

**MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING,
BOARD OF EDUCATION, SCHOOL
DISTRICT #225, COOK COUNTY,
ILLINOIS, MARCH 10, 2014**

A regular meeting of the Board of Education, School District No. 225 was held on Monday, March 10, 2014, at approximately 7:04 p.m. at Glenbrook North High School Library, pursuant to due notice of all members and the public.

The president called the meeting to order. Upon calling of the roll, the following members answered present:

Boron, Doughty, Hanley, Martin, Shein, Taub, Wilkas

Also present: Bretag, Caliendo, Freund, Geallis, Geddeis, Muir, Pryma, Ptak, Riggle, Siena, Wegley, Williamson

APPROVAL OF AGENDA FOR THIS MEETING

Motion by Mr. Boron, seconded by Mr. Taub to approve the agenda for this meeting.

Upon calling of the roll:

aye: Boron, Doughty, Hanley, Martin, Shein, Taub, Wilkas

nay: none

Motion carried 7-0.

STUDENTS AND STAFF WHO EXCEL

Ms. Geddeis introduced five students who were recently recognized by the IHSA for their accomplishments.

GBN:

- Claire Symington earned 3rd place in Oratorical Declamation at the State Speech Tournament.
- Benji Englander and Camila Kaplunov qualified for nationals.

Ms. Geddeis noted that Claire, Benji, and Camila are coached by Ms. Ilie.

GBS:

- Alexandra (Alex) Canary will advance to nationals based on her Humorous Interpretation performance.

Ms. Geddeis stated that Alex is coached by Afrodite Skaouris.

The students introduced their families and reviewed their accomplishments and how their experiences have helped them.

Ms. Geddeis then introduced David O'Gara, who earned an honorable mention on the IHSA All-State Academic Team. David is one of 76 students selected statewide for this honor which required nominees to have at least a 3.5 GPA, participation in two sports and community service. Each school gets to nominate one boy and one girl each year. David participates in cross-country and track, maintains an academically rigorous schedule including honors and AP classes, and community service.

Ms. Geddeis stated that David is coached by coach Hasenstein.

David introduced his family and reviewed his accomplishments and explained how his experiences have helped him.

Dr. Riggle thanked all the students and family members for coming and sharing their accomplishments.

RECOGNITION OF COMMUNITY VISITORS

None.

BOARD AND SUPERINTENDENT REPORTS

Dr. Riggle stated that the Techny Music Festival was great.

A Board member stated that he went to the GBN Booster Club event. It was a great example of parents' involvement and community support.

A Board member stated that the Techny Music Festival is a great reminder of the wonderful work that Stevi Marks does and she will be sorely missed. He stated that it was a great performance.

A Board member stated that the Techny Music Festival is a great example of the two schools working together and noted that it was a great concert.

MOTION TO APPROVE CONSENT AGENDA

Motion by Mr. Boron, seconded by Mr. Taub to approve the following items on the consent agenda:

1. Appointments

- a) Certified - None
- b) Support Staff - None

2. Resignations

- a) Certified - None
- b) Support Staff - None

3. FOIA

the Board of Education review of the FOIA request contained in consent agenda item #6.3.

4. Vendor Bills

the issuance of Vendor Checks Nos. 61820 through 61988 and in the amount of \$624,826.56 as listed on the attached checks register dated March 3 and 4, 2014.

5. Payroll - None

6. Imprest

the reimbursement of the Revolving Fund for Employees for the month of February in the amount of \$30,460.21 represented by checks No. 15763 through 15793, 15846 through 15885, 15915 through 15919, 15923 through 15943, 15960 through 16000.
the reimbursement of the Revolving Fund for Vendors for the month of February in the amount of \$129,495.79 represented by checks No. 15794 through 15845, 15886 through 15914, 15920 through 15922, 15944 through 15959, and 16001 through 16035.
Checks issued in February voided in February: No. 15782, 15792, 15917 and 15962. Check issued in previous months, voided in February: N/A.

