

MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION
LOCKPORT TOWNSHIP HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT 205
Thursday, December 20, 2010 (7:00 PM)

A Truth-In-Taxation Public Hearing and Regular 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. President Ronald Svara opened the Public Hearing at 7:00 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Truth-In-Taxation Public Hearing

Member **Lou Ann Johnson** moved and Member **John Lukasik** seconded the motion to open the Truth-In-Taxation Public Hearing.

THE FOLLOWING BOARD MEMBERS WERE PRESENT:

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

Administrative Comments

Richard Lesniak, Director of Business Services, explained that the a Truth-In-Taxation Public Hearing was being held this evening to comply with applicable legislation concerning the Board's adoption of the tax levy for year 2010. On November 15, 2010, the tentative tax levy for tax year 2010 was presented to the Board for review and approval. Since that meeting, the notice of public hearing was published on Sunday, December 12, 2010, and that public hearing was being held this evening. The purpose of the meeting was to notify the Public that later in the meeting, the District will be asking the Board to approve a resolution levying taxes for Lockport Township High School District 205 for the year 2010, and that the amount of the tax, based on the assessed value of the real estate, is greater than 105% of the final aggregate extension plus any amount abated prior to extension for the preceding year. The Board President will be asked to sign a Certificate of Compliance with Truth-In-Taxation to be delivered to the County Clerk showing that the District has complied with all provisions of Truth-In-Taxation, as amended, with respect to the adoption of the tax levy for year 2010, and the Certificate of Tax Levy.

Board Comments

None

Public Comments

None

End Truth-In-Taxation Public Hearing

Member **Susan L. Forbes** moved and Member **Michael Lewandowski** seconded the motion to end the Truth-In-Taxation Public Hearing. The hearing concluded at 7:06 p.m.

Regular Board of Education Meeting

President Ronald Svava called the Regular Board of Education Meeting to Order at 7:06 p.m.

THE FOLLOWING BOARD MEMBERS WERE PRESENT:

Michael Lewandowski
Cindy Polke
Angela Kamely
Lou Ann Johnson
John Lukasik
Susan L. Forbes
Ronald Svava

Presentations

Adoption - Resolution Recognizing the Accomplishments of the Girls' Cross-Country Team in the IHSA Girls' Cross-Country Competition

Brian Goff, Athletic Director, read into public record the Resolution Recognizing the Accomplishments of the Girls' Cross-Country Team in the IHSA Girls' Cross-Country Competition. The team finished 1st in Regional, 2nd in Sectional, and 13th in State.

Member **John Lukasik** moved and Member **Michael Lewandowski** seconded the motion to adopt the above resolution as presented. By voice vote, all members present voted Aye, and the motion unanimously **CARRIED 7 – 0**.

Student athletes and Coaches Evon Schlotter and Erin Seidelmann were presented with signed and framed resolutions from the Board of Education for this accomplishment. Coach Evon Schlotter thanked the Board for their support of this program.

Adoption - Resolution Recognizing the Accomplishments of Megan O'Brien in the IHSA Girls' Cross-Country Competition

Brian Goff, Athletic Director, read into public record the Resolution Recognizing the Accomplishments of Megan O'Brien in the IHSA Girls' Cross-Country Competition. Megan took 2nd in Regional, 3rd in Sectional, and 14th in State.

Member **Lou Ann Johnson** moved and Member **Cindy Polke** seconded the motion to adopt the above resolution as presented. By voice vote, all members present voted Aye, and the motion unanimously **CARRIED 7 – 0**.

Megan O'Brien and Coaches Evon Schlotter and Erin Seidelmann were presented with signed and framed resolutions from the Board of Education for these accomplishments.

Adoption - Resolution Recognizing the Accomplishment of Dan LeJa in the 2010 IHSA Boys' State Football Competition

Brian Goff, Athletic Director, read into public record the Resolution Recognizing the accomplishments of Dan LeJa in the 2010 IHSA Boys' State Football Competition. Dan was named All-State by the Illinois High School Football Coaches Association for his performance in the State competition.

Member **Susan L. Forbes** moved and Member **Angela Kamely** seconded the motion to adopt the above resolution as presented. By voice vote, all members present voted Aye, and the motion unanimously **CARRIED 7 – 0**.

Dan LeJa and the football coaches were presented with signed and framed resolutions from the Board of Education for this accomplishment.

Adoption - Resolution - Advanced Placement Award Recipients - Class of 2010

Mickey Conway, Honors Program/AP Coordinator, read into public record the resolution recognizing the Accomplishments of the Advanced Placement Scholars from the Spring of 2010 Testing from the Class of 2010: AP Scholars Award, AP scholars with Honor, AP Scholars with Distinction, and AP National Scholars. Mickey explained the qualifications for receiving AP Scholar recognition. A combined total of 138 students from the Classes of 2010 and 2011 received this recognition.

Member **Lou Ann Johnson** moved and Member **Cindy Polke** seconded the motion to adopt the above resolution as presented. By voice vote, all members present voted Aye, and the motion unanimously **CARRIED 7 – 0**.

These students were presented with signed and frames resolutions from the board of Education for their individual accomplishments.

Adoption – Resolution – Advanced Placement Award Recipients – Class of 2011

Mickey Conway, Honors Program/AP Coordinator, read into public record the resolution recognizing the Accomplishments of the Advanced Placement Scholars from the Spring of 2010 Testing from the Class of 2011: AP Scholars Award, AP Scholars with Honors, and AP Scholars with Distinction. Mickey explained the qualifications for receiving AP Scholar recognition. A combined total of 138 students from the Classes of 2010 and 2011 received this recognition.

Member **Michael Lewandowski** moved and Member **John Lukasik** seconded the motion to adopt the above resolution as presented. By voice vote, all members present voted Aye, and the motion unanimously **CARRIED 7 – 0**.

These students were presented with signed and frames resolutions from the board of Education for their individual accomplishments.

Adoption - Resolution - Illinois State Scholars

Paige Dague, Principal, Central Campus, and Dennis Hicks, Principal, East Campus, took turns reading the names of the 112 students who were named Illinois State Scholars. Dr. Dague explained the qualifications for receiving Illinois State Scholar recognition.

Member **Susan L. Forbes** moved and Member **Cindy Polke** seconded the motion to adopt the above resolution as presented. By voice vote, all members present voted Aye, and the motion unanimously **CARRIED 7 – 0**.

These students were presented with signed and frames resolutions from the Board of Education for this accomplishment.

Recess called to move meeting from the Auditorium to the Maroon Room

The meeting was recessed from the Auditorium at 7:50 p.m. and was reconvened in the Maroon Room at 8:00 p.m. for the remainder of the meeting.

THE FOLLOWING BOARD MEMBERS WERE PRESENT:

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

Student Government Report

Taylor Thompson and Brooke Steinke, Copresidents, reported on what had been going on with Student Government over the past few weeks. They had Rachael's Challenge come to the school. Freshmen, sophomores, and select juniors and seniors saw Rachael's Challenge. Because they had learned so much from this amazing presentation and experience, a new club started here at Lockport called Friends of Rachael. The club is run by students for students and will allow students to be open with one another to spread the five challenges of Rachael's Challenge which they learned. One of their main goals right now is to bring Rachael's Challenge back to the school for all juniors and seniors. Step-up Night was held on December 2. Eighth-graders from area schools came in to learn about Central Campus and all the clubs and sports they have to offer. A lot of students signed up for Student Government. They also just had their holiday party. They watched the Christmas movie, Elf, and then wrapped their presents for their adopted families. They thanked O'Neil's Funeral Home for donating many presents. After break they will be meeting to plan their annual blood drive in January and then start planning for TWIRP in February. Member Polke expressed kudos to the LTHS Foundation for providing that presentation.

AFT Report

George Brecheisen, President, AFT Union, Local 604, stated that he had nothing to report.

