construction services, it is for pre-referendum services and that is what we may be billed for. There was no liability and there was no bill.

Member Lukasik asked Dr. Raymond, "Is what is being proposed by Henry Bros. to perform the work reasonable in terms of costs for us, and secondly, the continued discussion over this topic, over now I believe a fourth meeting, how does this affect our item of returning to a normal schedule and what impact does that have on our kids?" Superintendent Raymond explained that their most recent recommendation was not to use a GC. The timeline of this project and intricacies of this project is why Administration switched their recommendation to use construction management and to use DLA, and our main focus was to come in on time and under budget. He said we are already kind of behind the "eight ball" and we are trying to get this addition done so we can get the kids back to a regular schedule next fall. To continue to delay much longer would jeopardize the project. Administration feels that construction management would be more cost-effective to deliver this addition on time and under budget.

Bill Callaghan stated that he had two pieces of information that he would like to share with the Board to further explain some of the differences between general contracting and construction management, and for anybody to make a statement of what fees are or not under either scenario

is extremely difficult unless they know all of the conditions and all of the details, and as he has explained in the letter, they consider themselves professionals and a very experienced company in both different forms of agreements, and we can tell the Board with certainty the bid strategies that he referred to in his letter, and would like to give the Board an example of very realistic information about the strategies. He asked that the information he provided remain confidential because it's personal information. The first sheet identifies a very likely scenario of general contracting versus construction management and how contractors look at the different bid strategies. He said he would challenge anybody that may say something different. Bill said we are a construction manager and general contractor and a self-performing contractor. In reply to Member Kamely's question, he explained that a self-performing contractor is a contractor that does a lot of the work themselves, e.g., excavating, concrete, carpentry. They own their own equipment and trucks and what's most important about that is that we understand pricing of it and we understand the bid strategy with subcontractors on how that work is costed and marked up, especially in an economy as we are experiencing right now.

Member Kamely stated, to that note, I don't mean to sound like Cindy, but I have been talking to people who are developers, builders of commercial, municipal and school, as well as the subcontractors and the guys that are in the trades. What they were telling her, when you are doing a construction management project, you put the work out, you get your bids, they open the bids, there is no negotiation, and you take the lowest responsible bid. When you are doing general contractor, he opens up his gazillion bids, and chances are that he has worked with some of these guys before, likes some, doesn't like some, whatever, he looks at his three lowest bids or a handful of lower bids, and then he talks to the guys that he really likes to work with if they weren't the bottom three, and says, this is my lowest that I've got here, you want the job, I'd like to work with you, let's massage this, let's bring this down, let's get it to a point to where we can both agree on this and I can get this job in under cost, and you have a lot more negotiation going on there. What she had been told in this economy and in this climate, these guys are so hungry for work right now, they are willing to really negotiate. All of them thought that for a \$4 million project, we could probably get a better deal with a general contractor because he is going to get lower prices.

Mr. Callaghan stated that she was very correct with a lot of what she said, but there is another factor, and that is that every subcontractor that they are not going to get the price that they give to a general contractor. So they consequently, as he has identified in this breakdown, they mark up their work more than what they would mark up when they bid under a construction management because that money then goes back to the general contractor, the district never sees it. The general contractor saves that money, not you. Under construction management they know that there is not going to be any negotiations after their bid—that's it—last chance—that's their only chance of getting this project is to come in on bid day with the lowest bid they can come up with. Member Kamely interjected, "But the chances are pretty good that when a contractor sees that this is going out to either a CM or a GC because it wants it and doesn't care who he is working under." Bill said you wouldn't submit both at the same time. She said she knew that both wouldn't go out at the same time although she sometimes questions why they wouldn't try it to see. Bill said that if you look at the scenario that he provided, the dollar figure is one thing under construction management but a different, higher figure under the general contractor. He explained in parenthesis why that is because they know they are not going to get

the job with the number they proposed and they must negotiate. He asked that they look at what the owner pays under the two different scenarios. He went into further detail to explain what he was showing them in his example and what his reasoning was for showing this to the Board. Stan Jagielski from Henry Bros. stated that they would like to continue as the construction manager for the District because of the team relationship that has evolved working with the District and Dahlquist and Lutzow Architects because they all had an interest in the work for the 2005 project that was completed on time and under budget. He said he'd like to see the teamwork continue with this project as well. Member Lewandowski reiterated what Henry Bros. was saying was that they could get this project completed on time and on or under budget by continuing as a team with the District as the District's construction manager and with Dahlquist and Lutzow Architects.

