

**MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING  
BOARD OF EDUCATION  
SCHOOL DISTRICT #225, COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS  
March 14, 2011**

A regular meeting of the Board of Education, School District No. 225 was held on Monday, March 14, 2011, at approximately 7:01 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:

Hammer, Martin, Shein, Taub, Wolfson

Absent: Boron, Regalbuto

Also present: Caliendo, Finan, Freund, Geddeis, Pryma, Riggle, Siena, Wegley, Williamson

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA FOR THIS MEETING**

Motion by Mr. Wolfson, seconded by Mr. Martin to approve the agenda for this meeting.

Upon calling of the roll:

aye: Hammer, Martin, Shein, Taub, Wolfson

nay: none

Motion carried 5-0.

**RECOGNITION OF COMMUNITY VISITORS**

None.

**BOARD AND SUPERINTENDENT REPORTS**

Dr. Riggle reported that the Glenbrook Special Olympics team competing at the State level had a great start. The team received an enthusiastic send-off from both schools. Two male teams and one female team competed. The male teams finished in 3<sup>rd</sup> & 4<sup>th</sup> place. The female team took a 4<sup>th</sup> place finish.

Dr. Riggle reported on the Techny concert held on Sunday. This was a collaboration of choir groups from both schools.

Mr. Wolfson also commented on the outstanding performance.

Mr. Hammer provided an update on NSSED. The NSSED budget was trimmed to reduce the deficit. There is some thought about increasing tuition rate. NSSED may move to a menu-driven system which would be more responsive to the end-users while saving costs.

Mr. Taub attended a meeting at the Northbrook Village Hall on Saturday. There was an expert from Denver discussing pension reform at the meeting. The village hall was packed with teachers and former teachers. From Mr. Taub's perspective, there is misdirected anger at municipal workers. Whether teachers are making too much or too little, they are working the contract they signed. They earned their pension for their 30 or 40 years of service. The State hasn't funded this obligation in the past several years. The State didn't invest pension dollars as they were supposed to. There are states that are going after current pension recipients. States are attacking C.O.L.A. adjustments. There are people rushing to take their pensions before they are taken away.

**MOTION TO APPROVE CONSENT AGENDA**

Motion by Mr. Hammer, seconded by Mr. Wolfson to approve the following items on the consent agenda including the revision to the 2011-2012 fee document holding the GBN Pre-school tuition fee at the same level as last year.

- 1.) a. no certified appointments
- b. the appointment of the following educational support staff contained in the Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources memorandum

**APPOINTMENTS**

<b><u>NAME</u></b>	<b><u>POSITION</u></b>	<b><u>EFFECTIVE</u></b>	<b><u>SCHOOL</u></b>
Bourne, Eileen (Repl. N. Maute)	Clerical	08.08.11	GBN
Nelson, Jill (Repl. J. Mackey)	Instructional Assistant	03.03.11	GBN
Paziouros, Vickie (New Position)	Instructional Assistant	03.02.11	GBOC

2.) a. the resignations of the following certificated staff:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>EFFECTIVE</u>	<u>SCHOOL</u>
Dolan, Erin	Teacher, Math	06.13.11	GBN
Malis, Gregory	Teacher, Math	06.13.11	GBN
Nicholson, Alma	Teacher, English	06.13.11	GBN

b. no educational support resignations/terminations

3.) no FOIA

4.) no Vendor bills

5.) the reimbursement of the Revolving Fund for Employees for the month of February in the amount of \$20,362.78 represented by checks No. 6337, 6343 through 6398, 6458 through 6459, 6461 through 6495, and 6515 through 6531.

The reimbursement of the Revolving Fund for Vendors for the month of February in the amount of \$215,425.19 represented by checks No. 6338 through 6342, 6399 through 6454, 6456 through 6457, 6460, 6496 through 6514, and 6532 through 6579. Checks issued in February voided in February: No.6337, 6351, 6376, 6410, 6419, 6453, 6535 and 6571. Check issued in previous months, voided in February: No. 5765 & 6051.

