

**NEW LENOX SCHOOL DISTRICT 122  
BOARD OF EDUCATION SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES  
102 SOUTH CEDAR ROAD, NEW LENOX, IL 60451  
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2018  
5:00 P.M.**

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by President Pender at 5:00 p.m.

2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The pledge of allegiance was led by Miss Pender.

3. **ROLL CALL**

The following Board members were present: Member Adair, Member Haring, Member Pender, Member Rosenfeld, Member Starklauf and Member Swallow.

Absent: Member Rush.

4. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment.

5. **PROGRAM PLANNING**

**ELA Adoption**

Dr. Cucci gave an overview of the proposed plans for the upcoming English Language Arts Adoption for grades K-8. She went over the ELA Textbook Adoption Timeline that was presented in February of last year, with the timeline beginning with ELA Committee meetings in the Fall of 2016. She noted the current Storytown series was adopted in 2008, and the Junior high literature book is from 2001, which are both out of print. She stated the Committee researched many reading programs, requested a vast sample of materials, and scheduled vendor presentations from several selected vendors. The rationale for adopting a new ELA program was that the current programs were pre-Common Core and not aligned with the new standards. Dr. Cucci added the current books were no longer available, and the teachers had been supplementing to meet the standards. After much research, the Committee decided on the ReadyGen program for K-5 and the myPerspectives program for grades 6-8. Dr. Cucci noted there was an unheard of number of 36 teachers who volunteered to pilot the programs this year. She added they all did a great job and provided invaluable and candid feedback.

Member Rush joined the meeting at 5:09 p.m.

Dr. Cucci provided the Board with samples of materials for the 2 new series. She shared ReadyGen is a K-5 integrated literacy program that accelerates learning for all by presenting modeled reading experiences with authentic text. She added students engage in practice, build motivation, and improve their reading stamina. She added the program resources include: 12 full-length authentic literary and informational texts at every grade level; text collections that include poetry, primary sources, and biographies; Sleuth, which is a collection of short, high-interest reading selections to sharpen students' critical thinking skills; and an ongoing assessment that is embedded to monitor student progress. ReadyGen will develop literacy skills such as: close reading practice; generative vocabulary format that presents words in clusters and not in isolation; foundational skills that are integrated into the instruction and text; and writing that is taught everyday through a gradual release method.

Dr. Cucci shared that in the myPerspectives program for grades 6-8: students read classic contemporary fiction and nonfiction texts and view/listen to media selections all related to an essential question; make connections to other content areas such as social studies, science, math, arts, and current events; and are prepared for standardized tests such as the PARCC and PSAT by helping students break down and analyze complex readings, building their vocabulary utilizing generative strategies, promoting student confidence and ownership in their learning, and giving students practice with online assessments. She added myPerspectives will develop literacy skills such as: close

reading; annotation; writing; argumentative, informative/explanatory, and narrative; and language development through concept vocabulary and conventions practice tasks.

Dr. Cucci stated there were other factors considered in choosing the programs which included change, pacing, assessments, and materials. For ReadyGen, the materials to be purchased would include: text collections; classroom libraries; foundational skills manipulatives; skills workbooks; digital access; teacher materials; intervention resources; and reader's and writer's journals. Materials for myPerspectives would include: 6-year digital license; 6-year print resources; and teacher programs. She added professional development will be provided to teachers for both series. Dr. Cucci stated the total expense for the 2 series would be \$460,000, to be spread over 2 fiscal years, and has already been budgeted for. She noted the cost includes \$80,000 for ELA consumables that is typical and already budgeted yearly. She noted the cost is much less than what it should be because of the \$310,000 in free materials the pilot teachers have already received from the vendor, which is unheard of.

Dr. Cucci presented an iMovie which showed testimonies from students and teachers who piloted the new programs over the past year.

Member Rosenfeld noted the digital component of the new series and stated that research shows that students still need actual books to succeed. Dr. Cucci replied the new programs will use a blend of technology and actual books, depending on the particular activity, day, and student. Member Adair commended Dr. Cucci on her great presentation, and appreciated the testimonies. He asked why we weren't sticking with what we are already doing. Dr. Cucci replied the teachers were feeling the current series were missing components from the Common Core standards, with too much supplementing having to fill in the gaps, and scores not being what they wanted. She added the new series have all the components in one place. Dr. Manville added the new programs are much more rigorous. Member Adair asked if the cost covers all the classrooms. Dr. Cucci replied yes, even Kindergarten which sometimes is not included in an adoption. Member Adair asked how much training would be involved. Dr. Cucci replied the pilot teachers have already been trained, and will be a great resource to the other teachers. She added official training will begin in April, with follow up training in September and on institute days. Member Starklauf asked if the new programs provided for differentiation. Dr. Cucci replied there are differentiation strategies and intervention materials provided. Member Adair asked if the students could take materials home. Dr. Cucci replied all the materials will be available online through PowerSchool. Member Swallow asked if the lessons were structured similarly to Storytown. Dr. Cucci replied there will still be a workbook, but with a different feel and strategy. Member Adair asked if we still teach cursive. Dr. Cucci replied we still teach cursive, but not as part of ELA. Member Starklauf asked if this will work with the reading skills classes in the Junior Highs. Dr. Cucci replied the reading seminar classes will still include the current strategies and add cross-over things from the new program, studying scope and sequence as we go. She noted one of the pilot teachers was a reading seminar teacher. Member Adair asked if the new programs would help with PARCC. Dr. Cucci replied yes, hands down. Member Adair asked if the ELA area needed more focus than other disciplines such as math. Dr. Cucci replied the District looks at all areas annually. She added we added to the math programs in 2015 and 2016. She added ELA has been on the radar for a long time. Dr. Manville stated we are on a cycle and typically look at every content area about every 7 years or so, depending on need. She added we are looking for a kick in our reading scores, and the program is good common sense. Dr. Cucci noted we looked at the science program after the new standards came out, and added more materials and activities to meet the new standards. Member Haring asked if we would have any issues with not having 1:1 iPad at all the grades yet. Dr. Cucci replied the teachers will manage, by dividing the classrooms up and borrowing from neighboring classrooms. Member Haring asked if the block schedules at the Junior Highs would affect anything. Dr. Cucci replied the teachers will pace accordingly. Member Haring asked why we wouldn't phase this in, and would 5<sup>th</sup> graders have to play catch up for the past 4 years. Dr. Cucci replied the pilot teachers have been extremely helpful with this, and there are many pre-educational materials and activities online to fill in any gaps, especially with grammar. Member Haring asked how the new program ties in with Lincoln-Way. Dr. Cucci replied we have great vertical teams with Lincoln-Way, with the LW teachers coming in March to observe our teachers. She added we have a great relationship with the Lincoln-Way department heads and teachers. Member Haring asked if it was still possible to do novels. Dr. Cucci replied the new series provide a great balance using novels, and the teachers can still incorporate their favorite novels into the new curriculum. Member Rush stated he appreciated that the pilot teachers would be able to help the other teachers learn the new series.