Member **Lewandowski** stated that since this was an Information/Action Report, he moved to use Henry Bros. as the Construction Manager for this project. Member **Lukasik** seconded the motion to approve Henry Bros. as the Construction Manager for this project.

Some discussion took place with the District's attorney as to how to proceed. It was determined that the Board's motion made at their last meeting to approve to go to a General Contractor needed to be rescinded before this new motion could be considered for approval. Member Polke felt that this item was an information report and did not realize it was listed as information/action.

Member **Lukasik** moved to rescind going with a General Contractor for this project that was approved at the previous Board meeting. Member **Lewandowski** seconded the motion.

Discussions again took place regarding hiring a general contractor verses construction manager and there was concern that these discussions may be causing some confusion that could hurt the District regarding the April 5 referendum/election. It was also noted that this project needed to get done on time in order to provide enough space for our students to get back to a regular schedule next fall as we have already told the public we would. Member Kamely stated that all students were in the building at the same time taking final exams. However, Dr. Gould explained that not all students were in the building at the same time because if a student has a study hall they are not required to be in attendance for that period. Also, there is a classroom issue during final exams, and teachers and students are placed into any open space that is available to take the exams. The other concern is the overcrowded hallways. Member Lukasik was pointed out that overcrowding could be addressed immediately by the next school year by adding onto East Campus. He felt that Board members were not in the construction business and should take the Administration's recommendation for a construction manager so the Board could move onto the next order of business on the agenda. In reply to Member Kamely's question, Rich Lesniak explained that the contract the Board was being asked to approve was strictly for the East addition only.

President Svava called for a motion to rescind the General Contractor vote taken at the last Board meeting. He explained that a "yes" vote rescinds the General Contractor vote and a "no" vote does not rescind. Roll call being taken, the vote was **2 Ayes** and **3 Nays**. The motion to rescind the General Contractor vote approved at the last meeting **FAILED 2 – 3**.

Cindy Polke	No
John Lukasik	Yes
Michael Lewandowski	Yes
Angela Kamely	No
Ronald Svava	No

#### MEMBER LOU ANN JOHNSON REENTERED THE MEETING

#### Action Considerations

#### Action Consideration #1101-01 – East Campus Addition – DLA

President **Svava** moved to approve the contract which was negotiated with our attorney to approve DLA as architect for the District. Member **Lukasik** seconded the motion.

Discussions took place regarding the content of the contract and the deletions and additions that were negotiated with DLA and our attorney which appeared to give the District more control. Some clarification had to be given regarding the motion President **Svava** moved to amend #.5 of Item 3.5.2.2 The Architect shall assist the Owner in bidding the Project by organizing and conducting of the opening of bids, by adding the words *at a public meeting*, and subsequently documenting and distributing the bidding results, as directed by the Owner. President Svava explained that he wanted this change so that when bids come in, everyone would hear the outcome at the same time at the public meeting. Member **Kamely** seconded the motion to amend that section.

Attorney Hodges asked DLA to speak regarding that issue. Eric Sickbert from DLA explained that it is mandatory by law to publish a notice in the newspaper as to when bid openings would be held, it's all State Statute. Attorney Hodges explained that typically, after the bids are opened at a public meeting, the architect would put together a report and that is what comes back to the Board. Upon clarification of this process, President Svava asked Member Kamely to withdraw her second and he withdrew his motion to amend.

