

# ***Spotlight on the Board***

## **Notes from the District 15 School Board Meetings**

### **March 11th, 2009**

This was a Regular meeting. All Board members and Candidates for the April 7<sup>th</sup> election were present.

#### **Preliminary Staffing Report for 2009/10**

**John Fenton, Director, Personnel and Human Services** – From the Student Assignment Plan for 2009/10, it was determined that there is to be a reduction in classroom staff of approximately 14.1 teachers. That does not include ELL, Bilingual, Self-Contained or Special Education teachers – it is a reduction in Regular Education classrooms. It was also determined based on the formula for PAs (Program Assistants) provided in the CTC (Classroom Teachers Council) contract, that there would be a reduction in PA staff of eleven (11). Other departments, there will be a headcount reduction of 2.0 (one warehouse position and one mechanic). There is also a request for approximately 4.7 new positions all of which are covered by Grant funding except for 1.6 positions for social work interns. The total cost to the district for that would be \$9K.

#### **Special Education Update**

Ref: *Special Education Update and Phase-Out of Language Learning Programs memorandums*  
[www.fcwpta.org/pdf/BOE\\_031109\\_SpecialEd.pdf](http://www.fcwpta.org/pdf/BOE_031109_SpecialEd.pdf)

**Mary Zarr, Asst. Superintendent for Curriculum** – This is an update of Special Education initiatives progress, potential program changes and some other initiatives that will roll over into the 2010/11 school year. She said that **Cindy Phelps, Director of Special Services** would deliver the report to the Board (see link above to memos that were the essence of the report given to the Board.)

*Board questions/comments during and after Phelps report –*

#### **RtI – Response to Intervention -**

**Board Vice President Kelly Keenan** – Asked for an explanation of RtI.

**Phelps** – Currently if students are identified as eligible for special education services under the category of specific learning disabilities, the model is that we would do testing and determine that this is their intellectual ability (held her hand high) and this is where they are performing academically (held her other hand lower). There has to be a significant discrepancy between the two before students would be eligible for special education services as learning disabled students. That is really a “wait to fail” model. In other words, the student will have to be in school for a few years for there to be this discrepancy between their intellectual ability and their ability to perform academically. The new model is that we do screening of all students, which we do through the MAP testing and through AIMs. Then we look at where the student is achieving and can see from the beginning those students who are not being as successful and we start providing interventions early. Those interventions are targeted to their specific deficits and we monitor progress on an ongoing basis. As we provide more interventions, if they succeed then they are out of the intervention. If we need to continue to provide interventions then the response to the interventions is not sufficient, then we can assume that there is a learning problem.

**Keenan** – Asked if that information was communicated to all parents, even regular education parents that their children might not fall into the category of needing extra help or intervention.

**Phelps** – It would only be for students suspected of having a learning disability and referred for a case study evaluation. Through MAP testing, we are able to look at all of our students and determine if they are not making progress, then we need to provide some interventions. In that case, parents would definitely be involved in knowing that their child needs interventions and what type of interventions are going to be given in order to get the student to grade level. She thinks it would be helpful to have the district’s RtI coordinator come and give a more detailed explanation to the Board if needed.

**Board member Sue Quinn** - Thinks that would be helpful to give a detailed explanation at some point in the future on RtI and how it applies to the general population not just for special needs children.

**Phelps** - Indeed, it is before we determine if they need special education. It is a general education tool. **Quinn** - That leads to her follow up question which is since we have been using the RtI model which is now about 12 months. Asked if that was right or was it just this calendar year?

**Phelps** - We have just really begun this calendar year and it is really not in full swing in any school yet.

**Zarr** - By January 2009, you had to have your study plan submitted to the State and then by January 2010, you had to show how you would identify your students. The Response to Intervention will allow us to apply interventions to any student without going through the IEP process.

**Quinn** - So her question might be premature but perhaps it can be answered. Is the scope of the number of kids that we are now discovering or identifying - is it larger because we are using the newer model? In other words, were we missing kids using the prior model?

**Phelps** - Thinks we are helping more students prior to ever looking at whether they have a disability. That would be the goal. There were many students that were mistakenly determined to have a disability when in reality; it was a lack of previous instruction, perhaps a lack of early intervention. When they came into school, they weren't at the same place as someone else. By giving more targeted interventions, what we are hoping is to narrow that gap between their academic achievements and where the others are in their classroom.

**Zarr** - It is important to understand that RtI is a National initiative that was a mandate to the States. The implementation of how to monitor was left up to each individual State. While we followed the National mandate to begin our process, we now follow Illinois deadlines to meet it.