Dr. Manville stated the approval to vote on the new ELA series would be at the February Board meeting. Dr. Cucci stated the advantage to voting at the February meeting would be the ability to order the materials as early as

possible. Member Adair thanked Dr. Cucci for her great enthusiasm for curriculum. Member Rosenfeld added she was also dazzled by Dr. Cucci's enthusiasm.

#### Kindergarten Spanish Program

Dr. Cucci shared the history of the Spanish program at the Kindergarten level, noting it was an enrichment program with good exposure of Spanish to the students. She added the original goal was to expand Spanish to grades 1-3, but because of how costly it would be, the District has not been able to expand the program. She stated the rationale to eliminate the Kindergarten program is because we cannot expand it beyond Kindergarten, and it would take up too much time with the new ReadyGen ELA program starting. Dr. Cucci stated the recommendation would be to eliminate the Kindergarten Spanish program. She added the District would still continue with Spanish Quest, the after school Spanish enrichment program offered at the primary and intermediate buildings. She added the Junior Highs also offer Spanish as an elective. Member Starklauf added students who take Spanish in junior high can start at Spanish II when they go to high school. Member Pender added the Spanish programs at the junior highs are outstanding. Dr. Cucci noted the Kindergarten teachers will still add some Spanish instruction into their teaching.

#### Technology Update

Dr. Manville stated Mr. White would be updating the Board on the District's approved instructional plan depicting the use of the new technology equipment. She added he would also be presenting the Board with a new document, the 10-year Technology Budget. This chart will be a document that will be shown every 6 months, and will be used as a benchmark for future boards.

Mr. White shared with the Board the ERATE Grant projects planned for the Summer of 2018, which are reimbursed at a rate of 40% with ERATE funds. The proposed plans would include upgrading the internet bandwidth by about four times and upgrading the wide area network, the service that connects all the buildings together. He added the time line for ERATE is: the bids go out in November and come back in January; the projects are talked about in February; the decisions are sent to the FCC in March; and the 40% reimbursement comes back in August or September. He added there is some risk, because the projects are done over the summer, with the reimbursement coming in after. Dr. Manville added this is typically what we have done over the past years. Mr. White stated the additional ERATE projects would also include upgrading the junior highs with more wireless access which would include adding 41 new wireless access points and adding the corresponding cabling. Member Adair asked why we would need more access points. Mr. White replied that the additional access points are needed to accommodate the additional devices (iPads and apps) that we are adding each year. Dr. Manville noted Mr. White does a great job of assessing and looking at our usage and estimating what the District would need and not going overboard.

Mr. White stated the District needed an upgrade and conversion to the current Phone System. He noted it has been five years since we added the new phone system, and the software is getting old with the district being 2 – 3 upgrades behind. He added the majority of the cost is for the engineer to push out the updates in the right way. Mr. White stated he hoped to get some cost savings by reducing the number of lines. He added he would also need to convert how the phones communicate with each other. Mr. White recommended updating the current phone system in order to get another 3 – 5 years out of it.

Mr. White updated the Board on the next phase of the iPad Purchase plan. He noted the Summer 2018 plan would include: giving each teacher an iPad; getting 1:1 devices for 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> grades; and upgrades for 600 devices. He added the 2019+ plan would include 1:1 expansion of devices for 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grades, and keeping staff and student devices current and the infrastructure updated. He shared a chart with the Board that depicted the technology devices refresh and the 1:1 multi-year plan. He noted the plan would include purchasing the devices outright.

Member Starklauf asked what would be the benefit of teachers having an iPad and a laptop. Mr. White replied we only have a few spare iPads in the tech office. Dr. Cucci added that some of the apps require the teacher to run and supervise the app from their own iPad. Mr. White added that some apps can only be run by an iPad. Member Starklauf added she thought the teachers could get away with having only iPads. Dr. Manville noted in 2021, the District could decide if the teachers really need their laptops, or maybe would need a device yet to be determined. Member Rosenfeld asked if we could restructure the current lease to drop the laptops if it isn't the best choice. Dr. Manville replied as things are rapidly evolving, the laptops may become obsolete, but now the teachers are still

using them. She added we really need to wait and see what happens after the teachers get their iPads. She noted in a year we can look at the plan and revise it if needed. Dr. Manville added it is very important to have a long range plan for technology. Member Rosenfeld asked is there a number the District is looking at in regards to all the items in the budget such as the new ELA adoption, the technology additions, and the capital project improvements. Dr. Manville replied yes there is a limit that is being discussed behind the scenes all the time. She added it is important for the Board to be aware of what the annual costs are for a District of this size and level, and what is coming up. She added the District is always prioritizing. Mr. Groos replied everything that is being discussed tonight is in the five-year forecast. He added the curriculum adoption is already budgeted for over the next two years. He added the technology purchases are also included in the budget. Mr. Groos stated the purpose of the five-year forecast is to account for all the various projects, the variables, the staff, benefit changes, technology, programs, adoptions, and needs and compare them to the revenue sources and come up with a balanced budget. Member Rosenfeld asked are we spending for things because they are in the budget or are we spending because they are necessary things. Member Starklauf replied that is why we look at it every six months. Member Rosenfeld asked what happened to the money saved on the roofs. Mr. Groos replied the money is put back into the budget and the five-year forecast is adjusted. Dr. Manville added we only put in the budget what the needs are, and the needs are what drives what is in the five-year forecast. Member Starklauf noted that if the Board decided not to do 1:1 devices or not to add a position, the savings would go back into the five-year forecast. Mr. Groos stated yearly he goes around to everyone in the District and asks what the needs are, and if the revenue is there, those are the programs we run. He does not say he has x number of dollars, what are you going to use it for. Dr. Manville added the District has been very frugal and does not just add things. Member Rosenfeld stated the District has to remain flexible in their spending as laws may change, and not get locked into leases and contracts. Member Haring noted that many of the District's projects are spread out over several years in order not to spend large chunks of money in any one year. He added buying the technology outright gives more flexibility in not being locked into a lease. Dr. Manville added if things got tough, the District could collect the technology and reallocate it to a 2:1 or 3:1 environment. Member Rosenfeld asked if there are complaints the internet speed is getting bogged down in the buildings. Mr. White replied not yet, but he is concerned it may get slower as more devices are added on. Member Rosenfeld asked if he was concerned about net neutrality. Mr. White replied the cost structure has not been created yet nor the restrictions determined, but he is envisioning the District would be paying more for access to the educational sites, which he would have to evaluate when it happens. Member Haring asked if there will be plenty of room on our internet for the new ELA series. Mr. White replied he has already seen usage increase with the pilot programs and with Google classroom, and the new upgrades will help. Member Adair asked how long the 600 iPads proposed for replacement have been in use. Mr. White replied the iPads are about 4-6 years old, and the newer devices can run apps better and stronger. He added some of the older iPads can't even be updated. Member Adair added he thinks there should be further discussion on whether teachers need both an iPad and a laptop. Dr. Manville replied we will look at the plan every 6 months.