Discussions continued regarding the various sections of the architect contract, e.g., what would take place if a deficiency in the work was observed, to which DLA replied there was a process in place to handle that, and the meanings of some of the terms of the contract. Eric explained each of the items in question, e.g., that because the Board already reviewed the drawings, there would be no concern of going over the budget because of aesthetics, because the Board would have already approved what the finished product would look like. Member Polke asked that the square footage of the project be added to the contract, and also requested that the percentage for the architect's fees remain the same as it was in the original contract. Dr. Raymond clarified that the last time the Board saw the contract, the architect would have been working with a construction manager who would have done many of the tasks the Board is now asking the architect to do, so that is why the percentage was minimally changed. Cindy said that she was also uncomfortable that the Board was being asked to vote on a contract that was not a finished product and why the widening of the "K" hallway was never included in the redesign drawing. Eric explained that although the architects were present at the many Board meetings when "K"

hallway was discussed, they were never given direction by the Board to include that revision. Member Johnson asked President Svara if the Board could ask the attorney who was negotiating for them with DLA to add that revision.

Rich Lesniak updated the Board on what he discussed with Attorney Levi today. He explained that they went over the changes that were proposed by DLA and there was a list of things that Attorney Levi was to contact Eric about some of our suggestions and some of the things that we thought were acceptable, but was unable to reach Eric today. Jim Levi said he would write the changes up and get them to Eric. Rich said that the changes were relatively minor so that was why Attorney Levi stated how the motion should be worded. Rich explained that whether the Board uses a construction manager or a general contractor, they are both viable means of getting the project completed. Neither one has less work it's just a matter of who is going to do the work. He explained how the responsibilities change when you use a CM versus a GC and how the architect's responsibilities change. He explained that because the original fee proposal was 7.5%. When the Board shifted a large burden of the work back to the architect by doing a GC, there is more work for the architect, and because of that, he thought that the .35% increase was very reasonable. He stated that it did not mean that the entire project costs more because while they are doing more, someone else is doing less.

President **Svara** moved to end the debate. Member **Lou Ann Johnson** seconded the motion. President **Svara** asked for a roll call vote to end the debate.

Lou Ann Johnson	Yes
Angela Kamely	Yes
Cindy Polke	No
Michael Lewandowski	Yes
John Lukasik	Yes
Ronald Svara	Yes

A roll call vote being taken thereon, the vote was **5 Aye** and **1 Nay**. The motion **CARRIED 5 – 1**.

President Svara asked for a motion to approve the DLA agreement as discussed subject to attorney review and approval and to authorize Rich Lesniak to sign the final agreement on the Board's behalf. Member **Lukasik** moved and Member **Lewandowski** seconded the motion as presented.

In reply to Member Kamely's question, if there was a change in the 7.85%, it would come back to the Board for approval.

John Lukasik	Yes
Lou Ann Johnson	Yes
Cindy Polke	No
Angela Kamely	Yes
Michael Lewandowski	Yes
Ronald Svara	Yes

A roll call vote being taken thereon, the vote was **5 Aye** and **1 Nay**. The motion **CARRIED 5 – 1**.

Action Consideration #1101-02 – Approval – April 2011 Referendum Ballot Question

The Board was asked to review the Ballot Question that was written for us by Chapman and Cutler.

Member Kamely noted a change to be made regarding the location and address noted on the Resolution. It would be changed to the *Little Theatre at the Central Campus, 1222 S. Jefferson Street*. Also, on the second page, third paragraph, Member Kamely requested that the words *and safety of all students* be added to that paragraph. In addition, she asked if the District would publish the notice in the *Homer Horizon* too. Rich explained that the County is the one who has the responsibility of publishing the notices in the *Herald News* and they will only publish it in one newspaper.

Attorney Hodges suggested that if the Board would like, the Administrative Office could publish it in the *Homer Horizon* on its own and it would not need to be included in the Ballot Resolution. Consensus of the Board was to have Administrative Office publish it in the *Homer Horizon*.

Member **Polke** moved and Member **Lewandowski** seconded the motion to approve the April 2011 Referendum, as presented.

Member **Kamely** moved and Member **Johnson** seconded the motion to amend the original motion to reword the location and street address listed on the Resolution to *the Little Theatre at Central Campus, 1222 S. Jefferson Street*.

