

**MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING,
BOARD OF EDUCATION, SCHOOL
DISTRICT #225, COOK COUNTY,
ILLINOIS, MAY 22, 2000**

A regular meeting of the Board of Education, School District No. 225 was held on Monday, May 22, 2000, at approximately 7:30 p.m. at Glenbrook South High School, 4000 W. Lake Avenue, Glenview, 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: Beyne, Lerner, Long, Olson, Rogal, Seymour, Shact. Also present: Casey, Freeman, Hales, Helander-Heiser, Herrick, Lacivita, Lanz, Rainier, Riggle, Schilling, Sennholtz, Smith.

Mr. Shact suggested moving agenda item #3 to item #2 to discuss Topics Involving Facility Planning, Financial Planning, Student Attendance Areas and Student Enrollments prior to the recognition of community visitors.

Mrs. Beyne said she would like to discuss student attendance areas before recognition of community visitors. Then she would like to discuss facility and financial planning followed by any questions or issues that result from the recognition of community visitors, and finally student enrollments.

Mrs. Rogal questioned whether one topic would affect another and decisions on student attendance areas.

Mrs. Beyne stated it depends on how broad the discussion becomes. She said she hoped there might be a limited discussion that might resolve some of the issues that are of concern to the community. She stated it appears that this topic was raised without any prior board discussion. Mrs. Beyne stated that it would be helpful for the board to have that opportunity to talk about student attendance areas before opening it up to community visitors.

5/22/00

MOTION TO CHANGE THE AGENDA

Motion by Mrs. Beyne, seconded by Mr. Shact, to change the agenda order to discuss student attendance areas and then proceed to recognition of community visitors.

Upon calling of the roll:

aye: Long, Olson, Seymour, Shact, Beyne

nay: Lerner, Rogal

Motion carried.

ACTION/DISCUSSION REGARDING STUDENT ATTENDANCE AREAS

Mrs. Beyne stated she was concerned when the administration proposed a series of recommendations dealing with what they felt was an ideal way to handle the students and student attendance areas for our district. The four areas they discussed were: whether or not district 34 should be split, whether or not we should consolidate district 30, whether or not we should keep district 30 split, and whether or not we should consolidate district 31. The administration came to the conclusion that they should keep things status quo. She stated that is how she believes the issue first evolved. The board has never really talked about student attendance areas and shifting of students. Mrs. Beyne stated that she has read about it in the paper and is not in favor of moving students. She has listened to all the arguments, listened to people talk about moving students, and listened to the passionate people who would really like their students to go to schools that they aren't assigned to go to now. Mrs. Beyne stated that she has also listened to the passion and emotion of people who bought homes with the intent that their kids would go to the high school where they bought a home. Mrs. Beyne said that one of the hardest things for a board to do is mandate boundary changes. She wouldn't want somebody doing that for her child and it would be hard for her to do to that to somebody else's child. She said she would like to make a motion not to change current boundaries.

Mr. Lerner stated that he is against moving students. Mr. Lerner stated that he does not believe that the board can deal with the issue of boundaries because notice must be given if the board discusses boundaries. He said there is a difference between boundaries and attendance areas. The appropriate motion would be to approve or disapprove maintaining the current attendance areas. Mr. Lerner said the board is talking about attendance areas, not boundaries.

Dr. Schilling stated that there are two small areas that were transferred to North that would have been in the South attendance area. Dr. Schilling said that there are only 2 or 3 children coming from those areas and in one case transportation is a problem. He said at some point the board should probably also consider whether or not those areas should be returned to GBS.

Mrs. Long stated that previously the board came to consensus that they would like to maintain the attendance areas pending final review of finances, etc. Mrs. Long would prefer that the board continue or begin the full discussion about the facility issue and finances.

Mr. Olson stated as a basis for reviewing the facilities issue and student attendance area question, he has used the district's mission statement and goals as a reference point. With reference to the broad mission, the board set as the second of three goals for its current year to appropriately and accurately assess changing community needs and the ability of the school district to respond. Three specific objectives were set in that regard 1) to conduct a demographic study of area population changes, trends and projections 2) to review and analyze data, weighing the impact of the study against district philosophies and respond to changing needs and 3) to integrate demographic study and philosophy to achieve final district boundaries and/or facilities plans. With regard to the mission statement and the need to create and maintain an environment which affects continued growth and opportunities for every student, if the board considers the realignment of student attendance areas from South to North to economize on projected space available at North and draws that population from specific locations from within the South population, the overall academic environment at South will suffer and over time fundamentally impact the ability of our district to create and maintain an environment which affects continued growth opportunities for every student.

MOTION TO RETAIN THE CURRENT STUDENT ATTENDANCE AREAS

Motion by Mrs. Beyne, seconded by Mr. Shact, to retain the current student attendance areas.

Upon calling of the roll:

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

nay: none

Motion carried.

5/22/00

Mr. Shact stated the reason he felt it was important to second Mrs. Beyne's motion was because it is obvious that the topic has caused the community a lot of anguish. Mr. Shact stated the board has not had an adequate amount of time to thoroughly discuss and address some of the issues. In the absence of these discussions, people have been making interpretations of various board member's opinions and thoughts regarding this process. He stated that with such a large community turnout it seems like it would serve everybody's interest to continue with the type of discussion the board needs to have tonight. Mr. Shact stated the board is talking about an enormous amount of money, some very complex issues, and the board is trying very hard to deal with these issues.

RECOGNITION OF COMMUNITY VISITORS

President Rogal reviewed procedures for community visitors who wish to address the board.

