

**MINUTES OF A SPECIAL MEETING,  
BOARD OF EDUCATION, SCHOOL  
DISTRICT #225, COOK COUNTY,  
ILLINOIS, JANUARY 31, 2000**

A special meeting of the Board of Education, School District No. 225 was held on Monday, January 31, 2000, at approximately 9:10 p.m. at Glenbrook High Schools administration building, pursuant to due notice to all members and the public.

The president called the meeting to order and announced the reasons for the special meeting of the Board of Education. Upon calling of the roll, the following members answered present: Beyne, Lerner, Long, Olson, Rogal, Shact. Absent: Seymour. Also present: Hales, Lacivita, Rainier.

**RECOGNITION OF COMMUNITY VISITORS FOR COMMENTS LIMITED TO  
TOPICS ON THIS AGENDA**

President Rogal asked if there were any community visitors who desired to address the Board. No community visitors requested to address the Board.

**DISCUSSION REGARDING CONTRACT WITH SHELDON GOOD & CO. FOR SALE  
OF RESIDENTIAL LOTS ON GLENBROOK DRIVE IN NORTHBROOK**

Mr. Olson thanked Mr. Lerner for taking time to review the proposed contract and suggesting revisions.

Mr. Rainer advised the Board that soil testing is required for each of the residential lots.

Mrs. Rogal requested copies of each ad and/or brochure prepared by Sheldon Good & Co.

1/31/00

**MOTION TO APPROVE AMENDED CONTRACT WITH SHELDON GOOD & CO. FOR SALE OF RESIDENTIAL LOTS ON GLENBROOK DRIVE IN NORTHBROOK**

Motion by Mr. Olson, seconded by Mr. Shact, to approve the revised Real Estate Marketing & Auction Agreement with Sheldon Good & Company, 333 W. Wacker Drive, Chicago, 60606, for the sale of six residential lots on Glenbrook Drive in Northbrook owned by the district, as attached to Mr. Rainier's memorandum of January 28, 2000, and direct the Board secretary to sign the Agreement on behalf of the Board.

Upon calling of the roll:

aye: Beyne, Lerner, Long, Olson, Rogal, Shact

nay: none

Motion carried.

Note: See attached agenda item #3

**DISCUSSION REGARDING USE OF HEARING OFFICER FOR DISCIPLINARY CASES**

Dr. Hales stated that he was bringing an alternative proposal to the Board regarding the use of hearing officers for disciplinary cases. The hearing examiner would hear the disciplinary case. If the hearing officer determines that a violation occurred, the hearing officer could move forward and hear testimony and recommendations from the administration and parents regarding the consequences. From the administration's standpoint, it would be similar to the recommendations coming from the Major Disciplinary Committee and principal. The Board could then review the facts and make a determination. Dr. Hales stated the law provides for the final determination to be made by the Board.

Dr. Hales stated there is a disciplinary hearing pending. The Board agreed to meet on Wednesday, February 9 at 7:30 p.m. to conduct the disciplinary hearing.

Mr. Lerner said he does not support using hearing officers.

Dr. Hales stated when the districts use a hearing officer, the board makes their determination based the facts submitted by the hearing officer.

Mrs. Long stated she would have trouble with that procedure because any member of the community who wishes to address the board should have the right to do so.

Dr. Hales stated he is concerned that the Board is serving as both judge and jury.

Mr. Shact stated that someone could request a hearing, but it would be at the board's discretion to hear them or not.

Mr. Lerner stated as a board member he could request the student appear to take evidence.

Dr. Hales stated if the board would like to do that they might as well hear the case anyway. That is part of the give and take of the process. The board is not spending hours and hours doing it and the board would have to be willing to trust the judgment of the hearing officer and their ability to compile the facts and make a decision based on the facts. If the board re-invites the participants back to re-hear the case it would defeat the purpose.

Mr. Shact would prefer not to use a hearing officer.

Mr. Olson stated he is in agreement with Dr. Hales and Mr. Shact. He stated it gets to the broader point of what a board member should be doing with their time. The Board should delegate to people who have the ability to do it and deal with disciplinary cases on an exception basis if necessary.

Mrs. Beyne would like to use a hearing officer, but for different reasons. She stated that parents who had gone before the board have told her how painful it was for them. There is a degree of isolation that would come from working with a hearing officer.

Mr. Olson stated that if one or two hearing officers are used over time a consistency would develop. If the Board disagrees with the consistency the hearing officer would be changed.

Mr. Lerner said he would not expel a student that he did not see or talk to. The student has the right to see his judge and jury. Mr. Lerner said it is his responsibility to make the judgment based on the evidence.

Mr. Olson said that it shouldn't stop the board from deciding something differently even if Mr. Lerner objects to it.

1/31/00

Dr. Hales said the hearing officer could prepare findings of fact, but no conclusions or recommendations.

Mr. Lerner stated that he would then be under the hearing officer's timeframe because the written report has to be filed within a certain number of days, otherwise the hearing doesn't count. The hearing officer has five days from the hearing to file a written report and the board has five days to approve it or reject it.

Dr. Hales stated that it is really important to provide services for students who have made mistakes. He said he didn't want to encourage or counsel students to withdraw from school. Dr. Hales stated if the board is uncomfortable with a district administrator serving as a hearing officer, the board could hire an independent counsel who is not from our law firm to conduct the hearing.

Mr. Shact requested that any additional ideas be brought to the board for a vote at the next meeting.

Dr. Hales will also look at our policies.

Mr. Shact stated if the board voted for a change, the policies would be changed accordingly.

Dr. Hales will bring the timeline required when using a hearing officer, and advise the board how much time the board would then have to make a determination. He will also examine the qualifications of a hearing officer. The current policies and handbook language will be shared with the Board.

Note: See attached agenda item #4

**MOTION TO MOVE INTO CLOSED SESSION**

Motion by Mr. Shact, seconded by Mr. Olson, to move into closed session at approximately 9:45 p.m. to consider collective negotiating matters; and to consider litigation which has been filed and is pending or is probable or imminent (Sections 2 (c) (2) and (11) of the Open Meetings Act).

Upon calling of the roll:

aye: Long, Olson, Rogal, Shact, Beyne, Lerner

nay: none

Motion carried.

The Board returned to open session at approximately 10:30 p.m.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Motion by Mrs. Beyne, seconded by Mr. Olson, to adjourn the meeting at approximately 10:30 p.m.

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

Motion carried.

\* Means Beyne, Lerner, Long, Olson, Rogal and Shact all voted aye.

CERTIFIED TO BE CORRECT:

\_\_\_\_\_  
PRESIDENT - BOARD OF EDUCATION

\_\_\_\_\_  
SECRETARY - BOARD OF EDUCATION

NEXT REGULAR BOARD MEETING: Feb. 14, 2000      Glenbrook Administration Bldg.  
7:30 P.M.      1835 Landwehr Road  
Glenview, Illinois