Mr. Groos showed the Board the 10-year technology budget plan that depicts where Mr. White's previously discussed project proposals fit in. He also showed an analysis of the difference between leasing and buying technology equipment. He added he will start giving the Board the 10-year technology plan the same way he gives the Board the 10-year capital projects plan every six months. Member Rosenfeld asked why the District leased last year instead of buying. Dr. Manville replied we have leased for the past two rounds, with the thought that leasing forces replacement of technology equipment which ensures we are always up to date with our equipment, which has worked out well in past. She added Mr. Groos has determined buying makes more sense in the 10-year plan, and also we don't like the accounting that goes along with the leases as determined by the new laws. Mr. Groos added the District has been leasing for years which was the common practice, and 2 years ago \$2M was too much to pay out in one year, so it was decided to lease. He added that 1 ½ years ago, leasing was the best plan at the time. He added that looking at the next round, purchasing the technology seems to be the right way to go. He added there was nothing wrong about leasing in the past, but the evolution of the plan now shows that since we have the money in the budget, he is recommending we purchase instead of lease and save on interest. Dr. Manville added there is always a debate on whether to buy or lease, and we will make those decisions based on what is best for the District at that time. She added she hopes the new 10-year technology chart will help future boards when making their decisions regarding technology. Mr. Groos added the leases we have are flexible. He added in the most recent audit, we were forced to categorize the leases as capital leases instead of operating leases, and drastically changed how our financial statements looked. Member Adair asked how the new tax laws affect the District. Mr. Groos replied the new tax law doesn't have an effect on us. Dr. Manville added she hopes the new chart helps the Board

decide how they want technology to look in the classrooms. She added adjustments can always be made to the plan every six months.

The Board took a break at 7:38 p.m.

President Pender reconvened the meeting at 7:53 p.m.

6. **FACILITIES**

**Summer Capital Projects – Bid Results**

Mr. Groos shared the bid opening for the Summer 2018 Capital projects was held yesterday. The three projects that were up for bid include: Haines HVAC; painting ½ of Tyler, ½ of Bentley, gyms at Liberty and Martino, and hallways at Nelson Ridge; and sealcoating work at Liberty and Nelson Campus. He noted the bids came in great, with a lot of competition. The original budget was \$4.4M, and with the bids that came in, the budget is now \$3.6M. He added the alternates also had great bids. The alternates include: 1 - replace the mechanical system in Haines Gym and adjacent rooms; 2 - provide data cabling including terminations, testing, and related work at Haines; 3 - provide asphalt and concrete repair at Liberty; and 4 - provide a 10 year parts warranty on the Haines system. He noted alternate 4 would be rejected because the system provided by the low bidder already comes with a 10-year parts and 1-year labor warranty at no extra cost. Mr. Groos stated the recommendation would be to take a vote at the February 20<sup>th</sup> Board meeting to award the contracts for the base bids and approve all three alternates for a total cost of \$3,878,055. He noted he is recommending the alternates because the bids came in so low.

Member Starklauf noted that even with the alternates included, the total is still lower than the \$4.4M that was originally budgeted in the five-year forecast. Dr. Manville add the amount includes a contingency amount also. Member Haring asked about the painting. Mr. Groos replied the painting is finishing up what was done last year. Member Haring asked if there were any projects we could add since we had extra money. Mr. Groos replied it was probably too late in the process to design and put another project out to bid. Dr. Manville added that next time we do an HVAC project, we would probably include the air conditioning of the gym in the project instead of as an alternate. She noted the air conditioning for the gym was in the original base bid, but was taken out and made an alternate because it was thought the project would cost so much. Member Rosenfeld asked where the alternates were listed in the 10-year capital projects plan. Mr. Groos replied the alternates are options that come up and wouldn't necessarily be listed in the 10-year plan. Member Adair asked if the company who is putting in the new HVAC system would also be supporting the system after it is put in. Mr. Groos replied the new system has a 10-year parts and 1-year labor warranty, and Precision would service the HVAC system after the warranty is over. Mr. Nelson added this is a perfect opportunity to add the air conditioning to one of only four of our buildings that is not air conditioned, and to also improve the air quality. Member Rush had asked earlier why we bid out for our summer painting projects and didn't just use internal people or summer help to do it. Mr. Nelson replied the scope of the painting which includes scaffolds and more involved work in the gyms, is better done by a professional crew, especially when we had such competitive bids come in. He added we only have 67 days to complete all the summer projects, which is a lot of work, and we get a better bang for our buck by having professionals do the painting jobs. He added our people can do the touch up jobs, but he recommends leaving the big jobs to the professionals. Member Rosenfeld asked why we don't do the Haines restrooms instead of the cabling. Dr. Manville replied the cabling came up because it is an opportunity to run cable while the ceiling is open. Mr. Nelson pointed out that is the benefit of having the partners we have, such as our architects and engineers, because they can point out these extra things that come up that make sense to do at the time. Member Rosenfeld asked if there was a reason that there was such a difference between the estimates and the bids that came in over the past two years. Mr. Groos replied that ICI does a reasonable job of estimating, but the District has been fortunate over the past two years to have the designs out on the street very early and have many companies put in bids. He noted last year we saved additional money because we didn't have to use our contingency. He added that might not be the case this year because of the complexity of the HVAC project that is being done in a very old building. Mr. Nelson added we will be looking at the Summer projects for 2019 in the next couple of months in order to get our projects out early again and save money, while the Summer 2018 projects are going on. He added we had a good day with our bids this year, and that doesn't necessarily happen all the time. Member Starklauf added the Board gets the estimates at the August Facilities Meeting in order to start making decisions. Mr. Nelson added that this year the planning started even earlier because of the complexity of the HVAC project. Member Rosenfeld stated that just because the bids