Mr. Olson said he hoped the board vote on attendance areas addressed community concerns and that comments would be brief.

Mr. Lerner stated the board just voted to maintain the current attendance areas. The discussion will now focus on construction, money, what needs to be done in the schools and what the board now wants to consider.

Mr. Olson stated that the board will discuss facility and financial planning and student enrollment.

Mr. Shact stated that the board addressed mandatory enrollment areas. The board has not addressed the issues of choice, scheduling changes, or physical facility changes.

Mr. Lerner stated if choice is an issue, that would mean a student in one attendance area could choose to attend another attendance area, and then if that is the case it is contrary to the vote the board just took to maintain the current student attendance areas. Mr. Lerner stated the board should get clear on what they just voted on and if the vote needs to be changed, now is the time to talk about it because the board took it out of context.

Mrs. Beyne stated she didn't realize she was locking herself into a position to not be able to talk about student enrollments or choice at a later date. That is contrary to what she intended in bringing up the vote. She stated she brought up the issue because she believes there are a lot of people in the audience who were very concerned that the board was going to be talking about consolidation of district 30 or continuing splitting of district 30,

or consolidation of 31 or continuing splitting of 31. Mrs. Beyne said she didn't want the audience to have to spend a lot of time speaking in opposition to consolidation. She stated that the board has received a lot of letters to that effect and she also didn't want to take away the opportunity to be able to talk about choice when the student enrollment issue was discussed. She stated a large number of parents insist that the landscape has changed. They purchased their home in District 30 to send their student to Glenbrook South, but it is a different profile than they bought. Mrs. Beyne stated that the board would like to talk about choice. Mrs. Beyne stated the motion she put forward did not deal with mandatory boundary changes or mandatory shifting of students.

Mr. Lerner stated that Mrs. Beyne did not speak for the board when she said the board wanted to discuss choice. He said that Mrs. Beyne made a motion to establish the current attendance areas and the board voted on it. Any movement of children out of one of those areas is going to be contrary to the policy the board just established. Mr. Lerner stated he understands that Mrs. Beyne feels she wasn't clear, but if the board takes another vote they go back to square one which defeats the whole purpose of taking this out of context.

Mr. Olson stated that the board has shown the ability to deal with a wide variety of issues in a flexible fashion which furthers the objectives of our district in a very positive way. The board can use legal interpretations of agenda items and documents, but in so doing might stifle the process and cause it to no longer be streamlined or efficient and might not be in the best interest of the whole. A discussion about what is included in student enrollment should wait until its proper sequence.

Mr. Lerner stated he came on the board to do what is best for the students who attend our schools. He said that this started out to be a discussion about an item. The board didn't have a discussion; there was a motion and a vote. Now that it may appear the vote didn't come out the right way, now it is time for discussion. Mr. Lerner stated that he finds that to be an effort to supplant the rules. There was a motion to determine whether or not we should maintain attendance areas.

Mrs. Beyne stated the reason she took it out of context is she thought it would remove some angst of the people in the audience who came to the board very concerned that changes would be mandated and students forced to change schools. Mrs. Beyne said she still wanted to have the opportunity to be able to talk about choice as an option. She suggested the board go back to recognition of community visitors, talk about student enrollments and leave

5/22/00

the student attendance area off, Then she suggested the board make a motion to disregard the motion that what was previously passed and get into the community area. Mrs. Beyne stated she was trying to relieve the concerns of people in the audience who were concerned the board was going to force their students to move. The board voted not to force anybody to move. Mrs. Beyne said the board got into a discussion over the exact definition of attendance areas which was broader than she thought it was when the motion was made.

Mrs. Rogal stated she would like to allow audience participation. She reminded community visitors that their comments are limited to three minutes.

Ellen Nussbaum, 931 Queens Lane, Glenview, asked to share a letter that was signed by over 400 taxpayers in district 225 requesting that the current school boundaries be retained. The letter also requested that Glenbrook South grow to accommodate the growth in Glenview in addition to equity in spending between the two schools and between feeder districts.

Vanessa Podgorski, 1430 Pleasant Lane, Glenview, stated she has three students attending District 34 schools and one at Glenbrook South. She stated she recently sold her Glenview home to a family from Evanston who was looking for diversity in the student population.

Elias Matsakis, 3601 Ari, Glenview, stated that he was pleased that the board took action to put the issue of changing attendance areas to rest.

Marikay Boraca, 2005 Grove St., Glenview, stated she did not want boundary or any other changes made that would compromise either campus.

Janice Baskerville, 2401 Happy Hollow, Glenview, stated the board is attempting to make Glenbrook North an all one color school. She stated she lives in this neighborhood, her children have gone to the schools, and if residents are given a choice, the choice will always be for North.

Kathy Fink, 2313 Carrington, Glenview, stated that the students at South don't want to be split from their friends. She said the issue is not at the high school level, but at Maple and Field.

Steven Miller, 3606 Ari Ln, Glenview, stated his son graduated from Glenbrook South and had a diverse group of friends. He believes that Maple students should continue to attend Glenbrook South.

Joanne Matsakis, 3601 Ari Ln, Glenview, stated a small interest group without experience has used this budgetary process to address their children's perceived social needs. The reality is that everyone who lives in Glenview knew that Glenbrook South would be their high school. She would like the administration to approve the staff's recommendation to expand Glenbrook South and keep all of Glenview together.

Rick Edmonds, 3843 Crestwood Dr., Northbrook, IL, spoke against boundary changes.