6.) the Technology Committee Meeting minutes from February 28, 2011, the Open Session Minutes from the February 28, 2011 Regular Board Meeting and the Facility Committee Meeting from March 8, 2011.

7.) the Student Fees for 2011-2012 School Year as contained in the revised consent agenda item # 5.7.

8.) Board Policy 8030 - School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services and Board Policy and Procedure 8235 - Food Allergy Management Program as contained in consent agenda item # 5.8.

9.) the request for Girls' Lacrosse Trip as contained in consent agenda item # 5.9.

10.) the request for Boys' Lacrosse Trip as contained in consent agenda item # 5.9.

11.) the GBS Business Professionals of America National Competition trip as contained in consent agenda item # 5.11.

Upon calling of the roll:

aye: Hammer, Martin, Shein, Taub, Wolfson

nay: none

Motion carried 5-0.

**DISCUSSION/ACTION: BOARD ORGANIZATION MEETING**

Dr. Williamson referenced Board Policy 2010, Organization of the Board of Education, which requires that at the March meeting each year the organizational meeting of the Board will be established.

Dr. Williamson explained that at this organizational meeting the Board must swear in and seat new Board members, elect officers and set the Board's regular meeting schedule.

The meeting designated as the organizational meeting is Monday, May 2. This is within the window of time following the election that begins no earlier than Tuesday, April 26, and ends no later than Tuesday, May 3.

The Board discussed the date for the organizational meeting.

Dr. Riggle mentioned that we will bring the 2012-2013 school calendar to the Board on April 11. The Board will establish regular Board meeting dates on May 2 for 2011-2012 and for 2012-2013.

(See Agenda Item #6)

**DISCUSSION/ACTION: PROCEDURES FOR RELEASE OF NON-TENURED TEACHERS**

Dr. Caliendo reviewed the memo regarding the process of releasing non-tenured teachers. The resolutions are included in the materials. Certified releases will take place next week. Non-certified releases will come in the near future.

Mr. Martin asked if a decision would be made by the Board regarding granting tenure for new teachers in the same night that the Board would see for the first time the list of teachers being recommended for tenure. He asked if there would be a description of the individuals recommended for tenure.

Dr. Caliendo explained that this was the same procedure used last year and that the Board would be provided a list of names, but there would not be descriptions of each individual.

Mr. Wegley stated that once teachers reach their fourth year of teaching, the principals and Instructional Supervisors are confident in their level of teaching. More often, if non-tenured teachers are not performing, they are released in the first couple of years.

Dr. Caliendo explained that those teachers reaching tenure are individuals who have performed at a consistently positive level during their time in the Glenbrooks.

Mr. Shein mentioned that the Board received a historical report regarding the percentage of teachers reaching tenure and requested that report relative to the group that started at the same time as the 21 teachers who would be recommended for tenure.

(See Agenda Item #7)

**DISCUSSION/ACTION: .22 GBN MAINTENANCE FTE INCREASE**

Mrs. Siena explained that the GBN maintenance team will be assigned to provide maintenance support at 3801 West Lake. This is not cleaning work, but includes things such as HVAC and plumbing. The reason we are coming forward now is that we need to make this transition over the summer.

Mr. Shein asked if we are talking about an individual employee increasing by 0.22 FTE.

Mrs. Siena explained that a current employee is going from a 0.78 to 1.0 FTE.

Mr. Shein asked if this is something that the Board must act on tonight.

Mrs. Siena indicated that she would like the Board to take action at this meeting.

Dr. Riggle stated that this could be placed on consent at the next meeting.

This item will be placed on consent for March 21.

(See Agenda Item #8)

**DISCUSSION/ACTION: DISTRICT COMMUNICAITON PLAN**

Dr. Riggle introduced Ms. Geddeis to review the Communication Plan. Ms. Geddeis thanked the Board and members of the Communications Committee for their support.