come in lower doesn't mean that the saved money has to be spent. Mr. Nelson replied that sometimes it is good to add in alternates because we already have the vendors in a very competitive mood and are producing an economy of scale because they already have the work. Mr. Nelson added that we did two roofs last summer because we got such a great deal doing both at the same time, thus saving a great deal of money. Member Rosenfeld brought up the bathrooms at Oakview that were not done as an alternate two years ago. Dr. Manville replied she would also have liked to have done the bathrooms that year. Member Adair asked where the contractors were listed on the bid sheets. Mr. Groos replied that ICI put the bid packages together listing the scope of work for each project. Member Adair stated he would rather have one general contractor for the whole project who is responsible for everything. Mr. Nelson replied there are savings and benefits in having a construction manager in charge of our projects. Mr. Groos added that ICI technically serves as our general contractor and representative, holding all the contracts, and holding everyone to task. Member Rosenfeld asked if something goes wrong, do we go after ICI or the individual contractors. Mr. Groos replied we would talk to ICI. Member Rosenfeld asked what happened with the problems with Liberty parking lot. Dr. Manville replied that was Henry Brothers who took no responsibility for the subcontractor who went out of business. Mr. Groos added that is why the District decided to go with ICI to manage our projects so we wouldn't have problems with subcontractors because ICI holds all the contracts. Mr. Nelson added that ICI stood behind the flooring issues we had last year at no cost to the District. Board consensus was to go forward with the vote at the February Board meeting for the base bids and the three alternates. Member Haring asked if in the future there could be more alternates listed so the Board could pick and choose to do more projects if there was money available. Mr. Groos replied it can be inefficient to pay for drawings and plans and then not do them. He added that next summer when the projects are listed for the Board, he will list 5 or more extras that the Board can prioritize as alternates to be added on. He added it is probably too late to ask Legat to draw up plans and go out to bid for more projects at this time. Mr. Groos added it is a good problem to have to be under budget and wanting to do more projects. Mr. Nelson reminded the Board that we can always reject the lowest bid if it doesn't meet the specifications, and also reject all bids if they decide to do so. Mr. Groos added that there may come a time when a low bidder may not come to the table and we won't have the extra money. Mr. Pender asked how much more expensive would it have been if we had waited to go out to bid in March or April. Mr. Groos replied that by looking at the bid tallies, you can see that you may have had to take a higher bid because the low bidders may have already had projects. Member Rosenfeld added that it is a good strategy to go out to bid so early. Dr. Manville stated the vote would be on the February agenda.

#### **GCA Custodians**

Dr. Manville asked the Board if they were still okay with the District using GCA people to fill custodian positions if a decent person couldn't be found to fill the spot. She noted that when the decision was made to have the night custodians outsourced, the Board decided they did not want the day custodians to be outsourced. She added that over the years when a custodian was on leave or sick, sometimes a GCA person was used to fill the spot, and they were awesome. Member Haring stated the District is not replacing staff, but only using GCA if someone was sick or retiring. Dr. Manville replied that if after interviewing and not finding a person of quality, a GCA person may be used. She added it may not be a permanent replacement. Member Pender asked if the GCA people go through the same background checks. Dr. Manville replied yes. Board consensus was to use GCA people when it was necessary.

#### **7. SUPERINTENDENT INITIATIVES**

##### **Special Education Transportation Update**

Dr. Manville shared she talked to Mr. Tingley, the 843 rep this year, regarding 843 transportation. She stated 843 did not run the numbers to see what it would mean to cut 122 out of the contract a year early, and it is going to up their cost a ton. Dr. Manville added she told Mr. Tingley to tell 843 they would have to rescind the termination letter, and the Board would talk about it. She added she had a meeting with Mr. Tingley, Dr. Bruni, Mr. Groos, and the Business manager from 843. 843 would like the District to enter into a 3 year contract because the buses would have to be re-leased. In addition, 843 would like to charge the District a surcharge because we are not a member district. Dr. Manville replied to them that actually 843 owes the District because of the mistakes in billing with the SELF program over the years. Mr. Groos suggested doing an intergovernmental agreement like last time. Dr. Manville stated a surcharge should not be part of the agreement. She added she did not want to be in a situation where 843 says they offered to bus us, but we refused. She noted the pros of staying with 843 are: the parents are comfortable with the 843 bussing; and the District has leverage on how we negotiate a new agreement because 843 needs us. Dr.

Manville recommended staying with 843 transportation without the surcharge. Dr. Bruni requested 843's performance be improved and a roster list be provided. Member Starklauf added this can all be included in the intergovernmental agreement. Member Haring stated the options are to find a new bus service or enter into a three-year agreement with 843. He asked if we could just finish out the one year left on our contract. Member Pender stated 843 essentially wants to do a two-year extension on the one year that is left on our contract. Dr. Bruni added there should be no surcharge, and a pro of going with another company would be a better billing system that would charge per student. Member Rosenfeld stated although 843 is a community partner, they seem to be burning us. Dr. Manville added the other superintendents are supportive of the District going back and using 843 for transportation. Member Haring asked what assurance do we have that all the staff will be properly trained. Dr. Manville replied that 843 assured them that their staff is properly trained. Member Starklauf noted 843 kicked us out but now they need us back. Dr. Bruni added it would have been appropriate for 843 to have not terminated us and asked for an extension for two years. Dr. Manville added we are now in the negotiating phase. Member Haring suggested we come back and finish out our original contract at the same cost, and then come back in a year to negotiate. He added in the meantime we should look at other companies. Dr. Bruni added that now we have the routes, we have been looking at other options. Dr. Manville added she has no idea what has been communicated to the 843 board and if they even know that our district has not been a member district at any time during the 843 transportation contract. Member Starklauf added we have to do what is best for our students. Dr. Manville stated what is best for the parents is to stay with 843; what is best for the students is a combination of 843 and a new service; and what is best for the District financially is probably to find a new company. She added that she has been trying to tell the other superintendents that they needed to really look at the numbers. Member Starklauf asked if someone should attend an 843 board meeting. Member Rosenfeld added the safety of our kids is the number one priority. Member Pender expressed concerns about having to accept the lowest bidder if we go out to bid for a new company. Mr. Groos added that new laws state we don't necessarily have to take the lowest bid for special education transportation. Dr. Manville stated she would go back to 843 and say we would do this year as stated in the original contract, and renegotiate for next year. She added if 843 does not agree, the District would walk away from the deal. She added 843's next board meeting is February 27<sup>th</sup> so the Board has time to think about it. Member Pender asked when bids would have to go out to bid. Mr. Groos replied that ideally we should have gone out to bid earlier, but there is still time to go out to bid. Member Rosenfeld asked if Hopewell could transport. Dr. Bruni replied that their fleet is not that big and they do not have the inventory, but they do bus our REACH kids. The Board was in consensus for Dr. Manville to talk to 843. Member Adair asked if we were being efficient with transporting out special education students because sometime he sees only 1 or 2 students on a bus. Dr. Bruni replied there are many factors that come into play when deciding on the number of students that are assigned to a special education bus.