7. Minutes

- February 24, 2014 Regular Board Meeting
- February 24, 2014 Closed Board Meeting
- February 26, 2014 Technology Committee Meeting
- March 5, 2014 Facility Committee Meeting

8. FY14/15 Student Fees

9. NCLB School Improvement Plan (District and GBS)

10. Gifts

| Gift From | Amount of Item | School | Department | Account |
|---------------------------|----------------|--------|-------------------|---------|
| Goodman Family Foundation | \$2000.00 | GBS | Student 2 Student | 830992 |
| K of C Charities Inc | \$2000.00 | GBS | Special Olympics | 810900 |
| Anonymous | \$1000.00 | GBS | Debate Team | 830290 |

11. IHSA Membership
12. GBN Varsity Baseball Trip
13. GBS Yearbook Trip

Upon calling of the roll:

aye: Boron, Doughty, Hanley, Martin, Shein, Taub, Wilkas

nay: none

Motion carried 7-0.

DISCUSSION/ACTION: REJECT DEMOLITION BID

Dr. Ptak provided that the administration is recommending that the bid received for the demolition portion of the GBS small building projects be rejected. The work will be re-advertised and we anticipate that there will be additional bidders in the next round.

Dr. Ptak gave the background on why the administration suggested rejecting the bid.

In response to a Board member's question Dr. Ptak stated that one bidder dropped out due to the inability to secure a bid bond in a timely manner. The second bidder had a change in personnel on the day of the bid opening that resulted in a bid not being submitted.

Dr. Ptak responded to a Board member's question by stating that it is in our interest to get other bids to do this project rather than using the other trades.

MOTION TO REJECT DEMOLITION BID

Motion by Mr. Boron, seconded by Mr. Doughty to reject the demolition bid.

Upon calling of the roll:

aye: Boron, Doughty, Hanley, Martin, Shein, Taub, Wilkas

nay: none

Motion carried 7-0.

DISCUSSION/ACTION: APPROVAL OF SUMMER 2014 CONSTRUCTION BIDS

Dr. Riggle stated that upon submitting the required drawings for the proposed parking lots at GBS we received word from the Village of Glenview that we would be expected to follow the Village review process. This would involve presentations with the Planning Commission, Zoning Commission, Aesthetic Commission and the Village Board of Trustees. This is the first time the school district has been required to follow a review process in either Glenview or Northbrook.

Dr. Riggle stated that there are variances in the plans that will have to be made to provide the Village's code for landscaping and design. This will result in change orders to the bids we have received, primarily in the areas of asphalt and concrete. The Village administration has streamlined the process calendar and given us their guarantee of expediency in approval of variations and the sign-off of MWRD documents.

The administration will work with the Village and bring the final conditions back to the Board for consideration and approval on April 28.

Dr. Riggle stated that the Board will still have the right to accept or reject the bids based on more accurate costs.

Dr. Ptak stated that subsequent to the Facility Committee meeting, the lowest paving bidder withdrew his bid, resulting in higher costs (\$40,800) than shared at the facility meeting. The low bidder stated that they mispriced the bid.

Dr. Ptak reviewed the proposed parking lot work. Dr. Ptak reviewed the reasons for the difference in the bids we received and our estimates.

Dr. Ptak reviewed the spots gained in each of the parking lots.

A Board member stated that he thought the consensus of the Board was that Lot C was a necessity because of safety. The only reason we were going to bid on Lot A and Lot B was to see if we could get a better price if we did all the lots at one time.

Dr. Ptak stated that the administration would like the Board to review the different options and give them direction.

The Board member stated that he reviewed the costs per parking space and did not see a savings in doing all of the lots at one time.

Dr. Riggle suggested that the Board not accept any of these bids, but rather discussed the scope of the work. The estimated

additional cost is approximately \$60,000 to the total package, based on concrete work, credit for asphalt and the additional trees.

Board members discussed:

- Concerns with bids that are much higher than our estimates.
- Options Board members are comfortable with for parking lots.
- Storage building options.

Board members asked for clarification of the storage buildings projects.

In response to a Board member's question Dr. Ptak stated that it would cost a couple of thousand dollars per year for a POD.

Mr. Cozzi and Dr. Ptak explained the different projects and what is included in the total cost.

In response to a Board member's question Dr. Riggle stated that there may be an issue with using gravel, but the administration will check with the Village of Glenview.

A Board member stated that gravel may be a safety concern.

Mr. Cozzi replied to a Board member's question that we cannot move building A because there is not enough room.

Mr. Cozzi explained that the bid cost of the building is for a basic building, no water, no sewage. There are gas lines so that we will be able to provide heat in the future.

In response to a Board member's question Mr. Cozzi stated that there is enough electricity going to the building if in the future we purchase electric trucks.