Janet Bernstein, 3832 Kiess Dr., Glenview, has a freshman at Glenbrook South and her children have lived through the split at Maple and Field School. GBS alumni had no problem fitting in and there has been no impairment to students being divided after middle school. The students have survived and thrived. Choice is not an option.

Mary Ann Sgarlata, 3833 Kiess, Glenview, stated she is sorry the issue has gone this far, putting neighbors against neighbors and friends against friends. She said GBN and GBS are drastically different on the school report card. Any change in the attendance units or choice within district 30 will greatly impact the racial/ethnic percentages. It is the school board's responsibility to follow the School Code.

Lee Sacks, 3317 Maple Leaf, Glenview, stated the culture that has been so successful should be preserved. Mr. Sachs stated he hopes the board will approve a plan which will preserve the reserves. South can be expanded and North facilities upgraded.

Alan Lofgren, 3803 Michael Ln., Glenview, stated both high schools are excellent. He said he has petitions signed by 257 Glenview and Northbrook residents. Status quo should be maintained. GBS should be expanded. The choice issue divides the community.

Antonia Antonakos, 3414 Winnetka Rd., Glenview, stated she isn't afraid of ethnic diversity. Children survive if they are separated from their friends after middle school.

Dawn Denzel, 3408 Winnetka, Glenview, purchased her home in District 30 and knew that the Glenview children would be attending Glenbrook South and Northbrook friends would go on to Glenbrook North.

Susan Borre, 3908 Harvest Ct., Glenview, purchased her home in Glenview and spoke against school choice. Glenview students should attend Glenbrook South and Northbrook students should attend Glenbrook North.

5/22/00

Lois Wolfson, 3232 Maple Leaf, Glenview, stated that District 30 Glenview students should continue to be allowed to attend Glenbrook South.

Rita Planey, 1463 Glenwood Ave., Glenview, stated that homebuyers look at demographics and academic achievement of the school which are features directly affected by attendance flow. Attendance changes can virtually affect property values overnight. The district can afford to build classrooms to solve the problem. The movement of any high achievement group from GBS could send the ACT score down and property tax base with it. She favors building classrooms to accommodate population needs of GBS.

Art Wulf, 3948 Rutgers, Northbrook, suggested broadcasting board meetings on cable television. He stated the issue isn't comparing North to South, it is the allocation of scarce resources. The issue of enrollment began probably three or three and a half years ago before current board members were on the board. Mr. Wulf stated that is one of the reasons why there is an unequal allocation of monies spent at Glenbrook North compared to South over the last several years is because Glenbrook North is a much older school. The decision the board needs to make are the issues related to the financial consideration.

Andy Newman, 2324 Greenwood, Glenview, stated he is not in favor of changing attendance areas and wanted to confirm that he did hear that the board has agreed not to permit any mandatory change in student service areas. He agrees completely and supports the board's decision.

Mike Denzel, 3408 Winnetka, Glenview, stated he has reviewed the financial projections and financing package. He believes the financial package submitted by the administration on May 8 addressing the projected cost of facility additions and renovations and the accompanying operating fund forecast is a fundamentally sound proposal. The plan satisfies the four fiscal guidelines established by the board to the administration and the most important objective which is to avoid the imposition of additional taxes through referendum.

Jill Ruter, 2349 Fir, Glenview, stated her parents were aware of district boundaries and wanted her to attend GBS. They purchased a home and moved the summer before her freshman year. It was not a traumatic experience for her. She said that children pick up on the anxieties of their parents and mirror their worries and concerns. She is happy the board voted to maintain the attendance areas as they are. The homeowners in District 30 and the Glen knew what schools they were going to attend when they purchased their home and many purchased their home to attend GBS.

5/22/00

Carolyn "Mama" Glass stated she doesn't reside in the district, but that as a 32 year Glenbrook employee, she believes she has earned the right to speak. Maine had choice and it was unsuccessful. Mama Glass stated that she did not want one of her South kids to go to North.

Gale Glantz, 2319 Phillips Dr., Glenview, stated she has lived in Glenview for more than 20 years. Financially it makes much more sense to use existing capacity at Glenbrook North before spending money to create duplicate facilities. Balancing the enrollment would give students the opportunity to participate in many more programs. She stated the board should think about spending money that we may not receive.

Karen Hirsch, 1714 Wildwood Ct., Glenview, stated she supports the master plan which would accommodate the growth in Glenview so that all Glenview's students can attend Glenbrook South. She would like the district to build Glenbrook South to meet the needs of Glenview's children.

Michael Gaynor, 2340 Phillips Dr., Glenview, stated his daughter is not worried about where she will attend high school. High school is about making friends. He believes the board will come to the right decision for the students.

Helene Abramowitz, 2409 Saranac Ln., Glenview, stated she is a social worker who helps people with conflicts related to transition and develops programs targeted to high risk groups. There is a rumor that the board is thinking of moving District 30 students out of Glenbrook South. This is fueled by the so-called trauma expressed by some Maple School families related to the separation of their children from their best friends. There will always be individuals who find certain transitions more challenging than others. It is the job as parents and educators to teach these young people necessary lifetime coping skills. She does not want children moved by choice or any other means.

Carol Rudnik, 2501 Indian Ridge, Glenview, said she is a District 31 resident. She thanked the board for maintaining the current attendance areas. She stated the option of choice would create many problems. The parents have already made a choice.

Mrs. Rogal stated that the board has already doubled the amount of time allocated per board policy for community comments. She said it is at the pleasure of the board whether or not to continue community comments. Mrs. Rogal asked board members for their opinion regarding additional public comments. A majority of the board stated they would like to move on with the agenda items. Mr. Shact suggested returning to community comments after the board discussion. Mrs. Rogal asked the board if that would be agreeable. Board member consensus was to reopen the floor for public comments following board discussion.