#### Debt Payments

Dr. Manville shared she is looking for direction from the Board on what they would like to do with the district's outstanding bond debt. She asked the Board if they would like to allow the spike in the debt to happen and then the debt would be gone in 2030, or would the Board like to restructure the bond debt. And, if the Board decides to restructure the debt, how many years do they want the debt to go out and what does the Board want the payments to look like. Mr. Groos gave scenarios on what the debt schedule would look like for a \$200K, \$300K, and a \$400K house if the current debt schedule stayed in place based on several assumptions. Member Starklauf stated that there is something to be said for letting the debt ride out and be paid off, but you also have to take into account people on a fixed income. She added you are not going to make everyone happy. Member Swallow added it is all about people's priorities. Member Starklauf added this Board did not create this situation, but they are the ones who have to deal with this tough decision. She added there is the philosophy that if you extend the debt out then the people who are using the schools are still paying for it. But, there is something to be said for not adding more debt and saving lots of money in interest. Member Pender asked what Lincoln-Way's debt schedule looks like. Mr. Groos replied Lincoln-Way has a similar spike situation happening a few years before our spikes. He added at this point in time Lincoln-Way cannot restructure, unless they can sell Lincoln-Way North. Member Swallow asked what is the correlation between the spikes and levy. Mr. Groos replied the levy would be added on top of the debt spikes. Dr. Manville added there may be additional growth that would offset it. She added that if the debt is paid off, it allows the District to go out and build another building in the future if needed because there would not be any other debt. Mr. Groos added that when you restructure you are paying for more than the buildings, as you are paying for the interest on the refinancing of all the interest. Member Starklauf asked as a business manager, what Mr. Groos would recommend. Mr. Groos replied that based on the philosophy of paying the debt off, in 2030 you have all

these possibilities with an interest cost of 0. He added the most efficient choice is to not restructure the debt because any restructuring is adding \$10M-\$30M of interest that the taxpayers will have to pay for with nothing in return, plus it takes away the District's flexibility. He added it is a complicated decision to make. Member Rosenfeld added she can see both sides. Member Haring asked if there was an option to take money and knock down debt in a spike year. Mr. Groos replied paying off \$1M in debt would save a taxpayer with a \$250K home \$60 for one year, with the \$60 savings going away the following year, and the bubble moves down the line. Dr. Manville added that if the Will County Facility Tax goes through, the District could pay down debt every year. Member Haring added if new property is more than \$20M a year, then the increases would be less. Mr. Groos added if you are going to take \$1M from your fund balance and pay off debt, the best thing to do would be to pay off some of the callable bonds, because the principal and interest goes away. He added we have the callable bonds that are due right now, and we can pay them off or refinance them, but we haven't take action on that yet because we are still discussing it. He added we don't want to run ahead and start taking the bonds and restructuring them and putting them down in different years, and then decide to restructure everything and undo everything you just did with \$60K in fees. Member Adair added that with interest rates creeping up, we may not achieve the savings. Member Adair suggested paying off some of the callable bonds. Mr. Groos replied that by paying off \$1M in callable bonds, you would save the \$1M in principal and all the interest costs. He added by paying off debt you are taking money from fund balances and paying off debt which comes out of our funds and saves the taxpayers money. Whereas when you are restructuring debt, you are spreading out the payments, and there will be taxes levied to pay these stretched out payments that will come out of property taxes and not out of our fund balances. Member Adair stated it is good PR to let the public know that you are using money to reduce the increase in taxes. Mr. Groos stated that if you take money from fund balances and give it back to the taxpayers, then down the road when you need to do capital projects, and you don't have the money, you have to sell bonds and take it out several years, thus costing the taxpayer more than what the original amount needed was. Member Adair stated we are already budgeting for our capital projects. Mr. Groos replied he has budgeted for capital projects, but has not set up a line item to rebate money back to the taxpayers. He added that paying off \$1M in debt would only make a small dent in our debt. Dr. Manville added that we really have a tight budget so that we can pay for our capital projects with cash, which not many districts can do. She added several years ago the District decided to create our own revenue source in order to save money to pay for our capital improvements. She added she knows how fast fund balances can go down over the years once you start dipping into your reserves. Member Adair asked what percent is needed for fund balances. Member Starklauf replied 25%. Mr. Groos added ISBE recommends 25%, but the District has 60%. He added per the 5 year forecast that shows paying cash for capital projects, the fund balance percent will drop to 40%. Member Haring stated he would like to see the debt payments more linear. Member Starklauf replied that would add \$30M in debt. Member Adair asked why not pay off the \$4.2M in callable bonds. Dr. Manville replied that would kill our fund balances. Member Adair added it would save money in the long run. Member Haring replied it would hurt our operating funds. Dr. Manville added it would save the taxpayers money, but the money would be forever gone to the District. Member Haring asked if we could pay a portion of the callable bonds off. Dr. Manville replied that was an option. Member Haring asked who decided to schedule the debt payments this way. Dr. Manville replied the Board at that time really thought they would get the \$7M back from the construction grant, and stretched the payments out, banking on receiving the payment. Member Pender added that if the new construction growth is bigger than estimated then the tax increase won't be as big of a hit. Mr. Groos agreed that if new property is higher or if existing values go up by more, it will help, but it can also work in the opposite direction too. He added that with the property tax freeze bill, not only are they looking to freeze property taxes, but they are looking to significantly change how the exemptions work, so that could change the numbers too. Mr. Groos stated that regarding debt restructuring goals, the District can never precisely control the tax rate, the property tax payment amount, the annual change in property tax payment amount, the EAV changes, the exemption amounts and changes, the market values of property, or the amount and value of new property added. He added the school district can only precisely control one variable, which is the annual debt payment due to the bond holders. He stated we can talk about our goals, our parameters and what we want to do, but everything is based on the assumptions we use, which could look very different five years from now. Member Swallow asked if we don't do anything now, can we still do something in five years. Mr. Groos replied yes. He added that Ms. Hennessy has come to the District for the past two years and said to wait until the next round of callable bonds come due. He added we haven't refinanced the 2007E bonds the day they became callable in October because we are in the middle of something and don't know what the plan is for the whole big picture. Dr. Manville added that if the Board decides to let the debt ride, in two years there will be a new board who may want to make a different decision. Mr. Groos added that if the Board decides to let it ride, they are not stuck for the next ten years. He added things may change in a year. Member Haring asked when would be the deadline to act on the 2021 spike. Dr. Manville replied we would have up