Public Hearing and Petitions

Name	Tom Polke
Address	Homer Glen, IL
Topic	Reflections on 2010

Tom Polke apologized for reading this, but he wanted to make certain that he got his thoughts down and touch on everything that I thought was important. This is the end of the year and I guess it's time for reflection and I guess as I reflect on 2010, I can't decide whether not I'm sad, angry, puzzled or amazed at some of the decisions that have happened this past year. "During the spring, I presented this group a rather unique approach of funding a school that could

potentially save millions of dollars a year. Rather than being hounded with questions by interested Board members and administrators, I instead felt like I had to sell something to a group of skeptics. When Garry presented this item for consideration in the fall, it was said, quote, ‘the administration has no recommendation.’ Sadly, several of you never even asked a question yet simply voted no. I stood before this group and asked one very simple request and I meant it. Treat taxpayer money, every dollar of it, as if it’s your own. Interest rates have risen 1% since I presented a plan, and Build America Bonds have expired as I first warned. Does anyone feel like they missed an opportunity as if it was your own home mortgage and you missed a 1% rate increase? You should. At a meeting I attended in March the Board finally voted to return to a voluntary early bird schedule. There was about ten minutes of motions and amendments, and amendments of motions, and withdrawals of motions, everybody’s head spun—I don’t know how Gloria got the minutes correct—but once that decision was made, where was that timeline outlining the process that was about to be taking place? Where were the important steps? Where were the key deadlines? When was the special meeting held to discuss those steps on what needed to happen for that directive to be implemented? Best yet, how did we decide in August that we need an addition to meet that deadline five months later? Here it is December and I can’t help but feel like the next words to come out of somebody’s mouth are, if we don’t hurry we’re going to be late. Well, whose fault it that? I’m tired of attending meetings where the Board keeps getting blamed for poor planning. If we are going to be late this time—fire somebody. Our kids are getting up at 5 o’clock, 5:30 in the morning, getting on buses at 6:00 a.m. and they are not going to do it another year. Not because people can’t plan, people can’t understand directions, people don’t follow directions, and people don’t put out deadlines and timelines. I was shocked at your last meeting when a former Board President kicked off the meeting by giving a speech supporting a construction firm, yet no one spoke of changing anyone. What information did he have that motivated him to make such an unsolicited plea? Who gave him the impression that such a discussion was even going to take place? What is most ironic about that is that he was on the previous Board that actually switched firms, or potentially switched firms because they went out to bid for general contractors, because as I looked at expenses and costs from 2005, there was a huge amount that was paid to a firm in particular which presumable was from a contract bid. So the same guy who was saying why would you change horses made a decision, apparently, to put that process in place, yet stood before the Board saying I can’t believe you are going through this process. I heard the comment made, I feel like I’m fighting for my job. Again, where did you get that impression? This was the very first topic, this was public discussion before an item was even discussed on the agenda, and people have the impression they are fighting for their jobs. Better yet, who got that job in the first place? Who is authorizing this kind of stuff? To my knowledge, the meeting was supposed to be about the referendum and a very short discussion about the approach to be used—not about firms—not about anything. Is the mere discussion of a process that troubling? Is it that concerning? The last document I received from this Board was when the Homer Glen Plan, the addition, and a new school, that was called Ron’s Referendum Plan, was being evaluated, and in that document, it clearly states how that project, if it was an addition, \$5.4 million was to be bid—was to be built. Read it. It exists. It’s not pretend. Where is the change of heart? Is it because we are poor planners and now we have to skip certain steps? This all sounds like politics to me and it’s all nonsense. If somebody is lobbying for something, whatever, you guys do what you want to do. Just keep in mind what I said from the very beginning, treat every penny as if it’s your own. If you can honestly say that you buy stuff without looking at prices, without

shopping, you buy an airfare based on an airline that you happen to have miles on without checking the other airlines your decision is going to be very easy. Merry Christmas!”

Approval of Minutes

Approval of Minutes from the Regular Meeting of November 15, 2010

Member **Susan L. Forbes** moved and Member **Michael Lewandowski** seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of November 15, 2010, as presented. President Svava asked if there were any additions or corrections. There being none, a voice vote was taken.

By voice vote, all members present voted Aye, and the motion unanimously **CARRIED 7 – 0**.

Approval of Minutes from the Closed Session Meeting of November 15, 2010

Member **Michael Lewandowski** moved and Member **Susan L. Forbes** seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the Closed Session Meeting of November 15, 2010, as presented. President Svava asked if there were any additions or corrections. There being none, a voice vote was taken.

By voice vote, all members present voted Aye, and the motion unanimously **CARRIED 7 – 0**.

Approval of Minutes from the Special Board Meeting of November 17, 2010

Member **John Lukasik** moved and Member **Angela Kamely** seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the Special Board Meeting of November 17, 2010, as presented. President Svava asked if there were any additions or corrections. There being none, a voice vote was taken.

By voice vote, all members present voted Aye, and the motion unanimously **CARRIED 7 – 0**.

Approval of Minutes from the Special Board Meeting of December 2, 2010

Member Lou Ann Johnson asked that some time be given for her to read these minutes because she didn't have an opportunity to view them online today and they were just distributed before the meeting this evening. Member Cindy Polke distributed a document she typed that contained some comments, highlighted in red.

Member **Lou Ann Johnson** moved and Member **Michael Lewandowski** seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the Special Board Meeting of December 2, 2010, as presented. President Svava asked if there were any additional comments or corrections. President Svava entertained a motion to add the comments Member Cindy Polk has recommended.

Amendment—Additional Comments added to Minutes from the Special Board Meeting of December 2, 2010

Member **Angela Kamely** moved and Member **Cindy Polke** seconded the motion to approve the additional comments to be added to the Special Board Meeting Minutes of December 2, 2010, as presented. President Svava asked if there were any questions. Member John Lukasik explained that he thought procedurally these would just get added at the office and it's not something the Board would take action on. Member Cindy Polke too stated she thought that you just add them

and didn't take action on them. President Svava explained that when you are approving minutes, you start by asking to approve the minutes as presented and if there are any additions or corrections, then people may want to change some things or something is mistyped or had additions that they wanted to add more detail, then you ask if there are any additions or corrections, and this is an addition, and it was motioned and seconded. So the way you do this is you discuss the additions and then you move ahead with a vote on the amendment, and then you move ahead with a vote on the original motion.

Member Cindy Polke asked Attorney Hodges if you have to vote on the additions or can they be added if you believe that it was pertinent to the public. Attorney Hodges replied that if you add them, you can use the optional process that President Svava was suggesting, or she had seen some Boards short-circuit it by talking about the additions, and if they agree, they would just do one motion to approve the minutes with the corrections or additions submitted. Either way, you must note somehow that there were corrections or additions.

President Svava stated that the way he was familiar with for doing this is that there has been an amendment for these additions, and he would like to have on the question any comments anybody has on the amendment. He continued to say that what he thought was at issue here is to make sure that what is being proposed is what actually happened. Member Cindy Polke stated that she listened to the verbatim tape today and felt that these were pertinent statements that either she said or were said and needed to be part of the public record. She explained that she was surprised at the omission of certain lines that were certainly important to be in the public record. Member John Lukasik stated that the minutes are a summary of what transpired and the full context is on the tape. Member Cindy Polke reiterated that she believed it needs to be said.

President Svava explained that what they were voting on now was adding these to our typed minutes. There being no further discussions, President Svava asked for a roll call vote.

Lou Ann Johnson	Yes
Angela Kamely	Yes
Susan L. Forbes	Yes
Cindy Polke	Yes
Michael Lewandowski	Yes
John Lukasik	No
Ronald Svava	Yes

Roll call being had thereon, the vote was **6 Aye** and **1 Nay** (Lukasik). The motion **CARRIED 6 – 1**.

President Svava explained that now we will vote on the Original Motion as amended.

Cindy Polke	Yes
John Lukasik	Yes
Michael Lewandowski	Yes
Angela Kamely	Yes
Susan L. Forbes	Yes
Lou Ann Johnson	Yes
Ronald Svava	Yes

Roll call being had thereon, the vote was **7 Aye** and **0 Nay**. The motion **CARRIED 7 – 0**.

Approval - Treasurer Report and Bills Payable Report

Member **Angela Kamely** moved, Member **Cindy Polke** seconded the motion to approve the Treasurer Report and Bills Payable Report, as presented. President Svava asked if there were any questions on the Treasurer's Report. There being none.

Susan L. Forbes	Yes
Michael Lewandowski	Yes
Lou Ann Johnson	Yes
John Lukasik	Yes
Cindy Polke	Yes
Angela Kamely	Yes
Ronald Svava	Yes

By a roll call vote being taken, the vote was: **7 Aye** and **0 Nay**. The motion **CARRIED 7 – 0**.