RECESS

The board took a five minute recess.

MOTION TO APPROVE CONSENT AGENDA

The president asked if any Board member wished to have any item removed from the consent agenda for a separate vote. Mr. Seymour requested Item #4.2 appointments and resignations removed from the consent agenda and moved to closed session for discussion.

Motion by Mrs. Long, seconded by Mr. Olson, to approve the following items on the consent agenda:

1.) the minutes of the regular Board meeting of May 8, 2000.

4.) to authorize the reemployment of teachers contained in Mrs. Helander-Heiser's memorandum dated May 17, 2000.

5.) to change the previously approved special leave of absence without pay for Annahi Hart, foreign language teacher at Glenbrook North from 2/5 FTE to 1/5 FTE for the 2000-2001 school year.

6.) to accept the resignation of the following educational support staff as recommended by the director of human resources:

RESIGNATIONS

<u>NAME</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>EFFECTIVE</u>	<u>SCHOOL</u>
HISS, Jeanie	Instructional Assistant	6/7/2000	North
SWARD, Glenn	Custodian	5/31/2000	South

7.) the appointment and transfer of the following educational support staff as recommended by the director of human resources:

APPOINTMENTS

<u>NAME</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>EFFECTIVE</u>	<u>SCHOOL</u>	<u>SALARY</u>
RAMANI, Meena (rep. S. Kay)	Accounting Assistant	6/5/2000	District	C403
RIAZI, Cynthia (rep. K. Martin)	Nurse Aide	5/8/2000	North	AT01

TRANSFER

MARTIN, Kathryn (rep. J. Shea)	Nurse Aide	5/8/2000	North	AT01
-----------------------------------	------------	----------	-------	------

8.) the educational support staffing as contained in Dr. Schilling's memorandum dated May 22, 2000.

9.) the issuance of Vendor Check Nos. 188466 through 188817 in the amount of \$2,191,029.48 as listed on the attached check list dated May 22, 2000.

10.) the reissuing of replacement checks and to ratify the issuance of advance checks totaling \$173,801.50 as shown on the attached Supplemental Bill List dated May 22, 2000.

11.) the issuance of Vendor Check Nos. 188820 through 188825, for a total of \$15,646.14 as listed on the attached check list dated May 22, 2000.

12.) to ratify the issuance of the electronic wire transfers for credit union, TRS, federal taxes, employee and employer portion of FICA and Medicare taxes and state taxes, and payroll check numbers 242047 through 242863 and 243035 through 243341 totaling \$3,183,643.09. With adjustments of (\$193.89), employer TRS 2.2 contributions of (\$14,440.92) and employer matching FICA and Medicare of (\$70,345.94), the gross payroll for the month of March was \$3,098,662.34.

13.) the revisions in the Glenbrook health care plan as contained in Mr. Lacivita's memorandum dated May 18, 2000.

14.) a one year contract with National Data Works, 6429 West North Avenue, Suite 207, Oak Park, 60302, to provide third party administration of the district's claims under the fee-for-service program and administrative outreach program, based on a fee of 5% of reimbursed expenses, subject to final approval by the district's attorney.

15.) the medical and dental insurance rates for the 2000-2001 school year as shown in Dr. Schilling's memorandum dated May 22, 2000.

16.) the Glenbrook North space program educational trip to Wallops Island, VA, June 6-17, 2000.

17.) the Glenbrook symphony orchestra educational trip to Orlando, FL, January 2-5, 2001.

18.) to award the bid for asbestos abatement work in the new photo lab at Glenbrook North to Bay Environmental, Inc., 6124 N. Milwaukee Avenue, Chicago, IL 60646 for a total cost of \$12,000.

12
5/22/00

19.) the Glenbrook North debate program educational trip to Portland, Oregon, June 10-17, 2000.

20.) the Glenbrook South debate program educational trip to Rochester, NY, May 26-28, 2000.

Upon calling of the roll:

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

nay: none

Motion carried.

Note: See attached agenda item #4

RECOGNITION OF COMMUNITY VISITORS

Lisa Dembo, 2245 Sussex Ln., Northbrook, requested that the 1978 board policy dealing with balancing enrollments be reinstated. She commented she favors spending money to house all the Glenview students at GBS. She stated that the original policy should be reinstated to balance capacity, disparity of diversity between the two schools, and create a more balanced environment for the GBN students.

Beverly Braun, 2329 Sussex, Northbrook, 30 year Northbrook resident, stated it would be irresponsible of the board to make a decision regarding boundaries and choice this evening. She said the board hasn't done any research on the subject of boundaries or choice, but some community members spoke with board members this weekend and it sounded like some had already made up their minds. Regarding choice, she asked what district would be able to choose. She suggested allowing Districts 30 and 31 to choose. She asked if the board wanted to widen the disparity between the schools or keep the schools in a better balance. She implored the board to vote for what is in the best for District 225 as a whole.

Cathy Meglio, 3836 Miller Dr., Glenview, stated her daughter attended Glenbrook South and will be attending the University of Illinois. The University advised her that students are enrolled from almost every state in the United States and 33 countries. She said there was no better way to prepare the students to go into a college environment than to have them meet people from as many diverse backgrounds, economically, religiously to prepare them for college. The board now has an opportunity to allow the students of Glenbrook North to enjoy the same experience as the students who attend Glenbrook South.