until 2021, with more debt being paid off each year. Member Swallow asked what is the cost to restructure bonds. Mr. Groos replied the 2007E refinance could cost \$60K, but added there are fixed costs included, with a small percentage associated with the amount of the bonds. He added a big restructure could cost \$100K - \$200K. Dr. Manville added the Board could choose to do nothing at this point, but choose to refinance the smaller bond that is callable. Member Rosenfeld stated the Board could choose to let it ride, choose to let it ride and refinance the callable bond, or choose to restructure all the bonds. Mr. Groos recommended not restructuring the 2007E bonds if the plan was to restructure the other bonds in the near future. Board consensus was to let the debt ride at this point and to revisit the discussion in another year. Dr. Manville added that Ms. Hennessy would be watching the markets for us and advise us if things change and we should revisit restructuring sooner. Member Pender stated if we refinance the 2007E bond, the debt would still be paid off and the spike would still be there. Member Adair replied the spike would be less. Mr. Groos replied the spike would not be significantly less. Member Pender stated if we refinance the small bonds, it would be more difficult to restructure down the road. Dr. Manville replied that is what Ms. Hennessy has advised us. Mr. Groos stated if you refinance the small bonds, and in a couple of years decide to do some other bigger restructuring, we will end up undoing whatever we just did now, and fold it into the new restructure. He added we would look back and say we wasted our time and money on the first refinance. He added we would save about \$40K a year, but it cost \$60K to do, and if we take action in 2 years, we would have probably broken even or even lost a little bit of money. He added that if we restructure in 3 - 4 years, we might save money. Member Pender stated that with interest rates going up, he is in favor of refinancing the bond, but understands he is in the minority. Member Swallow asked when the property tax freeze would go through if it is passed. Mr. Groos replied the levy we passed in December would be frozen. Dr. Manville added that Senator Hastings emailed and said he doesn't believe any action will be taken on it this year. Mr. Groos added he has heard it both ways. Member Rosenfeld stated she understands Mr. Pender's position, but with the Board makeup staying the same over the next year, she is open if Ms. Hennessy advises to do something differently. Mr. Pender replied he is comfortable with the Board's decision to not do anything for now.

### Illinois County Tax

Dr. Manville shared she sent an email with information about the Illinois County Facility Tax out to all the superintendents, got a lot of good feedback, and then spoke with them at the ROE superintendents' meeting last week. She stated it looks like we have most of the districts with the bigger student populations on board. She added she is going to call a meeting with them, talk about going forward, and go over the resolution. She added she talked to Mr. Walsh and told him we have to try to pass it. She stated that once we know we have the needed 51% participation, the superintendents and business managers will meet to strategize as a group and come up with the same PR plan to try to promote it. She noted the Board will have to decide exactly what they are going to tell the public they are going to do with the funds, such as ½ going to pay off debt and ½ going to capital projects. Member Adair asked if she had heard any negatives. Dr. Manville replied that some districts are scared, and some boards do not want to entertain it at all. She added we need 51% of the student population to get it on the ballot, and once it is on the ballot we need a majority to pass it. Member Pender asked if it would be on the November ballot. Dr. Manville replied that is something the superintendents will have to strategize about, and there are pros and cons to the April date and the November date. Member Adair stated he appreciated what Dr. Manville is doing, but thinks all the districts should be aware of it. Dr. Manville replied she will get the information out, and is pleased that there seems to be some momentum going.

### 3 Year Contract Renewals

Mr. Groos shared he had talked to all the vendors listed on the annual contract chart whose contracts are over at the end of this school year, and asked them all if they would be willing to give us a "no increase" in their rates in order to renew their contracts for a one-year extension. He noted all agreed to the extensions, with Tri-K agreeing to freeze their prices for 3 years. Mr. Groos recommended to approve all the one year extensions, and the three-year extension with Tri-K at the February 20<sup>th</sup> Board meeting for the next school year. He added for each vendor we have had excellent service and excellent pricing, with knowledge of the District's needs and buildings, and consistency of service. Dr. Manville added the approvals would be on the February Consent Agenda.

### Personnel Planning

Regarding the position of Director of Human Resources, Dr. Manville stated the position would begin next year. She added the spot she vacated when she became Superintendent was never filled, and when Dr. Bruni was appointed Assistant Superintendent and the second in charge, she kept her same job and is still the Director of Special Education. Member Rosenfeld asked who is doing the personnel job now. Dr. Manville replied that she is doing personnel. Dr. Manville added that due to budget reductions, it was decided in January 2015 to not fill the position. But, in January 2016, 2017, and 2018, the position was put in the 5 year financial forecasts. She added she has told previous and every board that eventually the position will have to be filled, as you cannot run a district of this size without a Director of Human Resources. She showed a chart that depicted the many years Dr. Manville and Mrs. Soltys have done double jobs. Dr. Manville also presented a chart that showed the staffing of District Office administrators in comparable elementary districts with similar student populations. She noted every district listed has more District Office administrators, and all have a Director of Human Resources. She noted the District has been running fine without a Director of Human Resources for many years, but it is not appropriate, and as a Superintendent she doesn't have the time to do the human resources job the way it should be done.