Policy Considerations

Superintendent Raymond stated that there were actually four items and asked if they wanted to do separate votes or combine them. PRESS Issue #72 is the book which the Board had for First Reading last month and tonight it's ready for Second Reading and adoption. Then there were two Board Policies that the Board proposed for adoption—Policy 2:123 Board Member Development and Training, and Policy 2:220 School Board Meeting Procedure - Second Reading and adoption, and these are in the Board Packets. Finally, a required Policy 7:285 – Students Food Allergy Management Program, is a New Policy that has to be in place January 1, 2011.

Member **Michael Lewandowski** moved to vote on all of the policies together. Member **Lou Ann Johnson** seconded the motion.

Member Angela Kamely questioned if that meant that all would be voted on together. The reply was yes. Member Angela Kamely said would did not want to vote on all of them together. She asked to remove Policy 2:123. Member John Lukasik did not want to remove any policies but had a comment on the School Board Procedure Policy.

Member Angela Kamely explained that the change in Policy 2:123 allows for too much taxpayer money to be spent by the Board on conferences. Member Cindy Polke asked for clarification as to which policy she meant. Superintendent Raymond explained that the policy that is currently in place was adopted February 16, 2010. The one that had no date on it was the one that was up for adoption. Member Lou Ann Johnson explained that the policy up for adoption requires the Board to vote on allowing a member to attend a conference two years in a row, which the Board exercised the last time. She felt that the Board still had control because it had to be approved by a majority of the Board vote. Superintendent Raymond explained that what Member Lou Ann Johnson was referring to was the current policy not the proposed policy. Member Cindy Polke felt the policy was good the way it was. Member Kamely interjected that the proposed policy

also allows a member to stay the night even if you live close too. President Ron Svava asked Member Angela Kamely if she wanted to delete the proposed policy. She stated that she did not want to delete it, and if she didn't like it she could vote no. Member John Lukasik suggested that perhaps a motion should be made to vote on these policies separately. President Ron Svava asked who seconded the motion, which was Member Lou Ann Johnson, to see if she would like to withdraw her second. Member Lou Ann Johnson withdrew her second, and Member Michael Lewandowski withdrew his motion.

Member John Lukasik moved to vote on the four policy items individually, Member Cindy Polke seconded the motion. There being no further questions, President Svava asked for a voice vote.

By voice vote, all members present voted Aye, and the motion unanimously **CARRIED 7 – 0**.

Approval – Adoption – PRESS Issue #72

Member **Michael Lewandowski** moved to adopt PRESS Issue #72, as proposed. Member **Angela Kamely** seconded the motion. There being no questions, President Svava called for a voice vote.

By voice vote, all members present voted Aye, and the motion unanimously **CARRIED 7 – 0**.

Approval – Adoption – Policy 2:123 Board Member Development and Training

Member **Lou Ann Johnson** moved to adopt Policy 2:123, as proposed. Member **Michael Lewandowski** seconded the motion. There being no further questions, President Svava asked for a roll call vote.

Cindy Polke	No
John Lukasik	Yes
Michael Lewandowski	Yes
Angela Kamely	No
Susan L. Forbes	Yes
Lou Ann Johnson	Yes
Ronald Svava	Yes

By a roll call vote being taken, the vote was **5 Aye** and **2 Nay** (Polke, Kamely). The motion **CARRIED 5 – 2**.

Approval – Adoption – Policy 2:220 - School Board Meeting Procedure

Superintendent Raymond stated that the only difference in the current policy and proposed policy was found on Page 4 of 5, the section on Quorum and Participation by Audio or Video Means, with the explanation found in Footnote #25. As long as you have a physical majority present at the Board meeting for quorum purposes, the Board could authorize a member to call in and participate electronically under three reasons: 1) personal illness or disability, 2) employment or District business, or 3) a family or other emergency. If it would fit under one of those three umbrellas, then the Board President would be able to allow that.

Member **Angela Kamely** moved to approve the adoption of Policy 2:220 – School Board Meeting Procedure, as proposed. Member **Cindy Polke** seconded the motion.

Member John Lukasik stated that Footnote #25 in the policy needs to clearly define all the parameters that qualify as emergencies, because he thought that it may be purposely be written to be vague, but as good as it may be in theory, but in principle, our meeting needs to be had in public where people can see what is transpiring, and if we are doing these things out of public view, then it's not what is intended in the Open Meetings Act. Meetings are to be in view, not to be heard, but viewed so actions by the Board can be observed. He felt that Footnote #25 has too many ambiguities attached to it, and until those are clearly defined, I propose that we don't accept that one. Member Lou Ann Johnson asked Attorney Hodges if she had any thoughts on what John just said. Attorney Hodges felt that John was pointing out that this law is legally troublesome to some boards. The Statute does say that these are the only three exceptions, and they are broadly written—the emergency one. She has seen some boards that feel comfortable with audio participation in the Open Meeting section, but not in Closed Session because of concerns about confidentiality. She has seen boards take different positions on what will work best, and some boards have chosen not to allow this at all.

Some discussions took place on the different reasons why this was a good idea—Ron, because of illness preventing a member from attending physically, Lou Ann—because of recuperation from surgeries, or where she might be required to stay at work because of a certain crisis and would have to stay at her desk, she would be unable to attend physically, but where she could still call in and participate while still at work. She said she asked about this at the last meeting and was told that employment was an excusable reason. Member Michael Lewandowski asked if her employer would allow her to do that, and asked if that were to happen would she be working for her employer or for the Board, and if her employer would be happy with her doing Board business on their time. Member Lou Ann Johnson stated that all she was saying is that employment was listed as one of the acceptable reasons for not being physically able to attend a meeting, and that, yes, her employer would allow that. Member Cindy Polke said that your constituency elects you for their voice and while we are all up here deliberating we all have different voices and sometimes we have the same, but I think that if there is an important issue on the table and you can't attend and you need to be their voice, you have to be there for them, they elected you. And, if you don't trust your Board members, then that is not a good enough reason for me to say you can't do this. We were elected by the people and need to speak for them. So I think it's important that our voice be heard, and if we can't be here and we need to be, then if we can make it a possible phone-in situation because we have something that is detaining us, I think it's important that we are here by phone or in person.

There being no further discussion, President Svava asked for a roll call vote for approval of the adoption of Policy 2:220, as proposed:

Lou Ann Johnson	Yes
Angela Kamely	Yes
Susan L. Forbes	Yes
Cindy Polke	Yes
Michael Lewandowski	No

John Lukasik	No
Ronald Svava	Yes

By a roll call vote being taken, the vote was **5 Aye** and **2 Nay** (Lewandowski, Lukasik). The motion **CARRIED 5 – 2**.

Approval – Adoption – Policy 7:285 – Students – Food Allergy Management Program

Superintendent Raymond explained that this was a new policy and school boards are required to implement it not later than January 1, 2011, in order to comply with State and federal law.

Member **Susan L. Forbes** moved and Member **Cindy Polke** seconded the motion to adopt Policy 7:285 – Students – Food Allergy Management Program, as presented.

By a voice vote being had thereon, the motion unanimously **CARRIED 7 – 0**.

Superintendent Raymond replied to Member Angela Kamey by stating there would be some procedural information that Bill Thompson is putting together a format for that and a meeting will be held this week or early next week to get this information together. Administration will be working with our nurses and food service personnel, custodial crews, etc.

Notices and Communications

Career & Technical Education Advisory Council – Susan Forbes

Member Forbes stated that a meeting was held on December 8. They used a different format for this meeting. The attendees were divided into three different groups working together who were talking and recording some answers as to what they saw as strengths and weaknesses at Lockport High School. What seemed to keep reappearing was that the students were very impressed with the number of offerings that are available at LTHS, because in talking with their friends who go to different high schools, they don't have the same opportunities that the LTHS students have. It was a very positive response.

IASB Governing Board - Michael Lewandowski

Member Lewandowski reported that he attended the Triple I Conference as the Delegate for our School Board. There were 315 Delegates who were in attendance at the Delegate Meeting. #1 High School Exams – There was a procedural error, so no vote taken. #2 Student Academic Placement – The Board asked him to vote for that, and he did and it was adopted. #3 Multicounty School District GSA Offset – This was removed from the agenda. #4 Income Tax Payment Offset – This was removed from the agenda because of procedural issues. #5 TRS Pension Levy – There was no appeal and was no vote was taken. #6 The Board asked him to vote for it and that vote did carry. #7 Educational Funding – There was no appeal and was no vote was taken. #8 Attorney General Monitoring – Was removed. #9 Freedom of Information Act Changes – That was removed from the agenda, and you asked me to drop that. #10 District Organizations and Elections – No contact appeal. #11 IASB Oversight Agreement – That vote was carried. Member Johnson asked if Michael would be giving the Board a written report from the sessions of the T&L conference. He said he would bring that to the next regular meeting.