Kevin Christell, 1007 Elmdale Rd., Glenview, stated his daughter attends the overcrowded Springman Junior High and is doing quite well. He commented the board members are elected by the people who have spoken here tonight. They've spoken about their feelings, discussed the finances, and they have faith in the administration that have made a recommendation. The board should follow the recommendations of the constituents. Choice is not right.

William Vranas, 3923 Gloria Ct., Glenview, stated many people have reiterated the arguments for maintaining the boundaries and doing the right thing. He has two daughters who have graduated from Glenbrook South and one who is currently a junior. They had a wonderful education. The major reason he purchased his home was because of the excellent school and diversity in the Village of Glenview. At that time, Glenbrook North and Glenbrook South had close academic scores and they were comparable. He stated he has been fortunate that District 225 is financially sound and has been able to retain the requisite funding to continue and expand its program and facilities to maintain excellence in education. He asked the board to take staff's recommendations and arguments from the constituents to do the right thing. The two high schools have kept very close in academia over the years; however, these scores have been changing and the disparity has been increasing over the past years. Even though Glenbrook South receives students from more diverse area, taking in the unincorporated areas of Glenview and Northbrook and part of this is balanced out by the areas of north and east Glenview. By disrupting this balance, he believes that this would lower the academia levels at GBS which would take away some of the academic challenges for the students requiring the challenge and lower the property values. He strongly opposes any boundary changes and that the board act on the recommendation to expand GBS.

Tom Shaer, 1421 Blackthorn, Glenview, stated choice is no different from mandatory attendance changes, which the board earlier voted against. Mr. Shaer stated that choice is not good and would lead to declining academic scores based on a lower collective income level. Mr. Shaer said the addition should be built so that Glenbrook South can continue to accommodate all the students who live within its current boundaries.

Gregg Minkow, 2523 Windsor Ln. Northbrook, stated he feels like a foreigner at this meeting. He stated he heard a lot of people talking about diversity, but he didn't hear a lot of tolerance.

5/22/00

Ty Laurie, 2144 Fir, Glenview, said he applauds the board for making the right decision in voting against the boundary change. He stated the board has to decide if they are going to vote for the appropriation for facilities, additions and renovations at both South and North and whether they are going to vote for choice. Staff is recommending those appropriations. Mr. Laurie stated that since the board voted against the boundary change the appropriation is needed even more. He said it makes no sense to use choice from a logistical standpoint if the board is trying to practice fiscal conservatism.

**ACTION/DISCUSSION REGARDING TOPICS INVOLVING FACILITY PLANNING,
FINANCIAL PLANNING, AND STUDENT ENROLLMENTS**

Mrs. Rogal stated she believes the people are struggling with comes down to the concept of community. She said each one of us defines community differently. Some feel their community is where their child goes to school. Others feel it is their immediate neighborhood or village. The scope goes from narrow to wide. People are passionate about their perceived community because of the one thing they all have in common. It was their choice to move to one town or another. It was their choice to move into one neighborhood or another. They chose an area to live based on which elementary or high school their child would attend. They made their choice. Unfortunately, some people apparently regret their choices. She said that between 1994 when a previous discussion on enrollment was held until now, not one person has come in front of the board and requested that boundaries be changed and students be moved. What began as an issue over the financing and adoption of a master facilities plan has become muddled and tainted by rhetoric about unrelated district's middle schools and where people choose to live. This is not the board's issue. The suggested social dilemmas of a small group must not cloud what is best for the entire Glenbrook district. The recommendation of our district administration is to build GBS to accommodate 2700 students if school administrators are confident that the quality of education and the ability to meet all student needs is not adversely affected by the size of the facility. If it is conversely enhanced by maintaining the cultural, economic and academic diversity of the student population it serves, if the financial component provides a comfort level of reserves does not jeopardize the district and indeed allows a cushion for ongoing and developing programs, quality staff and adequate facilities, if all that holds true, why wouldn't this board proceed and not attempt to tear apart a community.

Mrs. Long stated she perceived this as a facilities issue and the board asked the administration to put together a package that would financially do what we needed to do. The board asked to provide a quality education without raising taxes and to provide a cushion. In April the board said they would proceed after reviewing the financials. We now have the financial package which was presented to the board. It seems to accomplish all the goals, but they wanted a cushion for curriculum and programs. There is no long range plan in place for curriculum. There is no ongoing scheduled curriculum review of all of our areas. We still haven't come to a conclusion about our off campus program. Our special education population is rising and the board hasn't discussed how to accommodate the increase. Mrs. Long said she is inclined to agree that the administration has provided what the board has asked for but she would like to ask the board to think in a long range plan.

Mr. Lerner stated in conjunction with what Mrs. Long said, he believes what Dr. Schilling has provided a mathematical plan that doesn't affect future programming or the operation of the schools, either as we have them or as the staff may want to expand. He stated that what Dr. Schilling has put together responds to that point. In conjunction with what Mrs. Rogal has said, this started out many months ago as a circumstance in which the board directed the faculty and administration to establish their wants and needs. From there they began to refine that plan down. That plan is about half the size of what we started with. We've had the architects spend a lot of time redrawing, redrafting and refitting from the original request down to the request we have here. He said the board has spent an inordinate amount of time discussing issues about feelings, ideas and concepts that don't deal with the facility plan. There are a lot of emotional feelings that people have expressed, but he said it is also very clear that the public as a whole has confidence in the staff and administration. They have confidence in the proposal and numbers and at their own expense have taken the time to make sure that it doesn't raise taxes or affect a lot of other issues. The staff and administration have done what they were asked to do. Mr. Lerner stated either the board accepts the proposal or we don't or we modify the proposal or we don't, but the board has been given what they asked for.