3/14/11

Ms. Geddeis stated that JT (Jasculca/Terman) had many different recommendations, but had five priorities:

Infrastructure, website, media relations, content development, and opinion leader outreach.

Ms. Geddeis reviewed findings from the parent survey. Website and calendar are the biggest issues cited. Ms. Geddeis summarized findings from the staff and student surveys.

Ms. Geddeis reviewed the goals of the Communication Plan. Each goal has a measureable objective and specific metrics that will be used to show achievement of the goal. Data gathered to measure each goal will include administering surveys of community, parents, staff and students following the completion of plan implementation.

Ms. Geddeis will present the Board with an annual report with progress regarding the plan.

Mr. Taub questioned why it will take three years to accomplish all of the goals of the plan.

Ms. Geddeis stated that year-one is front loaded with many action items. There are not many projects in the third year.

Mr. Hammer asked about the distinction between Ms. Geddeis' role and the role of the assistant as outlined in the Communication Plan.

Ms. Geddeis stated that she would envision 50% of the assistant's role relating to website development and maintenance.

Dr. Riggle stated that this person would be a digital-based person, but would also help cover events. This gives the District more people in the field collecting and getting information out. Currently, there is a clerical person as the assistant who is not working in this capacity.

Mr. Martin asked if option one is the desired option.

Dr. Riggle stated that this is the desired FTE. The concern is if the position is less, then there may be a greater level of turnover.

Mr. Martin asked about the 0.4 FTE in clerical that would be absorbed by the schools which the former clerical person performed.

Mr. Martin stated that it appears that we are going from about a 0.5 person, increasing to a 0.92 position. He asked if there were other resources currently available to address the Board's concern regarding communication in the district.

Dr. Riggle explained that between special education and public relations, there was a combined FTE of 1.8. If the new assistant position comes in at a 0.92, then it is an increase of 0.12.

Board members debated the need for a 0.92 FTE position. Board members from the Communications Committee spoke in support of this level of FTE.

Mr. Hammer stated that proposals were solicited from three contractors to make the website better. We need to solve website and calendaring.

Ms. Geddeis stated that the calendar is something that we may be able to fix sooner. This could be done with iCal or Google calendar. This would then morph into the new website.

Mr. Martin asked if the Board didn't approve this position at the recommended level, would the website get done.

Ms. Geddeis stated that the website would still get done because she would tackle this.

Mr. Shein asked about the person that was hired to work the website.

Dr. Riggle stated that there is technical support and a technical person who helps work with staff to update the website. Dr. Riggle stated there have been three criticisms of the website - calendar, navigation and content. Minimally, we would need a 0.78 in the position that supports Ms. Geddeis. The Communications Committee has advocated for a 0.92 FTE. It would be wrong to move forward with the old skill set.

Mr. Wolfson asked if the Board needed to approve the Communication Plan tonight.

Dr. Riggle stated that this did not need to be approved at this meeting.

Mr. Shein stated that the Board is often asked to approve these kinds of things and there is a small FTE and dollar amount. There are so many of these small things that add up to the 85% of budget that goes towards salary. Mr. Shein expressed concern about the bigger picture of the total budget and would like to consider what our budget will look like in the next few years.

Mr. Shein referenced the first goal, positive perceptions, and stated that this should be the result of doing something well. The positive perceptions are the outcome we want, but he expressed concern about stating it as the goal.

The Board debated the language and intent of goal one.

The Board debated the need for the 0.92 FTE to support the Director of PR.

Dr. Riggle stated that there is not a line in the sand with this plan. We want unity in putting this plan forward.

Dr. Riggle stated that the salary range for the new assistant position is different and is lower than a website developer. This is in the range of the trainer of others in technology. Within the structure, this is not a web developer. If it is a 0.78 FTE, we can we make it work. We want to reach a comfort level with the Board in moving forward with the Communication Plan.