Member Rosenfeld stated it is a hard case to sell since Dr. Manville has been doing the job so well. Dr. Manville replied she can do it, but is not paying attention to it the way she should be. Member Rosenfeld asked what kind of position is it and what is the pay. Dr. Manville replied she is looking for a Director of Human Resources, an administrative position that would be paid between \$120,000 - \$150,000 a year. Member Rosenfeld asked why the position couldn't pay \$30,000. Member Adair asked why the need when Dr. Manville is doing the job now. Member Swallow added the Board has to look forward two years when Dr. Manville retires, and her replacement won't be doing HR. Member Starklauf stated that in talking to other Districts, they are surprised they do not have an HR/Personnel person. Member Rosenfeld asked what problems are coming from Dr. Manville doing HR. Dr. Manville replied she feels there are issues coming up that she is not paying attention to. Member Rosenfeld stated she doesn't see it as a higher level position. Dr. Manville replied the HR person would be in charge of all of the evaluations for the entire District, all the certifications, the mentoring, the new teacher orientation, and mounds of other work as shown on the job description. Member Starklauf added an HR person would allow the other staff to do their jobs better. Member Rosenfeld stated she thought everyone was doing their job very well right now, and for the past years when talking about the District's savings, the loss of this position was shown as part of the savings. Dr. Manville replied that she has been saying for years that she would do double jobs, but eventually the job has to come back and be filled. Member Pender added this job has always been with the intent of it coming back. Dr. Manville replied the District is not staffed appropriately, and she can't say enough how much this position is needed. Member Starklauf stated it is important legally to have the HR person checking that the teachers are certified to be teaching in the positions they are teaching. Mr. Groos stated that almost every school district has an HR position, and added he thought it was odd when he was hired that the District did not have an HR department. He added it is standard across the board that school districts have an HR director, even smaller districts that don't even have a business manager. Member Rosenfeld stated she thought we should start smaller with a lower position, because once a director is hired, it is hard to get rid of them. Dr. Manville replied she cannot have a lower level because she needs an administrator who can talk to a staff member who has serious health issues, or needs information on FMLA, or needs help coordinating their health benefits. Dr. Manville added she is so short staffed, she has been the one covering for a principal who has been out for two weeks. She added she doesn't even have a pool of assistant principals to send over because the assistant principals have been cut over the years. She added there is no flexibility anywhere because of the number of people we are employing. She added she is not handling the HR position at the level it should be handled, and doesn't think the District should have to skate by because we are understaffed in the number of administrators we have. Member Rosenfeld stated she thought the District was paying some big expense for an online system every year that was making it easier for health insurance. Mr. Groos replied it was the \$15K a year open enrollment system that allows the employees to go online and pick their benefits and then the database sends the information to our 8 vendors, instead of the benefits clerk doing it manually. He added the system also generates the tax forms required by Obamacare. Member Rosenfeld asked if the system allows for the benefits clerk to have more time to do HR things. Mr. Groos added the benefit clerk does not do HR, but meets with every employee and sub, signs up everyone for benefits, does background checks, and answers questions all day long, sometimes getting mixed up in personnel issues that Dr. Manville has to deal with. Member Rosenfeld asked if the position could be an A/P level position. Dr. Manville replied she couldn't trust the position to an A/P because there are too many decisions to be made and they wouldn't be qualified. Member Rosenfeld asked if we could do a search to find someone. Dr. Manville replied the HR person has to be a school position and would be in charge of all the certified staff and non-certified staff members and know all the ISBE regulations, rules and laws, and how certifications work. She added the person would be in charge of all teacher discipline. Member Adair

asked if Dr. Manville should do teacher discipline. She replied discipline issues should be processed by the HR Director, and come to Dr. Manville next. She added now she is judge and jury, and all issues go directly to her. She noted sometimes she has to pull Dr. Bruni from her job to sit in on meetings. Member Rosenfeld asked if Dr. Manville had someone in mind for the position. Dr. Manville replied she has someone in mind who she hopes would take the position. Member Rosenfeld asked if we would post for the job. Dr. Manville replied she would post internally. Member Adair asked if the person would be qualified. Dr. Manville replied yes, she hoped someone would apply who would be wonderful in this position, but really can't talk about the person in open session. Dr. Manville stated she has constantly proven she knows how to set up a good team and knows how to lead the District in a good direction. She added she has never asked the District to spend money that she didn't think was worth it. She added she has demonstrated that by beating herself up and doing multiple jobs for many years. Member Rosenfeld stated that if that is Dr. Manville's theory on how this goes, then the Board shouldn't have to sit here, and should just listen to what Dr. Manville's decisions should be on everything. She added she is doing her job as a board member and not just rubber stamp everything that is presented. Dr. Manville replied she would just like the respect that she knows what she is talking about sometimes. Member Adair added Dr. Manville has done such an outstanding job of handling both positions. He added he looks at the HR position in an old-fashioned way, with more of the bigger things still being handled by Dr. Manville. Member Rosenfeld asked if Dr. Manville had someone in mind for all the positions she is proposing. Dr. Manville replied only in her head for the HR position because she is always preplanning, but she doesn't know how it is going to play out. Member Haring stated Dr. Manville's replacement down the road may not be as adept, and by having an HR person, while Dr. Manville is still here, it is preparing the HR person for a new superintendent. Member Haring asked if the HR person would need an assistant. Dr. Manville replied we had originally planned for the HR person to have an assistant, but would start out without one and see how it goes. She added Mrs. Soltys and the benefits clerk would be assisting the new HR Director. Member Haring asked if the HR Director would evaluate teachers. Dr. Manville replied the person would evaluate teachers and principals. She added she evaluated the principals while she was in the HR position and is still doing it, which is a very hard job. Member Rush noted from past experience you need an administrator in the HR position who knows school certification and licensure. Member Rosenfeld asked if a clerk could do that. Member Rush and Member Starklauf disagreed and added you need a school administrator to do the job and know about the requirements. Member Rosenfeld asked if an A/P could do that. Member Haring replied that the chain of command would have to be higher if they are going to evaluate the principals, with the position being between a principal and the superintendent. Mr. Groos noted it is sometimes hard to make sense of the position's salary, but you have to look at the other districts' salaries and go with the market rate. Member Starklauf noted the position was a twelve-month position, which would merit more pay. Mrs. Soltys added the person in the position would have to be knowledgeable in retirement, TRS, and IMRF. Member Rosenfeld recommended doing an outside posting to see what we get and then be open to all possibilities. Member Pender stated he didn't think the position was an HR position only, but one that needed teaching experience. Member Starklauf noted in a company, you wouldn't go to the CEO with an HR issue. Dr. Manville stated she knows what the HR position looks like in a school district. She noted that the frame of reference of an HR person to someone outside a school district is very different than the frame of reference of someone who is in a school district. She added maybe the position should be called Director of Personnel instead of Director of HR, which is a limiting position title in this case. She added it is not appropriate for a superintendent to be bogged down for days doing the legwork and investigating a personnel issue. She added the Personnel person should be doing the investigation and interviewing and asking all the right questions of the staff member, or the parent, or the attorney and then bringing it to the superintendent. Dr. Manville added she has been doing that in isolation for many years, not being able to discuss it with anyone, and thus not doing due process legitimately. She added everyone should have a fair opportunity to go to another level, and currently the next level is the Board. Member Rosenfeld asked if Dr. Manville gets consensus tonight, then the next time the Board hears about it, Dr. Manville will have a candidate that is already picked, and this person will have experience in benefits as an administrator, and that will be the person presented. Member Adair asked if the person would need teaching. Dr. Manville replied she will be teaching something to the selected person. Member Rosenfeld asked if Dr. Manville would be teaching the benefits part. Dr. Manville replied the benefits part is a small part that won't be hard. She added this person will be facilitating all of the staff members. Mr. Groos added the benefits part comes from him and the insurance committee along with Assurance. Dr. Manville added this person will deal with all staff issues, like Dr. Bruni deals with all student issues, and Dr. Cucci deals with all curriculum issues. She added Mr. Groos deals with all finance issues, but has been pulled into personnel issues, as also Dr. Bruni has been. Mr. Groos asked what will happen when Dr. Manville retires in two years. Dr. Manville replied hire a superintendent and an HR Director. Mr. Groos noted it is important for Dr. Manville to be here to cross train a person. Dr. Manville added it wouldn't be fair to a new superintendent to not have an HR person. Member Rosenfeld stated that the job