Mr. Seymour stated the issue he has with the facility master plan is that the numbers keep changing. As you look at the projected enrollments as we proceed through the next eight years they go up and then they start to decline. The plan some years ago was to put an addition onto South and then go back and work on North and to give it some new science labs and raise its capacity equal to the capacity that GBS had which was 2450. In the meantime a couple of things have happened. We've changed the schedule and although it didn't have a great impact at Glenbrook North because it

5/22/00

was under capacity, it had a significant impact at Glenbrook South because it was nearly at capacity. So when we changed the schedule, we went from the designed 2450 down to 2350 or 2325. Now we're at the maximum building capacity. The projections are to increase as we go and they're going to increase more rapidly than the building is going to be expanded. Mr. Seymour questioned what we can do to go back or get close to the capacity that was designed and intended some years ago before we made the realization that the block scheduling would significantly reduce the building capacity. The monies that have been laid out here is a feasible plan. Mr. Seymour stated his issue is how we can increase the capacity of the school without increasing the cost and without decreasing the educational minutes that each child receives. He would like to bring the capacity more in line with the 2450 that it was designed to do two years ago before the change was made. Mr. Seymour requested that the administration take a look at changing the schedule or increasing the capacity of the building so that the build out is not so great in the future. As it stands, he stated it is a pretty good plan.

Mr. Olson stated that board policy JBCCA deals with attendance areas. The policy was last amended on October 22, 1984 and if the board voted to endorse or not change attendance areas, it would have direct reference to this policy. Mr. Olson would like the board to look at that policy as part of the discussion.

Mrs. Beyne stated she would like the board to make some decisions tonight so that the board could move on. Right now South has some big needs. The issue is we are 15 years out and we are hitting the ceiling of maximum borrowing. In doing this, we have brought our reserves to a 33% low. This project made her nervous when she heard about it and still does. She stated the problem she has is how to trim it back without cutting into programmatic needs for students and the needs outlined by administration. We do not have a long range programmatic or curriculum plan. She stated she doesn't know what kind of contingencies are on the horizon or how much they're going to cost. We do have a lot of capacity at GBN. What can we do as a board to make some sound decisions to make sure we're getting the biggest bang for our buck without borrowing to the max. She would like to look into any consideration that could happen at Glenbrook South to increase the capacity of the building from a scheduling standpoint.

Mrs. Rogal asked Mr. Smith if the issue has been looked at from a scheduling standpoint.

Mr. Smith said it has been looked at from a scheduling standpoint.

Mrs. Rogal asked if they had come to any conclusions.

Mr. Smith stated it depends upon what your tradeoff is. He said that the schedule change was made at a time when the board was asking us to enroll students in more class time. Mr. Smith said the only thing we could probably do is shifts where we have some students start early and leave early and some students start late and leave late. We would have to negotiate that with the union. Mr. Smith stated he doesn't believe that is the best educational atmosphere. The size of the building would determine the schedule and the academic program.

Dr. Hales stated the administration does not feel there is any sound way to address the schedule to get to the capacity we need without compromising the educational program. This means students will take fewer classes, there will be more students in the classes, we will be in a shift schedule or longer day which would have to be negotiated with the teachers' union. All of those issues were previously identified.

Mr. Lerner stated he would like to respond to Mrs. Beyne's comments that the size of the borrowing makes her uncomfortable. Mr. Lerner said the reason we have the ability to borrow is because we are about to pay off the last twenty years of borrowing that we did. In the last five or six years we reduced the reserves to free up cash of approximately \$20 million dollars to do the construction at North. We have always taken cash reserves to pay cash at times when Dr. Schilling feels that is the appropriate thing to do or we have borrowed it. I don't think the financial plan is anything of great consequence in the sense that this is what we've done all along, they've just found some better ways to borrow. I think that as a whole, the problem we have is not so much the proposal of the financial plan or the numbers it represents. And that is probably over the course of time, even though we've been one district and two schools as a community there has always been a North position and South position. Mr. Lerner said he doesn't think we can circumvent the fact that over the course of time the attitude is they've got it, so we get it. Essentially, one of the reasons the numbers are so large is because we put off doing construction at both schools at the same time out of fear of the numbers. I think we have to recognize that North was originally built in 1956 and South opened in 1962. There is no easy way to look at all these 0's. When you look at this proposal we have to decide either we have faith in those that brought it to us or maybe the issue isn't what they presented. I think the community's position is overwhelming. They are not upset with spending the money. Everybody has made it clear where they want their children to be. Mr. Lerner said the board needs to decide whether or not we want to do this; which is either a yes or no.

5/22/00

Mr. Olson said he is a 49 year resident of Glenview and went to Glenbrook North because of the student population at the time and then went to Glenbrook South for three years. Board members must consider all sides of an issue before coming to a conclusion. It is not easy to take that more objective point of view with the emotionalism that pervades this group. The board also needs to remember that we represent a profile of people who have grown up and lived in this community for many years. As a lifelong resident of this community he believes it is extremely important to represent the interests of a wide cross section of this community, many of them who do not have any children at this time attending any of the schools and are also paying the tax to live here. I think Mrs. Beyne, Mrs. Long, and Mr. Seymour are all trying to search for what the right number is in the context of the taxpayers. The board needs to consider all tax burdens as we make our decision. We must realize that we are making financial decisions without having a long term educational program. Mr. Olson stated that while he appreciates and understands the issues and while we have the financial wherewithal to do this we need to remember that this impacts everyone's taxes.