Cindy Polke	No
John Lukasik	Yes
Michael Lewandowski	Yes
Angela Kamely	Yes
Lou Ann Johnson	Yes
Ronald Svara	Yes

A roll call vote being taken thereon, the vote was **5 Aye** and **1 Nay**. The motion **CARRIED 5 – 1**.

Member **Kamely** moved and Member **Lewandowski** seconded the motion to add the words *and safety of all students* to the third paragraph on the second page of the Resolution.

Michael Lewandowski	Yes
Lou Ann Johnson	Yes
John Lukasik	Yes
Cindy Polke	Yes
Angela Kamely	Yes
Ronald Svara	Yes

A roll call vote being taken thereon, the vote was **6 Aye** and **0 Nay**. The motion **CARRIED 6 – 0**.

Member **Lewandowski** moved and Member **Lukasik** seconded the motion to approve the Resolution for the 2011 Referendum, as amended.

Michael Lewandowski	Yes
Cindy Polke	Yes
Angela Kamely	Yes
Lou Ann Johnson	Yes
John Lukasik	Yes
Ronald Svara	Yes

A roll call vote being taken thereon, the vote was **6 Aye** and **0 Nay**. The motion **CARRIED 6 – 0**.

Member **Lewandowski** moved and Member **Lukasik** seconded the motion to direct Administration to publish in the *Homer Horizon* the exact legal notice at the same time that the County publishes the legal notice for the ballot question.

Angela Kamely	Yes
John Lukasik	Yes
Michael Lewandowski	Yes
Lou Ann Johnson	Yes
Cindy Polke	Yes
Ronald Svara	Yes

A roll call vote being taken thereon, the vote was **6 Aye** and **0 Nay**. The motion **CARRIED 6 – 0**.

MEMBER SUSAN L. FORBES ENTERED THE MEETING AT 8:39 P.M.

Action Consideration #1101-03 – Approval – Referendum Handout

Superintendent Raymond updated the Board on the referendum presentation that had taken place at Dawnwood and the upcoming presentations at Lago Vista and two others. Kim Brehm walked the Board through the handout page-by-page. President Svara also discussed the tax table that was included and his explanation for including it. This table would be posted on the web site with a statement that there would be no increase in their tax bill for the bond portion of their tax bill. Also, the referendum calendar would be put on the web site once it's completed. It was requested that the Board meetings be added to the calendar. Kim asked Board members to contact her if there are any groups the Board would like to include on the calendar. President Svara proposed that some of what should be included in the handout was the boundary map, Frequently Asked Questions, and a note stating that for more information go to [www.tlhs.org](http://www.tlhs.org).

Member **Lukasik** moved and Member **Lewandowski** seconded the motion to approve the handout that was created by President Svara and the Administrative Team.

By voice vote, all members present voted aye, the motion unanimously **CARRIED**.

Superintendent Raymond asked the Board to move its March 3 Special Board Meeting date to March 10 instead to accommodate a Lockport Chamber of Commerce Candidates' Forum which would be held in the Maroon Room on March 3, at 6:00 p.m. Also, the next Regular Board Meeting will be held on Monday, February 28.

Terry Hodges also reminded the Board to review the Ethics Act and to be very careful of what we can and can't do regarding any political activity. It's important to stop short of saying vote yes for the referendum. Superintendent Raymond was asked to provide another copy of the Ethics Act for the Board to review. Our attorney will also provide the District with the forms it needs to file regarding monies used for campaign materials.

Closed Session

None

Presentations

Information Report #1101-01 – Business/Tech Department(s) Showcase

Katie Dykas, Business/Tech Department, and Coop/Career Internship Programs, and Matt Eber, Business/Technology Department, gave short bios about themselves and highlighted some of the happenings in their departments, which combined, provides 35 different courses, and explained some of the new teaching tools that are being used and the technology that is being incorporated into some of their technology classes this year and also in ROTC. A demonstration of the teaching tool called QWIZDOM allowed the Board to see firsthand how this tool is used.

New Business

The Board was reminded to complete and turn in their meeting evaluation forms to Gloria.

Announcements

None

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

---

Ronald Svara, President

---

Lou Ann Johnson, Secretary