Foundation Board - John Lukasik

Member Lukasik explained that the Foundation paid for “Rachael’s Challenge” that our Student Government mentioned. During that meeting, the dean from Central shared the story of what was observed from the students at this school. He said that it was so heartwarming to hear how this event immediately impacted kids in our school. There was not a delay—it was instant impact. He thanked the Board for letting him be associated with such a fine group of people in this Foundation and what they do for the kids in this District is beyond remarkable. He thanked Kim and Mike and Carl and everyone associated with that group. Their phenomenal work is so vital to the fabric of this school and he was glad to be there to hear that story because it was obvious it made an impact and he hoped that they continue doing things like this so that all of the kids in this school can benefit from it.

SCOPE – Angela Kamely/Cindy Polke

Member Kamely reported that there was no meeting this past month. Member Polke stated that she attended as a Delegate and they were planning the spring dinner meeting and the speaker. They will be having two lawyers come in to present at the dinner.

Correspondence – Lou Ann Johnson

Member Johnson reported that notes were received from the following employees thanking the Board of Education for the sympathy shown to them and their families upon the loss of their loved ones: ones: Bret Kooi, Physical Education Department, upon the loss of his father; and Ken Kirkland, Custodian, East Campus, upon the loss of his wife, Diane. A thank you letter was received from the SOS Children's Villages Illinois for the donation in memory of Lillian M. Gallagher, mother-in-law of Barb Gallagher, Media Services, Central Campus; and from the Christmas Crossroads Committee thanking the District 205 staff for making Christmas Crossroads a success and the students the winners!

Superintendent Report**Action Considerations - Consent Agenda**

All Action Consideration Items listed with an asterisk (*) are considered to be routine and will be enacted in one motion and vote. Any Board member who wishes separate discussion on any item listed on the Consent Agenda may remove that item from the Consent Agenda, in which event, the item will be considered in its normal sequence.

Approval – Consent Agenda

Member **John Lukasik** moved. Member **Susan L. Forbes** seconded the motion to approve the Consent Agenda items #1012-01, -02, -03, -04, -05, -06 and #1012-07, as presented.

Member Polke inquired about Action Consideration #1012-01. She asked if we were transferring someone who was a Dean’s Assistant to a Custodian, and are they being replaced with a Dean’s Assistant. She also asked if we were just transferring employees around and not hiring new ones. Todd Wernet, Assistant Superintendent for Personnel, replied that the action that began the employee transfers is Action Consideration #1012-03 – Resignation – Educational Support Staff. That employee was a Custodian and he resigned. That position was posted internally, and the individual that was being moved forward was currently a Dean’s Assistant in

the District. He applied to the internal posting for the custodian position, went through the interview process, and was selected to replace the custodian. It was precipitated by a resignation.

Member Polke also inquired about the Paraprofessional to a Secretarial position, is that a new one too. Todd explained that previously in about October or November we posted a position for the technology, where someone was out on an extended medical leave, a secretary applied internally for the position and was selected that created that. These positions are simply moved that have precipitated based upon two resignations, one was the custodian and the other the long-term medical leave that we are not aware of when that individual would be returning. The paraprofessional applied as an internal person which they are allowed to do for the secretarial position.

Member Polke asked if the posts that they leave were going to be left open or were they just going to be transferred and not be replaced. Todd explained that every approved position is replaced. We post a vacancy, select applicants, and then bring the recommendation to the Board for approval. By the custodian resigning, ultimately what we replaced was a paraprofessional coming into the District. Superintendent Raymond explained that we post positions internally first. Todd explained that the Dean's Position is currently open, and has not been posted as yet because it is at the end of the semester, but it will be posted. Member Polke proposed that we not post that position.

There being no further questions on the Consent Agenda, President Svava asked for a voice vote to be taken on Action Consideration #1012-01 – Appointments – Educational Support Staff, #1012-02 – Resignation – Certified Personnel, #1012-03 – Resignation – Educational Support Staff, #1012-04 – Appointments – 2010-2011 Cocurricular Staff, #1012-05 – Appointment – Certified Personnel, #1012-06 – Approval – Award of Aerobic Equipment Bid, and #1012-07 – Approval – IASB Conference Late Registration Invoice, as presented, and included in the Official Minute Book.

By a voice vote being had thereon, the motion unanimously **CARRIED 7 – 0**.

Action Considerations

Action Consideration #1012-08 - Approve the Development of "Responsible Bidder Criteria" Designed for the Size, Timing, and Complexity of the Addition and Seek Public Bids for a General Contractor/Construction Manager.

Member **Cindy Polke** moved and Member **Angela Kamely** seconded the motion to approve Action Consideration #1012-08.

President Svava explained that the process as he understood it is the first step would be for the Board to decide if it wants a construction manager or a general contractor. At the last meeting the Board decided that it wanted a construction manager. The second step then is to identify a firm that meets the qualifications of what the Board wants for a construction manager. The Board doesn't get a bid from that firm. He said he believed that State Statutes forbid getting a bid. Once the Board identifies a firm that the Board wants to be its construction manager, then negotiations are done on the contract, and then the Board approves a contract. He felt that this

was the second step; it is not really seeking a public bid because the Board approved a construction manager. If the Board had selected a general contractor, then the Board would be seeking public bids. What the Board needs to do is to identify a qualified company. Member Lou Ann Johnson asked if there were costs involved. President Svava explained that he read the State Statutes and it was his understanding that when the Board would take a service like this, you don't get a bid.

Member Cindy Polke interjected that she had done extensive research on this and that she had sent a packet out to the Board on all the research that she did after speaking with different contractors, architects, schools, people who had just gone through this process numerous times, and the reason she brought this up to be reconsidered by the Board was that as a Board you can reconsider it. There are two different processes. She did not believe that the Board was explained the timeline of both processes. It was implied to us that if the Board just give the construction manager the job, it would go quicker; but we weren't explained the timeline of a general contractor. She said that Henry Bros. is a general contractor as well. So, what the process was that, first she asked if there was a construction drawing, because that was the first step in a bid process. In order for someone to bid, we have to have a drawing that has the specs for construction. She asked Eric Sickbert, Dahlquist and Lutzow Architects (DLA), if there was a drawing. Eric's reply was that there was no current drawing. Member Polke stated that she knew that DLA had done numerous redesign work for the Board and the Board had numerous additions for every referendum plan, and she was told that in the original design, those classrooms were cut by DLA; and in September DLA said that those classrooms were cut so were these not part of the original design. Eric stated that they were in the original design going back to which project. Member Polke replied the 1995 design.

Eric explained that at that time, the drawings were not actually created because when you are in a conceptual idea some of the imagery that DLA had given the Board for the new high school in 2011 and the referendum in that, there are concepts and ideas but there are really no drawings developed because you try to establish a building based on a budget. So, back in 1995, for that particular project, there was a schematic, and some very rough ideas and concepts come out, so you don't move too far along with something too concrete unless you know you can afford it. At that time those concepts and ideas would come up but it never actually did make it to a drawing because of the budget issues we faced at that very beginning stage of the project. Member Polke stated that what she was referring to was the timeline that we have been through for this last year. And like public comment alluded, what Tom (Polke) was saying, we were taken to a process and then at the last minute, at the last hour, we were told what we were going to do versus asked what we were going to do. In public we were told what the process was and I put my vote on the vote because it was a public process and we were told we were going to go with a general contractor and it was going to go to a public bid, and I felt comfortable having a public process. In the interim, as Superintendent Raymond reflected on it, we were given Closed Session notes stating what we were going to do. She said she did not believe that was the spirit of the Board's job to be told by the Administration what we are going to do. It is supposed to be a vote amongst us, what we feel comfortable doing for our taxpayers. She reiterated that she then did a lot of research which she gave the Board packets on and asked if any of the Board members called contractors or schools or architects to understand this process better, and wondered how many Board members actually researched this process.

President Svara stated that he did. He explained that when he was on the County Board for 16 years, there was a fellow that works there who put up the jail, the addition on the jail, and the addition on Sunny Hill Nursing Home and aided the County to purchase the two building across from the court house, so he had a lot of experience in it, and he was the one who told him that he preferred a construction manager. He stated he called another fellow who puts up buildings and he likes general contractors. He called another fellow from the County about who are the people out there that do these kinds of jobs, and received some comments from him as well.