#### ***Program Changes for Next Year -***

**Phelps** - Due to a decline in the # of students needing such programs, two Special Education classes - one for the severe and profound and another for the physically handicapped - will be eliminated at the junior high level. The two JH aged students will be appropriately served in an existing program and the two affected teachers will be reassigned to other needs in special education programs.

There is a need for a cross-categorical program, that refers to students with mild cognitive disabilities and somewhat severe learning disabilities at the primary level. We currently have one at the intermediate level and 2 classrooms at the JH level. We see there is a need at the primary level now and will be started at Willow Bend where the intermediate classroom is located.

The proposed plan is to begin phasing out the Language based Learning disabilities Program (LLP) at Hunting Ridge. There are no first graders recommended for the program next year and the current sixth graders will go on to junior high into learning disabilities classes. Combining the remaining students into two classes will not cause the district to be in non-compliance with the legal limits. In the future, students who might have been recommended for LLP already meet the eligibility requirements for learning disabilities and can be served instructionally in existing programs. The speech and language therapy time that will be available due to the change, because of the displacement of the current teacher, this speech/language time can be reassigned so that they can work collaboratively with LD teachers, other special education and general education teachers to provide more language based support to all students in the classrooms.

**Board member Wendy Rowden** - Thinks that it is good news to see the district moving towards a process that really focuses on least-restrictive environments by showing that we put interventions in place can help kids that will not be eligible and also prevent kids who would otherwise be determined to be eligible but we hadn't really shown much of trying to intervene before that process. She is for the collaborative teaching process. Thinks it makes more sense to have the people with the specialties of emotional, speech and language, etc. in the classroom instead of taking the child out of the environment you want them to be successful in.

**Superintendent Daniel Lukich** - Asked Phelps what percentage of District 15 students are identified for special education? **Phelps** - Answered about 13% (1600 children) which is under the state average.

## Technology Plan Update

Prior to the PowerPoint presentation a short video clip was shown titled

"**A Vision of K-12 Students Today**" <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7N-mzrI86NM>

Ref: **Technology Plan Update** - [www.fcwpta.org/pdf/BOE\\_031109\\_TechPlan.pdf](http://www.fcwpta.org/pdf/BOE_031109_TechPlan.pdf)

**Jim Garwood, Asst. Superintendent for Administrative Services** led the slide presentation with support from **Carol Gajewski, Manager of Technology Services** and Jack Trapp, Network Specialist. (see link above of slides that were the essence of the presentation to the Board)

*Board comments made after the presentation –*

**Quinn** – Knows that some of this is part of our five-year plan. 21<sup>st</sup> century learning is different than 21<sup>st</sup> century technology. Technology is just one piece. As Garwood said, curriculum should drive our technology needs not the other way around. So there is a commitment there as we move forward and start talking seriously about 21<sup>st</sup> century learning which includes Math and Science and Technology as one piece. It needs to be an integrated whole. Great ideas here but just wanted to throw that (comment) out so that you know we are thinking about a bigger picture down the road.

**Garwood** – That presentation (21<sup>st</sup> century learners) is coming May 27<sup>th</sup> to the Board meeting.

**Board member Tim Millar** – Staff development is key to this whole implementation. The challenge is how to increase staff development throughout the entire district to the teaching staff, not just the IT staff. Does Garwood have any solutions with negotiations as to how to accomplish that?

**Garwood** – What he was referring to was the need to have that technology coordinator.

**Millar** – It is difficult right now with the site-based budgets and how we implement it one or two days a year (Institute Days) to really address that. The other issue was standardization. After visiting a lot of the schools, he noticed that we have a lot of similar equipment already – SMARTBoards and other interactive white boards. He thinks that we need to rein that in quickly because the cross-pollination between schools is not going to occur if you are on dissimilar systems. He thinks that is something that really needs to be addressed.

**Board member Nancy Lee Carlson** - When the original budget cuts in technology occurred several years ago, it was done in a time when we were looking at massive cuts in the district. It was never meant to be permanent. Unfortunately we are falling behind in our technology and are not in the position to have the tools. As we go forward looking at what we are going to be doing for the future of the school district so that technology can regain a place in the budget discussions. We are a technology based society now. When you look at what other countries are doing, it just shakes her head to see that we are falling further and further back in the district.

**Quinn** – Thinks that the district needs to take a close look at how we use those student computers in the classroom or not, as the case may be right now because they are practically dysfunctional. When Garwood was talking about the mini-laptops or stepping down the teacher laptops when they get replaced. Quinn thinks that the district needs to take a closer evaluation of what actually happens in those classrooms with that technology, how does that relate to SMARTBoard usage vs. not and the interaction with the computer labs. **Garwood** – This past Monday/Tuesday, a survey was sent to all of the staff to do just that. We asked for assessments on how staff feels their technology is, their skills, what they are using, what they would like to know how to use, how they are currently using technology and how they would like to be able to use it. We are collecting that information.