The administration stated that our custodial staff will take care of internal wiring for electric.

Dr. Ptak reviewed the number of bids that we received for each of the projects and stated that they were competitive.

Board members reviewed the number of parking spots that we are short for both students and additional staff.

In response to a Board member's question Mr. Cozzi stated that he believes that these projects have been bid at the least expensive cost to the district. The specs were bare bones.

Mrs. Siena explained the funding model of capital projects and building allocations.

A Board member stated that the questions the Board needs to ask themselves are:

1. Is this a justified expense?
2. What is the effect on the budget?
3. Can we afford this?

A Board member stated that he thinks the administration has made a case for these projects.

A Board member stated that she likes the idea of doing all parking lots at once and believes it is safer for the students.

Dr. Riggle explained the administration's reasoning for the summer construction projects.

Mrs. Siena stated that we have a 10 year facility plan which is reviewed every year, and the administration is very aware of the funding of all the projects.

In response to a Board member's question Mr. Cozzi stated that he believes the higher than anticipated bids are based on an improving economy. His best guestimate is that postponing projects will most likely result in higher costs in the future.

Dr. Riggle stated that we are not asking the Board for action this evening. When the administration brings the projects back in April we will have answers on gravel and any possible reduction in the cost of the buildings. We will have more accurate numbers at that time.

Board members discussed:

- No cost savings for doing all the parking lot projects at once.
- The pros and cons of doing all the projects.
- It is hard to spend money on parking, we want to spend it on kids.
- Concern about the buildings contribution on parking lots.

Dr. Riggle stated a philosophical discussion is needed. In the past it was agreed that the building would be responsible for replacing their maintenance garages. The philosophical question

is if we want the district to pay for the maintenance garages at the schools.

A Board member stated that parking is a safety issue, and we need to keep this in mind. The only reason all the projects were bid was to see if we could save money.

The Board president stated that the Board may not come to consensus and may have to take a vote.

Dr. Ptak stated that the next step is to go to the Village with the projects that we are interested in.

The Board President stated that the philosophy of the Board has been that construction and capital expenditures were decided by the Board. He stated that the Board may wish to review the philosophy.

Dr. Riggle explained how the equity issue came about. Parking was not an immediate need at GBS when GBN redid their parking.

Dr. Ptak reviewed what the administration will bring back to the Board.

DISCUSSION/ACTION: APPROVAL OF FY14/15 GBS SMALL BUILDING PROJECT

Dr. Ptak reviewed the small building project timeline and stated that due to GBS' growing enrollment, a new construction project has been deemed necessary by the building administration. Next year we will require additional office space in the student services area at a cost of \$85,000.

Mr. Freund reviewed the proposed project which includes two new offices to accommodate the additional staff.

Dr. Wegley responded to a Board member's question that this puts us where we need to be to service 2900 students.

In response to Board members' questions Dr. Wegley stated that extended hours in student services will not solve the space issue and would not benefit the students.

Board consensus was to ask the administration to go out to bid.

DISCUSSION/ACTION: BUILDING OPERATING BUDGETS FY2015

Mrs. Siena reviewed the methodology used to calculate the building operating budget allocation which is based on two main factors:

- 1) Projected enrollment
- 2) Annual cost of living adjustment.

Mrs. Siena reviewed a list of historical building budget allocations since FY2005, overall percent change per year, and enrollment numbers. Mrs. Siena explained the significant changes to the building budgets over the years.

Mrs. Siena noted that the \$15,000 for the parking lot renovation has already been taken out of the GBS allotment. If the Board does not approve this project, the \$15K would go back into the building budget.

The administration clarified questions for a Board member regarding the breakdown of funds.

A Board member stated that the chart is very helpful.

In response to a Board member's question Dr. Pryma stated that the building budgets are still working, but getting much tighter.

Dr. Wegley stated that the building allocation is a formula driven budget that allows the buildings to prioritize the projects that need to be done.

In response to a Board member's question the administration assured the Board that safety issues are placed at the top of the project priority list.

Mrs. Siena stated that this item will go on the March 17th consent agenda.

In response to a Board member's question Mrs. Siena explained that the building budget is only one part of the total budget. She stated that the administration brings pieces of the budget to the Board in parts including: staffing, technology, capital outlay and building projects.

Mrs. Siena responded to a Board member's question by stating that the Board has the remaining 1 - 2% of the budget to see.