Mr. Shact said programs, not facilities make our schools great. We are one district. He stated he shares the other board member concerns that we want great facilities, but the financial numbers scare him. This board and the boards of the future will have to deal with the problems that remain behind. That's the current board's responsibility. Dr. Schilling took a lofty plan that was a culmination of many group's wish lists and was given the task to figure out how we can pay for this. He came up with a good plan and didn't give a value judgment as to whether the board should do it or not. There were a lot of people who came before the board tonight who were upset and concerned. The board tried to make people feel a little more comfortable to say we're not going to make any decisions to mandatorily move students. We have a lot of different constituencies and must balance what is best. The reason choice continues to come up is we have about \$53 million that represents the maximum of our reserves, but we have about \$60 million of items that are identified that we want to do. The administration split it into Phase 1 and Phase 2, but the fact of the matter is when the district identified all of the goals and objectives, it exceeds the revenue. When the board talked about going to Phase 2 they talked about what we might do in a year or two or when the funds allowed. We're talking about a fifteen year borrowing net. We're going to shut down those options. When we talked about an alternative revenue bond, I think people described it pretty accurately. We're paying out of operating funds for bonds and interest. We are talking about losing a certain amount of flexibility. Who can imagine what we're going to need 10 or 15 years from now. Mr. Shact stated

he is not comfortable making a decision today for boards and people that are going to live in this community ten years from now. When you look around and see there is space at Glenbrook North and South is taxed to the max, it makes me uncomfortable. Mr. Shact stated he has heard so many different thoughts about what this building's maximum build out capacity is. The board voted for block scheduling last year. I recall being told this would not have an adverse effect on capacity. When you look at the combination of choice and scheduling changes, if everybody gives a little bit, everybody can walk away somewhat satisfied. It is fiscally irresponsible to spend the money and say because we're a wealthy district we have it. It's not really there. What we're talking about is future taxes and bypassing a referendum to go to an alternative financing technique. If everybody was that confident, we would probably put this out to referendum. Mr. Shact stated he doesn't think the board or community are that confident and would like to see some measure of choice being offered. The best person to make the decision where their child goes to school is the parent. A limited amount of choice is in the public's interest. He said he doesn't understand why we are so married to the block schedule. If that takes up 75-100 kids spaces here, maybe it's not going to work out. When we voted for the schedule change we were under the impression that a lot of good things were going to happen and maybe as more teachers were exposed to it, teachers would feel more comfortable with the concept. What our studies have revealed after one year, no change. Mr. Shact said split shifts are not terrible. No. The people in Glenview would like Glenbrook South to handle as many kids as possible. Mr. Shact would like to look at how to maximize building capacity. The solution will combine several elements. Not everyone will be happy, but everyone will walk away with something they want.

Mrs. Rogal stated at the April 15 special board meeting the board reached consensus that major renovations and remodeling would take place at Glenbrook South. Mrs. Rogal proposed starting at the top of the facilities list and going down item by item to arrive at a comfortable figure.

Mr. Olson stated the issue is one of perspective. Each board member examines issues from a different perspective. Mr. Olson stated that anyone who puts together a plan in any context does so with certain cushions and contingencies built in. He believes the administration should be given a number and told to make the appropriate trade-offs.

Mrs. Rogal asked Mr. Olson for the number he would be comfortable with.

Mr. Olson stated he merely raised a question. Each board member

brings their own perspective to the discussion.

Mr. Lerner stated his understanding of the list is that page 1 and page 2 total \$44 million dollars. He said Mrs. Rogal's question is if the board is not comfortable with \$44 million dollars, what are we comfortable with? Either we support what was presented or tell the administration it's too much. What are we telling the administration? Maybe there are other ways to accomplish this but Dr. Hales and Mr. Smith are saying we're using the building 92% of the time. We need to talk about the bottom line on the checkbook or what is right or wrong about the plan. We have to give the administration a number or an idea or we're going to keep coming back for the same decision.

Mr. Shact stated that is why boundaries and choice are germane issues. He asked if this is a plan for 2700 students? What is the baseline number?

Mr. Lerner stated this is the plan the administration from both schools say will provide the best education for every student in this district, at the school they want to attend, at a cost this community is willing to bear.

Dr. Hales stated on April 15 he heard the board deal with a couple of important issues with the understanding that funding and fiscal review had to take place. 1) Significant improvements need to be made at Glenbrook South regardless of the enrollment. 2) If we had a comfortable plan within our financial parameters, we will deal with the existing enrollment growth within our existing attendance areas. You've given us the parameters. We believe we have responded to you. We believe we have responded to you with what we feel is best for kids, our educational program, did so in a cautious and fiscally responsible manner so there is plenty of financial cushion to deal with increased staff, increased programs, other issues that we might deal with. If those parameters are changing, all we can ask of you is to tell us. We need to know what the parameters are. I hear several board members saying they are not comfortable with the plan. I don't know if it is an issue of trust or perspective. We work every day with our students and teachers, we will provide every student in this district with the best education we can whether they are at Glenbrook North or Glenbrook South.

Mr. Seymour stated the numbers provided don't add up. Mr. Seymour asked if all options have been considered to save money for each item.

Mrs. Beyne said we are proposing to spend a lot of money when there is space left. We can cut \$5 million from the Glenbrook South plan, make a pact among the board and make it work. We can float the choice issue

to put it to rest so the community members can go home. We can also ask the administration to take a look at scheduling.