Mr. Shein suggested that next week the plan come back for a vote.

Dr. Riggle asked the Board if they would like to see revisions in the plan before next week. He stated that we can carry this into April, if needed.

Ms. Geddeis commented that the Board seems fairly comfortable with the plan, but needs to continue to discuss the staffing. She suggested separating the discussion of the staffing from the plan, itself.

Dr. Riggle stated what needs to be approved is the staffing level. Concerns regarding the Communication Plan should be passed on to Dr. Riggle between now and next week.

Mr. Shein stated that he intends to support the recommendation of the administration. He would like to see this item come for a vote next time.

Dr. Riggle asked the Board about revising the first goal.

The Board debated the order of the goals and the wording of the first goal.

(See Agenda Item #9)

**DISCUSSION/ACTION: 2011/2012 CAPITAL OUTLAY REQUESTS**

Dr. Riggle introduced Dr. Ptak who worked with Associate Principals, John Finan (GBN) and Gary Freund (GBS) regarding



capital outlay requests. Both GBN and GBS are asking for snow plow trucks. One of GBN's trucks is in need of replacement. These capital outlay requests are part of their normal building budget allocation.

Mr. Hammer asked about the difference in trucks requested by GBN and GBS.

Dr. Ptak explained the differences based upon the needs at each school.

(See Agenda Item #10)

**DISCUSSION/ACTION: MECHANICAL BIDS**

Dr. Ptak opened bids on February 16. Two mechanical bids were withdrawn because of errors in the bids. Dr. Ptak asked the Board to formally reject the bids.

(See Agenda Item #11)

**MOTION TO REJECT MECHANICAL BIDS**

Motion by Mr. Wolfson, seconded by Mr. Taub to reject the mechanical bids.

Upon calling of the roll:

aye: Hammer, Martin, Shein, Taub, Wolfson

nay: none

Motion carried 5-0.

**DISCUSSION/ACTION: APPROVAL OF SUMMER 2011 CONSTRUCTION BIDS**

Dr. Ptak stated that the summer construction bids came in \$185,000 over projected cost. This represents roughly 2% over projections. Projects include life safety and infrastructure using Build America Bonds. These projects were discussed at the Facility Committee meeting. Dr. Ptak stated that we are asking the Board to approve \$7.8M in projects with a place holder for the main gym air handler at GBN which will be deferred until the summer of 2012 due to the wide cost range from \$385K to \$600K. In addition, the Voice over IP estimated at \$275K will also serve as a placeholder. The Board is asked not accept the GBN solar panel bid on the swimming pool because Build American Bonds cannot be used for this purpose.

Dr. Riggle suggested with the amount of money being spent, this item will be back for Discussion/Action at the next Board meeting.

(See Agenda Item #12)

**DISCUSSION/ACTION: APPROVAL OF ALTERNATE BID: GBN BACK GYM  
BATHROOM CONVERSION**

Dr. Ptak discussed the bid for the GBN back gym bathroom conversion as an alternate. The estimate of \$200K came in at \$150K. The consensus of the Facility Committee was that the alternate bid be approved.

This bid will also be placed as a Discussion/Action agenda item for next week.

(See Agenda Item #13)

**DISCUSSION/ACTION: LIGHTING RETROFIT PERFORMANCE CONTRACT**

Dr. Riggle stated that Mr. Taub brought up concerns regarding lighting. Mr. Taub's suggestion was to look at LED bulbs rather than T-8 bulbs because of increased energy savings.

Dr. Ptak explained that the cost per lamp is much higher for an LED bulb. The upfront cost of the lamp is \$40 compared to \$3.00. The cost of labor to adjust wiring would also need to be determined. Major manufacturers have not gotten into LED bulbs. The major manufacturers may move that way, but not for a few years. LED presents concerns about lighting consistency. We may need an increased amount of fixtures to obtain the same lighting coverage that is consistent with recommendations for classrooms.