DISCUSSION/ACTION: APPROVAL OF CAPITAL OUTLAY REQUESTS

Dr. Ptak stated that each year the buildings prepare a list of capital outlay items to be purchased from the allotted building budgets that would exceed \$2,500.

The categories include:
District funded requests
GBN funded requests
GBS funded requests

Dr. Ptak stated that this year there is an additional category of GBS funded requests because of increased enrollment.

Dr. Ptak stated that items over \$20,000 will go out to bid and will be brought to the Board for approval. She stated that we typically get quotes for items under \$20,000.

Dr. Wegley responded to a Board member's question about the replacement of only one baritone saxophone and stated that there are tradeoffs we need to make.

A Board member thanked Dr. Ptak for detailed explanations of the requests.

The administration explained why projects are considered capital outlay under accounting rules.

A Board member stated that he would like to suggest a future agenda topic to review the building budgets and how enrollment will play into this.

Dr. Riggle explained that capital outlay is based on enrollment and reviewed the history of the building budget formula.

Dr. Wegley stated that the district is helping with enrollment driven projects.

Dr. Riggle stated this item will be placed on the consent agenda next week.

DISCUSSION/ACTION: REJECT FITNESS EQUIPMENT BIDS

Dr. Ptak stated that fitness equipment was purchased with referendum funds in 2008. The life expectancy of the equipment was 5-8 years. The replacement was built into the capital outlay plan, but because of the low trade-in value (10-13%) and the overall solid condition of the equipment, the administration is recommending that the fitness equipment bids be rejected.

In response to a Board member's question Dr. Ptak stated that the equipment is safe and in great condition.

Dr. Ptak replied to a Board member's question and reviewed the administration's decision to keep the current replacement

cycle through a lease rather than a yearly percentage replacement.

MOTION TO REJECT FITNESS EQUIPMENT BIDS

Motion by Mr. Boron, seconded by Mrs. Wilkas to reject the fitness equipment bids.

Upon calling of the roll:

aye: Boron, Doughty, Hanley, Martin, Shein, Taub, Wilkas

nay: none

Motion carried 7-0.

DISCUSSION/ACTION: APPROVAL OF FY 14/15 TECHNOLOGY BUDGET

Dr. Ptak stated that she has been working with Mr. Thimm, Dr. Riggle, and Mr. Bretag to develop the technology budget for FY 2014-15.

Dr. Ptak highlighted increases in the technology budget including the software & licensing account, the telecommunications/internet service account and the certified staff lease account.

Mr. Bretag reviewed the pricing and benefits of the new 1:1 Chromebook device recommended by the administration. He stated that the suggested device will have the durability and technology that we want and need.

Mr. Bretag reviewed test results of devices with 36 teachers relative to the proposed new teacher devices. He stated that 100% of teachers in the test loved the Lenovo Yoga and 96% liked the Mac.

Dr. Ptak stated that we are currently budgeted for a 3-year \$1 buyout lease and if we keep the device in the 4th year there would be a cost avoidance of \$210,000 in year four.

There were discussions among the Board and the administration regarding the pros and cons of different devices.

In response to a Board member's question Mr. Bretag stated that we are moving to one operating system.

Dr. Ptak stated that the technology equipment account includes an upgrade to our security camera systems. Dr. Ptak stated that she applied for a school safety grant that might pay

for approximately half of the project. She noted that when this item is brought to the Board she will know if we received the grant.

In response to a Board member's question, Mr. Thimm stated that the technology staff is currently addressing the issues of connectivity in and around the gyms.

Mr. Thimm explained the pros and cons of hotspot wireless using cell phones.

In response to a Board member's question Dr. Ptak explained the administration's reasoning for spending \$250,000 to upgrade the security camera system. The administration stated that we are currently in the RFP process, but when this item is brought back to the Board additional information will be provided for the Board's review.

Dr. Wegley responded to a Board member's question stating that we do have cameras outside of the buildings at both GBN and GBS.

DISCUSSION/ACTION: CHROMEBOOK BUSINESS MODEL

Dr. Riggle stated that Mr. Bretag has really shown great leadership with the Chromebook initiative.

Dr. Riggle stated that the administration has been discussing several devices for freshman that will provide equity for our students and reduce costs (i.e. graphing calculators and online textbooks).