Member Cindy Polke stated: “Her point drawing back to this whole timeline issue was that first the issue was that we had a recommendation that a vote was placed on, and then we were given criteria and information on why we should be choosing a construction manager but you guys were all told that it was all based on the timing of the project. However, if you have a design drawn then a general contractor can go out immediately and submit bids and you go through a public process and you get as many people wanting to come and bid on this at that time. It doesn’t draw the project out longer because you are not doing a Request for Qualifications (RFQ). Now if you go with a construction manager, then you go through a public process. Then you go through an RFQ and you can’t ask for what they are going to charge you. They will submit their qualifications and you discuss a fee. That draws the project out longer. However, going to a drawing, getting it done as soon as possible, and then taking it out for public process, once again guarantees that you can figure out what that project is going to cost you, because you are going to get all those bids all at one time and you are going to have it based on what is going on with the economy right now. Henry Bros. is a general contractor. They would be part of that process. So what I was asking for the Board to reconsider is, understanding the timeline involved. It doesn’t make the project run longer. It can run the same amount of time and you can get an amazing number of bids based on how public you put that bid process out there. We were not given that kind of timeline to make that decision when we were told construction manager. So then I did call 33C because John (Lavelle) has the most experience in our District with two schools and three additions—a lot of work he has done in the last ten years—and they have done a different general contractor for every job they’ve done. And he told me they are beautiful schools. If you go and see them, they are unbelievable—each one of them. And I can’t say a bad thing about any of them, and the additions were all tied to time. They all had to be done for the school year to open or they made that decision on if that was the boilerplate issue. I mean, today, our kids all went to school on the same bus at the same time. They are all seated today taking tests at the same time. We housed all of our students on one schedule today. They were all picked up on a bus today—freshmen through senior—and they were all taking their test today. So we can house these kids. They’re here. And they all rode the same bus today.”

Member John Lukasik addressed President Svara and stated: “During our first evaluation as a Board there was one topic that we collectively agreed on that was similar in the second evaluation that Ms. Hodges had posted for us, and that was the Board wanted their meetings to be more fluid and we wanted to discuss an item and then be done with it and not revisit it over, and over, and over again. Additionally, we found through the discussion process that we tend, as a Board, to get very involved in the “how.” We set the “what” and let the Administration set the “how.” We gave them the “what.” Do an addition within the parameter of dollars. Let them do the “how.” If we want to go and look at the process once we have a successful referendum in

April, by all means, let's do it. But we've voted on this. I am done with this for this immediate project with a small addition to the East Campus.

Member Cindy Polke stated: "Again my vote was based on us going to a public bid process for a general contractor. That is what we were recommended, 'John,' and the scope of the project actually went down in size from that recommendation. So, when we voted in public on an addition, the recommendation in public, and what everybody saw up on that screen, what that we were going to vote for a general contractor. You guys stopped me from speaking, you gaveled me from speaking, and I wasn't done with this issue because I was treated very rudely by the Board. President Svava stated, "No, that was me." Member Cindy Polke interjected, "By the Board, they all talked over me at that time too. Garry was referring to a document that I was not referring to. The one that I was referring to I sent to all you Board members so that you understood, and Garry, because this is a serious topic for me. It's a most transparent process. It's going to change the face of what's going to happen in April. Because if we do not go through a public process, they will not trust us, and they will think that we are just handing over jobs because we owed somebody money and they get the first chance to bid."

Member John Lukasik asked Garry what Administration's thoughts were on this. Garry replied that there was not a motion on the floor yet but for this particular item we do not support approval. Member Angela Kamely interjected that one thing that she noticed in our packet here on the selection process for construction manager page, the very first sentence is, "An RFQ is just that, it is a Request for Qualifications to various construction managers for CM for their qualifications. Various managers--manager is plural, so I would assume that means we are going to go out to a number of them and ask them for their qualifications. Superintendent Raymond explained this was if this were to be a motion to be voted on. Currently, it's not. It's just under discussion, and again, it's not something the Administration would recommend, because if you did approve this, this would be what would you would have to do. President Svava stated: "That when he talked to these two people in trying to get more information, I know that when you have a general contractor you let it out for bids. General contractors come in and say A, and a different person says, B, and C, and you can open up the bids for what the general contractor says. Now under a construction manager I was worried that we would be in the process before we knew what the cost of what the building would be. However, that's why I allowed some people in the audience input to clarify that issue. My understanding is that plumbing will be bid by a bunch of people, including local people, and electricity will be bid, bricks will be bid, and we will get all those at one time. And the first fellow I talked to said that locals have more of a chance to get in with a construction manager than with a general contractor, but we will know what the cost of the building is when they are opened simultaneously in an open meeting. There will be local people that bid on bricks. There will be non-local people that bid on bricks and we will award it to the lowest responsible bidder, so either way we go, we are going to get opening bids. Now, one would be an opening bid on a general contractor and the other would be opening bids by the people that work through the construction manager. Either way we are going to know what it is going to cost." Member Cindy Polke, said, "Right, but you are going to know across the board costs from many, many people when you go general contractor. You are going to be told what the bids all come in at and you can qualify your bid to get locals or they can submit alternative bids, which I brought up last time, and when you qualify it in a number of ways, I suggest we look at how people have done it before because there is a lot of information

out there—a lot of examples to do it right and do it quick. So you get the drawing, you put out a public document, you put it up in a trade magazine and a newspaper and get out as much publicity as you can, and then you submit your bids, and I don't know why a Board would not want to use the most transparent process. There is no risk in an economy like this to get that done.”

Member **Cindy Polke** moved that we approve the development of “Responsible Bidder Criteria” designed for the size, timing, and complexity of the addition and seek public bids for a general contractor.

Member Cindy Polke explained that she was striking construction manager because if you eliminate the construction manager process you don't have to go to RFQ and it saves the time. So the Board would sit with the Administration and talk about the design with the architect. That's how you come up with the “Responsible Bidder Criteria.” Member **Angela Kamely** seconded the motion.

Member Michael Lewandowski inquired as to what Administration would think. Superintendent Raymond replied that Administration would not recommend adopting this motion.

President Svava asked if there was any other discussion, to which Member Angela Kamely stated that the only thing she would like to say is: “Today I was looking at our web site and I went through each one of our bios, the Board's bios, and there were three of us that talked about one of our goals was fiscal responsibility—and if something like this means that we are going to be sure we can get lowest prices and stuff, then I think that that is what our taxpayers were expecting of us—at least three of us.”

President Svava asked for any other comments. President Svava then stated that: “Probably a better motion would have been to rescind what we voted on last time. I have heard *Robert's Rules* interpreted two different ways. One way is to rescind it at the meeting or to rescind it at the next meeting, and depending on how you wanted to interpret it, that would probably have been a better motion, but there is a motion on the floor, which I presume would supersede last meeting's motion. Superintendent Raymond asked Attorney Terry Hodges what she felt would be the ruling on that. Attorney Hodges stated that: “As she understood the motion from the last meeting, the Board approved using a construction manager, and she sort of agreed with President Svava if you now have a motion that passes to seek bids for a general contractor, the Board is going to have to clarify somehow whether that means you have rescinded the construction manager, and that would probably take another motion, just for clarity.” President Svava stated he knows a little bit about *Robert's Rules* and we are getting to the point where we might have to hire a Parliamentarian. Member Michael Lewandowski interjected that: “This is why we have to keep moving forward instead of backward all the time.”

There being no further discussion, President Svava asked for a roll call.

Angela Kamely	Yes
Susan L. Forbes	No
John Lukasik	No
Michael Lewandowski	No
Lou Ann Johnson	Yes
Cindy Polke	Yes
Ronald Svara	Yes

Roll call being had thereon, the vote was **4 Aye** and **3 Nay** (Forbes, Lukasik, Lewandowski). The motion **CARRIED 4 – 3**.

Attorney Terry Hodges stated that for clarity, the Board should consider rescinding the Approval of a Construction Manager.

Approval to Rescind the Construction Manager Action that was Approved at the Last Meeting

President Svara stated that he needed a motion to rescind the Construction Manager Action that was approved at the Board's Last Meeting.

Member **Cindy Polke** moved and Member **Lou Ann Johnson** seconded the motion to Rescind the Construction Manager Action that was approved at the Board's Last Meeting.

Member John Lukasik asked for clarification on Parliamentary Procedure on who needed to make a motion to rescind, a member who voted against the motion or the one who voted for it. President Svara stated that to rescind a motion, it has to be brought forth by a member who voted for it.