Mrs. Long stated she is uncomfortable that the board hasn't completed their long range planning. She asked if the board is comfortable with the amount of the reserve. If we are comfortable, then we should proceed with what has been presented. If we're not, then we may have to ask if there is some way we can increase the reserves so we can accomplish what we might need to in the next 15 years.

Mr. Lerner stated if we follow the plan we will actually have more at the end of the plan than we started with at the beginning of the plan. Mr. Lerner said that according to Dr. Schilling, we can move remaining operating payments into debt service and that \$2.6 million will put back into our reserves starting in the 16th year.

Mr. Shact recommended the approval of \$39 million dollars. Out of that \$39 million he recommended reducing the GBS request by \$5 million dollars and direct the administration to use a combination of scheduling and choice proposals to reduce the capacity.

Mr. Shact proposed a motion to approve \$39 million dollars out of the \$44 million that has been requested. The \$39 million dollars encompasses what has been requested at Glenbrook South and what has been requested at Glenbrook North, subtracting the \$5 million dollars the administration has requested to add additional capacity at South. The administration is further directed to bring to the board a program of recommendations for how to implement the program of choice, scheduling changes and any other components that may be necessary in order to accomplish that.

The motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Olson stated the proposal without having to go to referendum is about \$55 million. As it is laid out in the plan that is put forth, the board would be considering an expenditure in the first phase of approximately \$44 million leaving a fundable cushion of about \$11 million. Mr. Olson said Mrs. Long is concerned about the lack of a long range educational plan. Mr. Olson suggested considering a number within a zone recognizing a fundable cushion of \$11 million and indicate that in the meantime, before we would consider further expenditures, and/or other phases that the board develop a long term educational plan against which we would review all additional funding for facilities or programs before we do anything in regard to a second phase.

Mr. Lerner stated they could spend all night deciding if North should have two pools as opposed to fixing one. Mr. Lerner stated if the board is not comfortable with a \$44 million proposal, that we approve the expenditure of \$40 million and let the faculty and administration go back and argue over whether North gets two pools or how it is spent and let them decide what would be the most appropriate way to spend, keeping 2700 enrollment at GBS and approve the number for the district and they have to determine where to spend the money and the board has protected the cash reserves and additional borrowing. I am willing to come to a lump sum number and let them argue about what they need. Mr. Lerner stated the request is for \$44 million, less the photo lab and performance contracting which has already been approved. He stated he would like to know why those requests are on there. They have already been approved.

Mr. Olson stated he believes they are in the request is because taking the board input provided at an earlier meeting, the administration decided to incorporate it subsequently into the overall plan.

Mr. Lerner stated if you want to save \$5 million dollars, this is \$6 million too much already. If you take away \$6 million of this, we are below where the board wants to be because we've already approved that.

Dr. Schilling stated the reason it is in the proposal is because he's had requests to redo this so many times, he wanted to keep track of money that was already approved as well as other because it all has to come from the same pot. He stated it was included for record keeping because he didn't want \$6 million dollars to get lost and have a motion.

MOTION TO APPROVE FUNDING FOR FACILITY PLANNING

Motion by Mrs. Long, seconded by Mr. Lerner, to approve the plan and authorize the administration to proceed with Phase 1 with the understanding that the board would like the plan to come in under budget.

Upon calling of the roll:

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

nay: none

Motion carried.

MOTION TO MOVE INTO CLOSED SESSION

Motion by Mrs. Long, seconded by Mrs. Beyne, to move into closed session at approximately 11:45 p.m. to consider the appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance, or dismissal of specific employees (Section 2 (c) (1) of the Open Meetings Act).

Upon calling of the roll:

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

nay: none

Motion carried.

The Board returned to open session at approximately 12:01 a.m.

MOTION TO APPROVE CONSENT AGENDA ITEM #4.2

Motion by Mrs. Long, seconded by Mr. Shact, to approve Consent Agenda Item #4.2:

2. to accept the resignation of the following certificated staff as recommended by the director of human resources:

RESIGNATIONS

<u>NAME</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>EFFECTIVE</u>	<u>SCHOOL</u>
BEILGARD, Phyllis	Business Education Instructor	End of 1999-2000 School Year	South
DUMALSKI, Sandra	English Instructor	End of 1999-2000 School Year	South
WEGLEY, Brian	Science Instructor	End of 1999-2000 School Year	South

5/22/00

3.) the appointment of the following certificated staff as recommended by the director of human resources:

APPOINTMENTS

<u>NAME</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>EFFECTIVE</u>	<u>SCHOOL</u>	<u>SALARY</u>
BOWMAN, John	Mathematics Instructor	2000-2001 School Year	North	MA, Step 7
CHOI, Angela	English Instructor	2000-2001 School Year	North	BA, Step 1
SIMMONS, Jean	Family & Consumer Science Instructor	2000-2001 School Year and	North and South	MA, Step 10 (0.8 FTE)
TUTTLE, George	Director of Special Education	7/1/2000	Dist.	MA+60, Step 18
WALOWITZ, Lindsey	Science Instructor	2000-2001 School Year	North	BA, Step 1

Upon calling of the roll:

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

nay: none

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Mrs. Beyne, seconded by Mr. Shact, to adjourn the meeting at approximately 12:05 a.m.

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

Motion carried.

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

CERTIFIED TO BE CORRECT:

PRESIDENT - BOARD OF EDUCATION

SECRETARY - BOARD OF EDUCATION

NEXT REGULAR MEETING: JUNE 12, 2000 Glenbrook Admin. Building
7:30 P.M. 1835 Landwehr Road
Glenview, Illinois