Mr. Taub explained his rationale for suggesting that LED lighting be considered. He knows of a contractor who fits schools with LED lighting and cited information regarding energy savings with LED. The district is committed to green solutions.

Mike Sauer from ARCON suggested having further conversations with Mr. Taub's sources.

Mr. Shein asked about the timing relative to the risk of meeting the grant deadline.

Dr. Ptak explained that with regard to timing, the administration wanted to bring this project to the Board in October 2011. However, we must have this project completed by April 15 to obtain the significant incentive provided in the grant. As a result, this proposal is being brought to the Board at this time as part of a performance contract with Siemens. The cost to the district is \$50K after a rebate of \$29K.

The Board debated the calculation of energy savings if the LED option is pursued.

Mr. Shein suggested that the Board approve this, but give the administration the latitude to pursue the LED option.

Dr. Riggle expressed concern about the Lyceum changing to this type of light.

Principal Wegley stated that the coverage piece is the question.

Mr. Wolfson asked if there was sufficient time to pursue the LED option.

Dr. Ptak stated that there was not time given that it would take 2-3 weeks to obtain the bulbs and the deadline for installation is April 15.

Mr. Hammer stated that we will save money, regardless. This is something worth studying for the future.

Principal Wegley asked if there is a school in the area that has LED lighting so that a site visit could be conducted. Dr. Riggle stated that we have one week.

President Shein stated that the manufacturers of LED lighting are not well known players - what is our organizational risk in proceeding?

The Board debated the next steps.

Dr. Riggle suggested that we will need to replace lights in the future and the LED option can be considered at that time. The current proposal results in a 3.5 year pay-back, which is one of the best that we have had.

Mr. Shein stated that he would abstain from voting on this item because he is a Siemens employee.

(See Agenda Item #14)

**MOTION TO APPROVE LIGHTING RETROFIT PERFORMANCE CONTRACT**

Motion by Mr. Hammer, seconded by Mr. Wolfson to approve the lighting performance contract with Siemens.

Upon calling of the roll:

aye: Hammer, Martin, Taub, Wolfson

nay: none

abstentions: Shein

Motion carried 4-0.

**MISCELLANEOUS TOPICS**

Dr. Riggle mentioned that on Thursday committee work will be completed at the State legislative level. After this time we can talk about pension reform and what is on the docket for consolidation. By next Monday we can have a more reasonable discussion of these topics.

**REVIEW AND SUMMARY OF BOARD MEETING**

NSSSED is working on their budget deficit which is down \$750K.

On May 2 the Board will have an organizational meeting.

At the next meeting the Board will receive the list of non-tenured teachers for release.

The Communication Plan will come back next time.

Capital outlay will all come back for a vote. Item 13 will come back also.

The Board approved the lighting retrofit for the performance contract with Siemens.

Future Meetings are March 21 and April 11.

**MOTION TO MOVE INTO CLOSED SESSION**

Motion by Mr. Martin, seconded by Mr. Taub to move into closed session at approximately 9:27 p.m. to consider student disciplinary cases; and litigation, when an action against, affecting or on behalf of the particular public body has been filed and is pending before a court or administrative tribunal, or when the public body finds that an action is probable or imminent, in which case the basis for the finding shall be recorded and entered into the minutes of the closed meeting. (Section 2(c) (1), (2), (5), (6), (9), (10) and (11) of the Open Meeting Act).

Upon calling of the roll:

aye: Hammer, Martin, Shein, Taub, Wolfson

Nay: none

Motion carried 5-0.

The Board returned to open session at 10:08 p.m.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Motion by Mr. Wolfson, seconded by Mr. Taub to adjourn the meeting at approximately 10:08 p.m.

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

Motion carried 5-0.

\* Hammer, Martin, Shein, Taub, Wolfson

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 21, 2011 7:00 p.m. Regular Board Meeting

Monday, April 11, 2011 7:00 p.m. Regular Board Meeting