Attorney Hodges asked to see a copy of the minutes from the last meeting to figure out if it would be best not to take a rescission action. She asked what the exact motion was at the last meeting, especially now that the Board had approved comments added to those minutes, because an option might just be to not to approve the contract. Upon review of the minutes from December 2, 2010, Attorney Hodges stated that clearly the Administration has selected construction management and a vote was taken to accept the recommendation from the Administration to use construction management. There is a vote on record to use construction management, so theoretically, that vote could remain. You don't rescind it, but then you are going to have to face the issue again when we get to the approval of the construction manager contract that is on the agenda tonight.

President Svara asked who made the motion and second to rescind this action so they could withdraw the second and the motion so he could take it off the floor. Member **Lou Ann Johnson withdrew her second**. Member **Cindy Polke withdrew her motion**.

Superintendent Raymond called *Point of Order*. Rich Lesniak just brought to Administration's attention that with the current architect's contract that is in the packet, is based on construction management, so that would need to be changed too, and he assumed that fees would then be changed because they would be working with a GC (general contractor) now instead of a construction manager. Dr. Raymond stated that we could still approve what we have for a motion

in the packet with the understanding that working with our legal firm in negotiations with the Architect we would have to get that changed as well. Attorney Hodges stated that the attorney that Rich was working with at her office, who talked with her tonight about 7:00 p.m., said he was comfortable with the changes that the Architect sent back and felt that they could be worked through easily, so he suggested that the Board approves the Architect contract subject to the final revisions being made. But Garry is right regarding this contract because it was tailored to an Architect working with a construction manager, not a general contractor. Attorney Hodges would be much more hesitant of negotiations as to what additional changes would have to be made now that the contract was changed from a construction manager to a general contractor.

President Svava explained that they were currently discussing **Action Consideration #1012-10 – Approval – Architect Contract**. Member Polke asked if the motion could be amended to include a general contractor versus a construction manager. Attorney Hodges stated that it would boil down to a question now that the majority of the Board wants to seek bids for a general contractor, because now the vote you are looking at is to whether to approve or not approve the two contracts that are on the table. Attorney Hodges stated that if you approve the Architect contract, as Member Polke was suggesting, it would be very uncertain now what you are approving because that contract was structured for the Architect to be working through a construction manager. President Svava asked if we could delegate that transformation to our attorney. Attorney Hodges said absolutely but they don't know if costs will change and that's very uncomfortable. Member Lewandowski stated that changing this contract was going to cost the District more. Rich Lesniak explained that the document that was attached to the Board memo was for an architect's contract working with a construction manager. The relationship when that happens is that some of the things that an architect would normally do, those job duties are switched to a construction manager. For example, the construction manager would put out the bid documents. With a general contract, the architect puts out the bid documents. So the burden is going to be switched from the architect to the construction manager. That rolls over not only into contract language, which when he talked with Attorney Levy this afternoon, it would be okay with having the Board approve that, but it will depend on DLA now as to what that will mean in price. There is usually a little lesser percentage when you use a construction manager because of some shift of the burden of work. Rich explained that on his memo, he was okay with the Board giving them authority to approve the contract, provided there was no change in fees. In other words, if DLA came to us and said we are going to change fees, the "buck" stops and we go back to the Board. Based on the motion you just approved, we are going to have to take that off because there may or may not be a change of fees.

President **Svava** moved that we approve DLA as our architect subject to approval of our attorney on the renegotiations of the contract. Member **Cindy Polke** seconded the motion. President Svava explained that what this does is that the Board is saying that we will be using DLA as our architect and our attorney is going to make sure that the transformation from the current proposal here to the new proposal will be in the best interest of the school. Member Cindy Polke asked that the drawing get done quickly so we can get out to bid quickly and we can advertise before the drawing is done just to get the project on the plate and they can put that out into the schedule to know that it is coming. Rich asked for clarification. He asked, "Does the Administration have the authority if there is a change in the cost of the architect's contract to go forth and sign it. He added he had no trouble with the terms because that is all worked out with the different

attorneys, but wanted to make sure he understood what Ron just said about entering into a contract without coming back to the Board if there is a change in the percentage of the fees. Ron asked, “Can we do that, I don’t know?” Rich said he didn’t know if there would be a change. It may be a half of a percent, but he didn’t know that.

Attorney Hodges addressed Ron to say that as she understood his motion, he would be giving the attorneys the power to approve a different pricing arrangement and I think that is why Rich is asking the question. Is that really what you want? President Svava replied, “It’s what I want.” Member Lou Ann Johnson asked, “Did you want Administration to have that authority or the attorney?” President Svava said, “No, he would delegate it to our attorney.” Ron explained that what he was saying here is that it may cost more money or may cost less money, and whatever it is, leave it up to the attorney to make a final decision. He said he was doing this because time was getting short. Rich said he just wanted to know—just tell us what to do and we’ll do it. Member Lou Ann Johnson asked if we had to have limits as to how much. Rich stated that he just wanted to know yes or no to be sure he knows what the Board wanted him to do. President Svava stated that he did not want to have another meeting just to do that, because it would be delaying it too much. He would prefer to let the attorney negotiate and get it done. Member Lewandowski asked to let the Board know what the additional charge would be added onto the school’s costs so that dollars for dollars, cents for cents, people know that making this change is going to end up costing the District more money. He said that it’s going to cost us more money for our architects and our lawyer is going to spend extra time on this as well. They are going to be billing us by the minute. Member Polke interjected that there is no fee when you go to a general contractor and you are assuring the lowest bid in the most competitive market we have ever seen. She said that she has been told that jobs are being bid with no profits just to keep guys working. Members Johnson and Lukasik asked Ron to restate his motion.

President Svava stated that the motion was for our attorney to negotiate with DLA on a contract that would include a general contractor and consummate the deal, but said he didn’t know if that was legal. He asked, “Do changes like that have to be approved by us?” Attorney Hodges stated that the Board would approve the ultimate contract, so if we come back with a contract that potentially has a price increase higher than you want, you will vote the contract down. She said she would assure you that Attorney Levi from our office would be in constant touch with Rich. That is how they have been working on this. President Svava stated, “I guess will have to approve it then at the next meeting.” He asked Attorney Hodges to negotiate a contract and bring it back to the Board. President Svava stated, “Our attorney will negotiate with DLA—that’s the motion.” President Svava asked for a roll call.

Angela Kamely	Yes
Susan L. Forbes	No
John Lukasik	No
Michael Lewandowski	No
Lou Ann Johnson	Yes
Cindy Polke	Yes
Ronald Svava	Yes

A roll call vote being had thereon, the vote was **4 Aye** and **3 Nay** (Forbes, Lukasik, Lewandowski). The motion **CARRIED 4 – 3**. President Svava stated that at the next meeting there will be a contract to vote on.

Action Consideration #1012-09 - Approval - Tax Levy for Fiscal Year 2010

Member **John Lukasik** moved; Member **Lou Ann Johnson** seconded the motion to approve the Resolution Levying Taxes for Lockport Township High School District 205, Will County, Illinois for the Year 2010, as presented.

There being no discussion, President Svava asked for a roll call.

Michael Lewandowski	Yes
Cindy Polke	Yes
Angela Kamely	Yes
Lou Ann Johnson	Yes
John Lukasik	Yes
Susan L. Forbes	Yes
Ronald Svava	Yes

A roll call vote being had thereon, the vote was **7 Aye** and **0 Nay**. The motion **CARRIED 7 – 0**.

Action Consideration #1012-11 - Approval - Construction Manager Contract

Member **Lou Ann Johnson** made the motion to remove Action Consideration #1012-11 – Approval – Construction Manager Contract from the agenda in light of the previous action on Action Consideration #1012-10, which approved the architect to work with general contractors instead of a construction manager. Member **Cindy Polke** seconded the motion.

There being no discussion, President Svava asked for a roll call.

Cindy Polke	Yes
John Lukasik	No
Michael Lewandowski	No
Angela Kamely	Yes
Susan L. Forbes	No
Lou Ann Johnson	Yes
Ronald Svava	Yes

A roll call vote being had thereon, the vote was **4 Aye** and **3 Nay** (Lukasik, Lewandowski, Forbes). The motion **CARRIED 4 – 3**.