description has a lot of clerk things in it. Dr. Manville stated she doesn't know any other superintendent who sits and coordinates the staffing of the 12 buildings for next year, meets with the principals, updates the spreadsheet, and checks certifications. Mr. Groos added it works, but Dr. Manville has to set something up before she leaves in two years or there will be a huge drop off when she leaves and no one will know how things work. Dr. Manville stated she is proposing a high level District Office administrator for the HR/Personnel position. Member Rosenfeld replied that is very hard core and she doesn't get it. Dr. Manville replied she is only being honest and not sugar-coating anything. Member Rosenfeld added then she expects the person to have experience. She asked if the Board would find out who the person is in the next board packet. Member Starklauf replied that Dr. Manville will let the Board know when she starts interviewing. Dr. Manville replied it will be principals within the District who apply for the position. Member Starklauf noted that when we were hiring the Facilities Director, Dr. Manville updated the Board on the process in her Board O Grams. Member Starklauf added that even with an internal posting, Dr. Manville will keep the Board updated on the process. Member Rosenfeld asked if there was a reason that the position had to come from within the District. Dr. Manville replied that she feels strongly that we have extremely qualified people in this District who have been in education for years and years, who have been exposed to all the inner workings of a school district, and who are completely competent. She added she doesn't see why when you have people with proven records of great success in their roles, why you feel you have to bring a stranger in. Member Rosenfeld stated if that were the case, then we would have never brought Mike Sass in from Ogle County. Dr. Manville replied that is true. She stated the Board didn't post her position because they had someone competent in front of them. She added there is something to be said if you try to take from within ranks people who are proven and are excellent at what they do, know the system and are part of the system. She asked why you wouldn't reward that person and afford them the opportunity. Member Swallow added we don't know who the person will be. Member Rosenfeld asked if it costs any more to look outside. Member Swallow stated why would we do an external search when we have someone internal. She added it would be more commonplace in the business world to look externally. She added what if the person Dr. Manville has in mind doesn't apply for the job and someone else does. She added we have to trust Dr. Manville and that she wouldn't put someone in this position who isn't qualified. Member Rosenfeld asked what is so hard about opening it up a little bit. Member Swallow added that from an HR perspective, when you have someone internal who knows what goes on here and how it operates and is a familiar face, people may be more inclined to be open. She noted an outside person could be beneficial too, but she would lean towards an internal person who has been here to bridge the gap of Dr. Manville leaving. Dr. Manville stated her goal is to only make it better each day, to keep enhancing what we are doing, and keep creating a tremendous team, and nothing less. Member Adair stated he doesn't see how an HR person would go to PTO meetings. Dr. Manville replied we should give the position a different name. Member Starklauf suggested naming the position Director of Personnel. Dr. Manville agreed. Member Pender asked for consensus to post internally for the HR position for the 2018-2019 school year. The Board was in consensus.

Dr. Manville explained the Instructional Technology Coordinator position. She noted for the past few years, Mrs. Fahey has been doing double jobs, teaching at Martino and getting a stipend to be the instructional technology coordinator. She added when Mrs. Fahey retires at the end of next year, the goal would be to bring the position back here beginning with the 2019-2020 school year, which would mean a savings to the District. This position would be redefined due to the increase in digital learning opportunities. The Instructional Technology Coordinator would continue to manage and support implementation of student subscriptions; enhance the role by providing classroom instructional support through co-teaching, modeling, co-planning and developing resources to support staff and student learning; and work with school leaders to drive strategic, appropriate and visionary use of technology in instructional practice. Dr. Manville added the administration would be bringing this position for approval to the Board at this time next year.

Dr. Manville explained she would be asking for a Technology Programmer/Analyst for the 2019-2020 school year. She added this position would modify and customize software packages to be more useful to our staff and students; perform heavily-coded server installations, modifications, and maintenance; and create custom programs, reports, and software solutions for our district. She stated over the years she has directed Mr. White to evaluate what he needs in his department. Instead of replacing the open tech aide position, Mr. White created a job description for a programmer. She noted that in the past, Mr. White created the concept of cutting the tech aide positions in half and have them centrally located, which has worked very well. Member Starklauf asked for an example of what a programmer would do in the District. Mr. White replied that yearly for online registration, he has to write code to add pieces to the PowerSchool installation and customize it for us. He added this person would also do the code for the online parent teacher conference program. Dr. Manville added the compromise for getting this position would be

to not fill the open tech aide position, with the cost not being that much higher. Member Rosenfeld asked if we already have a tech guy that we already pay. Mr. White replied we have someone who helps with the website and the teachers' website pages. Member Rosenfeld asked if that person could do this job too. Mr. White replied he envisions the new position to be more code heavy, with this person being able to change the whole theme of the website, or make a change to the website software, which involves more coding pages. Member Adair asked if there would be enough work for a coding person. Mr. White replied yes there would be enough work. Dr. Manville stated this position would be up for approval in another year.

Mr. Pender added the retiree and the open tech aide positions would provide a wash for these two positions.

8. **BOARD GOVERNANCE AND BOARD MEMBER INITIATIVE PLANNING**

Dr. Manville stated the two Board policies that were on the agenda and going to be discussed would be moved to the next Board meeting.

9. **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

President Pender asked for a motion to enter into executive session for the discussion of the appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of employees. A motion was made by Member Swallow and seconded by Member Starklauf.

*Motion carried on a roll call vote: 7 ayes, 0 nays.*

*Voting aye: Member Rosenfeld, Member Rush, Member Starklauf, Member Swallow, Member Adair, Member Haring, and Member Pender.*

The meeting adjourned into executive session at 11:07 p.m.


President Pender stated that was the end of the public business part of the meeting.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned in conjunction with the roll call to enter into executive session.

The meeting adjourned at 11:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



LeAnne Soltys, Recording Secretary

Approved by:



William Pender, Board President



Nicole Swallow, Board Secretary