Dr. Riggle stated that Mr. Bretag has been working with developers of different devices and the emerging device is the Lenovo Yoga. This would allow our teachers to have the same device as the students, but Lenovo hasn't given us pricing yet. We are estimating between \$275 to the low \$400's. The administration has partnered with other districts to leverage a price structure.

Dr. Riggle noted that when someone is exploring 1:1 they contact the Glenbrooks and Mr. Bretag.

Mr. Bretag stated that we have had 40 other districts come to learn about our 1:1 initiative. We are creating a valuable network.

Mr. Bretag stated that we do not have the pricing structure yet, but will be meeting in next couple of weeks with vendors to make sure that we select the correct device.

Mr. Bretag reviewed the devices. He explained that the operating system is Google and everything is in the cloud.

Mr. Bretag stated that the Lenovo would be insured for 4 years and is constructed with education in mind.

In response to a Board member's question Mr. Bretag stated that we will continue to review devices every year.

Mr. Bretag responded to a Board member's question regarding equity issues if the freshman will have "better" machines than the juniors by stating that there is a baseline that will be maintained.

Dr. Riggle stated that parents and students want to own their device. The students are much more invested when they own the machines. At the end of the lease we would like to give them the devices.

Dr. Ptak reviewed the current and proposed Chromebook models. She explained what the district would be expected to pay and what the families would be responsible for.

Dr. Ptak responded to a Board member's question and stated that the lease would be in the district's name.

Dr. Ptak stated that the administration is suggesting a 4-year lease and when the student graduates they would own the device.

In response to a Board member's question the administration stated that free and reduced students would also own the device after the 4 years as covered under Title I.

Dr. Riggle stated that the insurance will be more expensive and would be self-insurance for lower income students.

Dr. Riggle stated that if insurance is not mandated there may be some issues with broken machines and how that would affect the learning environment.

In response to a Board member's question the administration stated that other districts have different structures in place and have had no concerns.

The administration reviewed the current cost model and stated that hopefully we will be at the same price going forward.

Mr. Bretag responded to a Board member's question regarding any reduction in textbook costs by stating that there have been

significant changes, but the costs will adjust over the next five years.

Dr. Williamson stated that textbooks will be brought to the April 8th Board meeting and we may see some cost savings to the parents because of the Chromebook.

Mr. Bretag answered a Board member's question regarding why Loyola could go 100% eBooks and reviewed the pros and cons of our district following suit. He noted that we are being thoughtful.

Dr. Williamson stated that we are being considerate of textbook prices, but we are looking at what is best for our students.

Mr. Bretag stated that eBooks are currently being piloted at the Glenbrooks.

The Board stated that they are comfortable with a 4 year model.

Dr. Ptak explained that once a device is selected the administration will bring the business model to the Board for approval.

DISCUSSION/ACTION: TECHNOLOGY INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT

Dr. Riggle stated that Mr. Thimm has developed a consortium, the Northfield Township Technology Consortium (NTTC), in which the local school districts and other governmental entities can share resources for greater utility and economic efficiency. The first effort will be able to share internet resources with the other members of the consortium at substantially lower rates than the current members are paying.

Mr. Thimm stated that to formalize the NTTC, an Intergovernmental Agreement has been crafted that is to be approved and signed by all participating entities. This will also serve as documentation for reimbursement for all participants from E-rate. Mr. Thimm reviewed the cost savings and benefits to both our district as well as our feeder districts. The Intergovernmental Agreement was developed with Mr. Petrarca.

A Board member questioned the wording on how the district will be reimbursed.

Mr. Thimm stated that he will update the agreement to meet the Board member's suggestion.

In response to a Board member's question Mr. Thimm explained why these are the only entities we are working with right now.

Mr. Thimm reviewed the cost options and stated that our intent is to reduce cost and increase bandwidth.

In response to a Board member's question, Mr. Thimm stated that the reliability is the same with all the vendors.

Mr. Thimm, in response to a Board member's question, stated that it is hard to estimate how much bandwidth we will use next year. He stated that we can upgrade in the future, but the question is at what cost.

Mr. Thimm stated that once we commit to these levels there are contracts that must be considered.

Dr. Riggle stated that our technology budget includes the total cost of the bandwidth with no one sharing the cost.

Dr. Riggle stated that in the near future Mr. Thimm will need to make a commitment with the vendors.

Board members asked clarifying questions.