Action Consideration #1012-12 - Approval 2011 Referendum Plans/FAQs

Superintendent Raymond explained that part of the Board’s discussion tonight would be to definitely decide if you want all freshmen to attend East Campus and that with the scaled-back campus on Cedar Road, it would be expandable in the future when the construction grants arrive. Also, the Board would have to make a decision on the \$85 million referendum question, which will be discussed and a resolution adopted at the January Special Meeting in order to meet the

deadline for getting that question on the ballot. The Board will have to decide on the exact wording of the referendum question so Administration could then work with Chapman and Cutler to put the question into a Resolution for adoption. He also stated that the attorney may have the General Contractor (GC) contract ready for approval at that special meeting as well. Also, an attendance boundary would need to be decided upon. At its last meeting the Board asked Administration to work on a blending compromise approach with what the Boundary Committee did as far as what a previous Board had approved making I355 the boundary. Additionally, Kim Brehm will talk about her two meetings with the Citizen's Advisory Committee and some thoughts and updates to Draft 3 found in the Board's packets.

Approval – Handout Listing of the Freshman Center at East Campus

President **Svara** moved to have a handout compiled that would provide members of the public with information regarding the upcoming referendum. One of the items listed would be that there would be a Freshman Center for East Campus and that all freshmen would attend the East Campus. Member **Lou Ann Johnson** seconded the motion.

Ron explained that the handout will also list several items, such as, how much it will cost, what the boundaries will be, if any, information about the Freshman Center and about Central Campus. Also on the handout a statement would be included that reads: "For further details, go to LTHS.org." He stated that he felt the #1 item on the handout should be taxes. Although Member Polke felt that the items Ron suggested were important, but felt that the #1 item should be safety. The real eye-openers for safety issues would be when the public hears that there are no sprinkler systems and open stairwells at Central. Ron stated that safety issues at Central could be listed on the handout referring the public to the web site for more details. There being no further discussion, President Svara asked for a voice vote.

By a voice vote being had thereon, the vote was **7 Aye and 0 Nay**. The motion was unanimously **CARRIED 7 – 0**.

Approval - Cost of the Referendum for a new School to be \$85 million with No Tax Increase on the Bond Portion of the Taxes

President **Svara** moved and Member **Cindy Polke** seconded the motion to approve the cost of the referendum for a new school to be \$85 million with no increase on the bond portion of the taxes for District 205.

President Svara stated that he would put an amortization schedule on the handout as well. Member Lewandowski stated that people's property taxes are going to go up as they always do and when they do they will say they were told that their taxes would not be increased. President Svara stated that although property would most likely go up, we want the public to understand that taxes weren't being raised because of the new school. The bonding portion of their taxes for District 205 would remain the same. There being no further discussion, President Svara asked for a voice vote.

By a voice vote being had thereon, the vote was **7 Aye and 0 Nay**. The motion was unanimously **CARRIED 7 – 0**.

Approval – The Boundary

Superintendent Raymond stated that the Board had asked Administration to look at some type of a compromise between what the Boundary Committee had recommended and what the previous Board had set. The numbers were crunched assuming that all freshmen would go to East Campus. What Administration was looking at was either extreme if every single kid and every single family in that option zone picked one campus or the other campus, could we still house them, and the answer was either extreme can work with these numbers. A boundary map was provided in the Board packet and larger maps were available upon request. He explained that this was a concept that gives a soft boundary option area between Farrell Road and Cedar Road and then also District 89 and 90 would be in the option zone. The red area would be assigned to East Campus and the Green Area to the Cedar Road Campus. Ron asked if anyone wanted to amend the motion being that it was explained that District 92 was split into three different areas, but consensus of the Board was to approve the boundary as presented by the Administration.

President **Svara** moved to approve the boundary recommended by Administration as proposed. Member **Angela Kamely** seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, Ron asked for a roll call vote.

Susan L. Forbes	Yes
Michael Lewandowski	Yes
Lou Ann Johnson	Yes
John Lukasik	Yes
Cindy Polke	Yes
Angela Kamely	Yes
Ronald Svara	No

A roll call vote being had thereon, the vote was **6 Aye and 1 Nay** (Svara). The motion **CARRIED 6 – 1**.

Approval – Safety Issues at Central Campus

Member **Angela Kamely** moved and Member **Cindy Polke** seconded the motion to include the safety issues at Central Campus on the handout.

President Svara suggested that this item be kept short on the handout but to make a reference to see the District web site for further information. It was suggested to keep the handout simple.

There being no further discussion, Ron asked for a roll call vote.

Angela Kamely	Yes
Susan L. Forbes	Yes
John Lukasik	Here
Michael Lewandowski	Yes
Lou Ann Johnson	Yes
Cindy Polke	Yes
Ronald Svara	Yes

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

Action Consideration #1012-12 – Approval – 2011 Referendum Plans/FAQ

Superintendent Raymond stated this item was actually a final look of Draft 3 of the Referendum 2011 – Essential Questions, which came from the last discussion that was had with the Board. What was distributed by Kim Brehm at tonight’s meeting includes some refinements which came from the Citizen’s Advisory Committee. So, no action would need to be taken on this item unless the Board saw anything else that they felt needed to vote on. It appeared that the main FAQ were now taken care of, and that the Board could now continue to empower the Citizen’s Advisory Committee to fine-tune what would actually be placed the District’s web site. This would be a more detailed FAQ. What Ron was looking for was just a one-page, two-sided “door-hanger” type handout to inform the public. Ron explained that he would have 2,000 to 3,000 of these handouts printed and each Board member would volunteer to distribute about 100 of them. The opinion from our attorneys is that if we exceed \$3,000 in expenditures for just information, it would fall under the confines of PAC. The attorneys will draft whatever documents that we need to apply to the State Board of Elections for this status, because just sending out the next issue of the *Porter Reporter* containing referendum information would put us over that \$3,000 mark let alone any other copying we need to do. Our attorney explained that District expenditures for referendum information would fall under electioneering according to the new interpretation of the law. So, to be on the safe side, Administration is recommending that we continue to get advice from our attorneys to be sure we are doing everything properly. Also, Administration will continue to work closely with the Citizen’s Advisory Committee and Ron for his publication, and just get going.

Information Reports

Information Report #1012-01 - Maintenance Report

Superintendent Raymond stated that this monthly maintenance report has some sound-bites in it regarding Central Campus, safety, and costs for a 100-year-old building that might help. President Svava stated that he noticed that we lost electricity at Central and our back-up generators don’t supply electricity for heat and asked if it was an internal problem? Bill Thompson replied that it was a Commonwealth Edison problem. Ron commended the maintenance person who came out at midnight and found the problem before anything froze-up.

Information Report #1012-02 – Attendance Summary and Gains and Losses Report

The average attendance for the month of November was 93.45%. Member Kamely inquired if there was consensus of the Board regarding the attendance summary Kerri Green provided for the Board to review after the Board’s last meeting. She asked for a more concise explanation in an easy-to-read document clarifying enrollment status for our students and had hoped that it would have appeared in this packet in a new format. Superintendent Raymond stated that he had not heard from any of the other Board members. However, Member Polke stated that she concurred with the new format. Consensus of the Board was to provide the new format in the future.

Information Report #1012-03 - Bond Sale Final Report

Rich Lesniak provided the breakdown of the bond proceeds. The actual bond sale was less than what the Board had approved. The actual bond sale was for \$4,235,000 on December 9. The closing was held and that amount less closing costs were wired into our account, so we have \$4.175 million ready to go for the addition. Ron explained that in order to get the Build America Bonds, the bonds are floated as taxable. Whoever buys them will be paying taxes. The 20-year value on an amortization schedule is 6.75%. The average comes out to be about 4.26% when everything was “put into the mix.” If we get this passed, he was hoping our tax rate percent would be pretty much the same as the Build America Bonds.

Information Report #1012-04 - Overnight Field Trips - Wrestling; Girls' Soccer; Ski Club; and Band

Information on the overnight field trips for wrestling, girls' soccer, ski club and band were all provided for the Board's perusal.

Unfinished BusinessInformation Report #1011-03 – School Report Card Data (Moved from the November 2011 agenda.)

Brett Gould, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction, explained that the data from the Illinois School Report Card for Lockport Township High School was included in the November board packet and answered all questions the Board had regarding this data. He further explained that the information in this report was taken from the 2009 school year and was the 2010 Illinois School Report Card for LTHS. (The District School Report Card is also located on the District's web site.) Historical trends of this data here at LTHS and comparison data to the State were provided for each of the categories reported. In a later report, the Board will get information that compares LTHS data with data received from all 15 area schools in the SouthWest Suburban Conference (SWSC). Dr. Gould briefed the Board on each page of the report card and noted that LTHS is considered a large high school. He informed the Board that this information is being used for the LTHS Strategic Plan and by both the Student Outcomes Committee and the LTHS Interventions Committee.

Information Report #1011-07 - Superintendent Goals Status Report (Moved from the November 2011 agenda.)

Superintendent Raymond provided a colored chart and explained that the color **green** was for what was accomplished, the yellow color was changed to **blue** for items in the process of being completed, and **red** represented no progress toward that goal yet. Member Johnson asked if the ledged of colors could be placed on the actual form for easy reference. Superintendent Raymond stated that they would add that to the form. He was pleased to report that three of the four goals were in green and one will be in green soon. He explained the status report provided showing the progress that was made and highlighted information on the two additional reports: 1) a comparison matrix for the SouthWest Suburban Conference (SWSC) schools and 2) a statistical analysis of the entire suburban area in regard to ACT scores that were provided for the Board's perusal. Of special note was that LTHS ranked 5th out of 71 schools in student performance on the ACT as compared to the expected ACT scores, and noted that the four schools that ranked above LTHS spent over \$4,000 more per year than LTHS. In reply to Member Kameley's

concern, Dr. Raymond stated that this information is shared with the Department Chairs who share this information with their departments, so they would receive this information prior to the newspapers reporting it. A portion of the *Porter Reporter* would be dedicated to academic and athletic information and the rest of the Superintendent's Newsletter will contain referendum information. Some discussion was also had regarding non-attendance of students. In reply to Member Johnson's question regarding when the Board would be receiving the written CEC report, Dr. Raymond explained that Matt Dusterhoft, who is spearheading this project, has been out sick, but that they were within a couple of weeks of getting that report out to the Board. Superintendent Raymond stated that they would be finalizing this report shortly because the Superintendent's Evaluation starts next month.

Information Report #1011-06 - Board of Education Goals (Moved from the November 2011 agenda.)

Dr. Raymond explained that most of the Board knows that most of these goals are intermediate to long-term goals, and some of them are more formative goals than summative, a little harder to put into a matrix. Most of the blue, in progress items are actually infused now into the CEC, so most of the Board goals have already been infused right into the CEC process.

MEMBER FORBES BRIEFLY EXITED THE MEETING

Closed Session

Member **Angela Kamely** moved and Member **John Lukasik** seconded the motion to enter into Closed Session to confidentially 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 ILCS 120/2(c)(2); and litigation, when the District finds that an action is probable or imminent, in which case the basis for the finding shall be recorded and entered into the closed meeting minutes. 5 ILCS 120/2(c)(11). President Svara asked for a roll call.

Lou Ann Johnson	Yes
Angela Kamely	Yes
Susan L. Forbes	Absent
Cindy Polke	Yes
Michael Lewandowski	Yes
John Lukasik	Yes
Ronal Svara	Yes

A roll call vote being had thereon, the vote was **6 Aye and 0 Nay**. The motion **CARRIED 6 – 0**. Closed Session commenced at 10:48 p.m. in the Principal's Conference Room. Closed Session ended at 11:28 p.m.

Reconvene Meeting

Member **Michael Lewandowski** moved and Member **Susan L. Forbes** seconded the motion to reconvene the Regular meeting.

A roll call being had thereon, the vote was **7 Aye** and **0 Nay**. The Motion **CARRIED 7 – 0**. The meeting was reconvened in the Maroon Room at 11:35 p.m.

Action Considerations - After Closed Session

This Action Consideration was not needed.

New Business

Potential Board Agenda Topics

Superintendent Raymond asked the Board to scratch out the bottom topic, the RFQ item from Member Polke, because it was dealt with earlier in the meeting. He added to the January 24 meeting requested topics PRESS Issue #73 which would be presented for First Reading. A Special Board Meeting on January 6 was definitely needed now. The District Improvement Plan would be moved to January 24. If our attorneys have the DLA final contract, it would be added to the January 6 meeting, as well as the referendum ballot question now that the Board decided on the \$85 million figure.

Consensus of the Board was to hold the January 6 Special Meeting at Central Campus at 7:00 p.m. and offer a tour of Central at 6:30 p.m.

Dr. Raymond asked the Board if they would be interested doing a Department Highlight. We would ask a Department Chair and a couple of their members to attend the meetings that are too congested with agenda items to spend some time with the Board. For the January 6 Special Meeting was to show a new teaching tool called QWIZDOM and perhaps highlight the Business/Tech Department and then get the Department Highlight item built into the agenda topics.

Member Polke explained that she talked to Brett Gould earlier in the day about the upcoming bus schedule and suggested that it be put on the agenda because of the difference in hours that exists at Central Campus and East based on Central Campus having shorter class periods and one extra elective, and instead of mandating the elective and have student choose an elective they would like to take instead, and also to see if we could align our bus schedule with our feeder schools so when we get out of school, we could hopefully end at the same time to continue our community service, peer mentoring, and tutoring, our split-schedule very difficult for that to happen. She was curious if we could align our calendars and bus schedules with the feeder schools to continue to make tutoring happen.

Superintendent Raymond stated that perhaps by approving our bell schedule that has been put together and given to our Department Chairs and Union that meets our 300-minute minimums and all of the rules and regulations that honor the CEC recommendation for collaborative teacher time, that came from Union negotiations as well, so what the Board saw in the Board Notes about a week ago will be 99% what Administration will bring to the Board for approval. This schedule was shared with all of the feeder school superintendents and we can't dictate what they chose to do. The beauty of this is that the Board sets its calendars two years out and that really helps the feeder schools although they don't always adhere to it, and don't have to adhere to it. The main goal is to try to align spring break and winter break. It would be the same with the bell

schedule. Once the Board approves it, then the feeder schools can decide what they want to do. Approval of the bell schedule will probably be placed on the agenda for January 24.

In reply to Member Johnson's question regarding replying to the lady who spoke at a previous Board meeting regarding bowling, usually in January Rich would have the updated five-year budget projections from PMA and then Administration starts brainstorming potential budget adjustments. He said that bowling was part of the PE curriculum, and when Ron was looking at Tier I and Tier II, Ron suggested cutting bowling last year in Tier I that added up to \$741,000 in cuts, but Administration recommended perhaps waiting till the next layer, Tier II, of potential adjustments, so the Board hadn't see that yet. Member Johnson asked to see what was being recommended to be cut before a decision was made. Dr. Raymond stated that between now and January 24, Administration would be looking at the broad picture and start bringing some items to the Board. The Board might want to consider dipping into their reserves to avoid cutting classes and avoid doing academic harm to the kids. He clarified that it was not the bowling team, it is PE.

Regarding Board members contacting the attorney for the District, Ron will continue to give permission to any Board members who wants to speak with our attorney, until he is given some direction as to who should make the decision, e.g., if it pertains to a Board agenda item. Member Lukasik asked how we can justify Board members calling our attorney whenever they get permission from Ron right after speaking discussion cutting curriculum to say money when the bill for our attorney for last month was over \$10,000. What is the connection to the Board's cost-consciousness when worrying about kids verses permission to call the attorney even though I don't know what you are going to talk about and if it would be in the entire Board's interest? He said he sees a big disconnect in the Board's actions. Member Polke asked if he had compared the current attorney bills with our bills from our previous firm. President Svava stated that he has this authority but it is not well defined and asked what criteria he should use for making such a decision. Member Lewandowski asked Ron to put together a policy on this topic and present it to the Board for approval. Ron said he would do that.

Complete Meeting Evaluation Form

The Board was asked to complete their Board evaluation instrument provided tonight and give it to Gloria or to fax it in the morning if they wanted to include it in the summary report. Ron commented that on the last evaluation summary, one person stated they did not like that he allowed the public to enter into a Board discussion. Two people said they liked the idea.

Freedom of Information Request

There were two FOIA requests included in the packet for the Board to review from Kurt Heinz and Alicia Mills. Both requests for information were granted.

Announcements

None

Adjourn

Member **Michael Lewandowski** made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Member **Susan L. Forbes** seconded that motion.

By voice vote being taken, the vote was unanimous **7 Aye** and **0 Nay**. The motion **CARRIED 7 – 0**. The meeting adjourned at 11:53 p.m.

Ronald Svava, President

Lou Ann Johnson, Secretary

gkm