Board consensus was to move forward with the agreement.

DISCUSSION/ACTION: BOARD ORGANIZATION MEETING

Dr. Williamson stated that Board Policy requires the date of the organizational meeting be established at the March Board meeting. At that meeting the Board will set meeting dates and elect officers. She proposed that the organizational meeting be held on May 12.

The Board discussed the best date to hold the organizational meeting. Board consensus was May 12.

DISCUSSION/ACTION: PROCEDURE OF RELEASE OF NON-TENURED TEACHERS

Dr. Caliendo outlined the purpose and procedure for the release of non-tenured teachers. He stated that non-tenured teachers must be released at least 45 days before the last student day which is June 6, 2014. It is likely that some of the teachers who will be released on April 8 will be re-employed after we have more information later this spring.

Dr. Riggle stated that Dr. Caliendo does not have numbers of teachers tonight, because he is currently working with the principals, but will have numbers at the next meeting.

Dr. Riggle suggested that on April 8th we schedule a special meeting at 6:30 p.m. to discuss specifics.

Mrs. Hanley stated that she will come after the GSO meeting.

The administration answered questions regarding the process.

No action is required this evening.

MISCELLANEOUS TOPICS

Dr. Riggle stated that the demographers will be at our next meeting. He stated that one demographer has to catch a flight so he needs to be put at the beginning of the agenda.

The Board discussed moving public comment after both demographers.

Board consensus was to have the demographers' presentations and then public comment.

A Board member asked Ms. Geddeis to let the press know the change in the agenda.

Ms. Geddeis stated that she will not present students and staff who excel at that meeting.

Dr. Riggle stated that the demographers' reports will be in the Board packets on Thursday.

The Board and administration discussed what the process should be going forward regarding enrollment.

Dr. Riggle stated in response to a Board member's question that building a 3rd level at GBS is not a solution.

A Board member asked what the compelling issue is to have this resolved by June.

Dr. Riggle stated that he is trying to manage the community's uneasiness.

A Board member stated that as a district we cannot guarantee the community anything in the long run, because demographers cannot guarantee their numbers.

Dr. Riggle stated that he is looking for direction from the Board to fulfill this initiative.

The Board discussed the importance of having a deliberate process.

The Board retreat was scheduled for Wed. April 16th 6:00 p.m.
- 10 p.m. at GBN.

MOTION TO MOVE INTO CLOSED SESSION

Motion by Mr. Boron, seconded by Mrs. Wilkas to move into closed session at approximately 11:23 p.m. to consider the appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of specific employees of the public body or legal counsel for the public body, including hearing testimony on a complaint lodged against an employee of the public body or against legal counsel for the public body to determine its validity; collective negotiating matters between the public body and its employees or their representatives, or deliberations concerning salary schedules for one or more classes of employees. (Section 2(c) (1), (2) of the Open Meeting Act.)

Upon calling of the roll:

aye: Boron, Doughty, Hanley, Martin, Shein, Taub, Wilkas

Nay: none

Motion carried 7-0.

The Board returned to open session at 11:53 p.m.

ACTION REGARDING MATTERS DISCUSSED IN CLOSED SESSION

Motion by Mr. Boron, seconded by Mrs. Hanley to approve the extension of the GESPA contract for one year.

Upon calling of the roll:

aye: Boron, Doughty, Hanley, Martin, Shein, Taub, Wilkas

nay: none

Motion carried 7-0.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Mr. Boron, seconded by Mrs. Hanley to adjourn the meeting at approximately 11:54 p.m.

Upon call for a vote on the motion, all present voted aye.*

Motion carried 7-0.

* Boron, Doughty, Hanley, Martin, Shein, Taub, Wilkas

CERTIFIED TO BE CORRECT:

PRESIDENT - BOARD OF EDUCATION

SECRETARY - BOARD OF EDUCATION

UPCOMING BOARD MEETINGS:

Upcoming meetings will be held at
Glenbrook North High School
Library
2300 Shermer Road
Northbrook, IL 60062

| | | |
|------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|
| Monday, March 17, 2014 | 7:00 p.m. | Regular Board Meeting |
| Tuesday, April 8, 2014 | 7:00 p.m. | Regular Board Meeting |
| Wed., April 16, 2014 | 6:00 p.m. | Special Board Meeting |
| Monday, April 28, 2014 | 7:00 p.m. | Regular Board Meeting |