**Gajewski** – They have also surveyed other districts to see what they are doing with 21<sup>st</sup> century technologies. That information will also be provided to the Board (at the May 27<sup>th</sup> meeting).

**Quinn** – It is very good to benchmark our surrounding districts and see what they are doing. We may be behind in some ways but we don't want to just "catch up" but be forward thinking about where we want to be. We can't get there all in one step because of money. We want to at least have a good place to get to. It is hard to go too far forward in technology because it keeps changing on us.

## **Network Refresh Preview**

**Garwood** – The purpose of this presentation is to provide the Board with an overview, rationale and scope. It is a budget item. They felt that prior to bringing their recommendation to the Board on April 15<sup>th</sup>, since it is a large ticket item – they wanted to give the Board a “heads up”. There were 40 vendors present at the pre-bid meeting today.

Ref: **Network Refresh Preview** – [www.fcwpta.org/pdf/BOE\\_031109\\_Network.pdf](http://www.fcwpta.org/pdf/BOE_031109_Network.pdf)

**Lukich** – It is fairly obvious as this Board and the next Board looks at the architectural study; the study of technology was not a part of the overall facilities study. It was probably an omission. He thinks that Garwood and his team are beginning to fill in that gap because any decisions a Board makes about “brick and mortar” certainly if it is a 21<sup>st</sup> century building, it will have to contain technology. Doubts if the district would want to build a 20<sup>th</sup> century building or remodel a 20<sup>th</sup> century building. We are bridging the discussion from architect to district. Lukich thinks that the 3<sup>rd</sup> part of that discussion that is quite frankly unknown – it is the federal piece that has to do with the stimulus money. He has been told that a great deal of stimulus money is going to be targeted for technology in school districts. If that is the case, one of the things that he has observed since he has been in D15 – He visited this district back in 2003 and came back in 2004 to have another look. Lukich does think that technology has taken a back seat, it shouldn't have, but it did. He will be making some very strong recommendations to the Board that will re-strengthen not just buying computers but re-strengthening the approach for the best and the latest technologies in front of 12,000 students.

## **Citizens Address the Board**

**Brian Drake** – 5<sup>th</sup>/6<sup>th</sup> Language Learning (LLP) teacher at Hunting Ridge

He is here to make a statement about the possible phasing out of our program at Hunting Ridge. Our team (of teachers) was asked to compile some data regarding student performance. It is his understanding that the Board received a copy of their most current and significant longitudinal data regarding the effectiveness of the program. The team would like to thank the Board for considering and reviewing this information and if there are any further questions, they welcome the opportunity to receive them.

**Patricia Pazdioch** – Hunting Ridge parent

She sent an email February 25<sup>th</sup> to the Board about the district doing away with the Language Learning program (LLP) offered at Hunting Ridge. She has an 11 year old child that has participated in the program for many years and has benefitted significantly from this program that is being phased out. She is curious as to why the district would want to recreate a program to replace the LLP which is already successful. Students have graduated from the program and moved forward with their learning experience among their peers. It offers children the extensive speech therapy in their classroom by the teachers, who are also licensed speech therapists. Students benefit from constant exercises to improve their skills as they go about their day without focusing directly on therapy. It allows those students who need more intense therapy to be monitored. It has been said that there are no incoming 1<sup>st</sup> graders for 2009/10 – is this because no one qualified or because the direction started last year to eliminate this successful program? What about the families that transferred into the district and need the program to help their child? How well will they accept that there is a program but it is being phased out for a cross-categorical classroom? That classroom existed when her son was in kindergarten and it was the most unproductive year of his 8 ½ years in school when he received low marks. After one year in the LLP which included 22 sick days for surgeries, at the end of year he received 13 out of 13 outstanding marks. It would be devastating to lose this program.

**Rhonda Bischoff** – District parent

She and on behalf of a group of parents, is asking the Board to make Transitional Kindergarten (TK) a full day program for 2009/10. Two items from the last Board meeting have prompted this request. During the presentation last month about full-day kindergarten, Mary Zarr mentioned that research has shown that all-day kindergarten helps to close the achievement gap for low-income and minority students and that there are no negative effects to the child being in all-day kindergarten. She would

have to believe that this would apply to our special education population as well. Secondly, Rebecca Allard mentioned during her review of 5-year financial projections that the district expects \$1.3M in Special Education funds from the stimulus package. TK is for children with IEPs and they would benefit the most from an increase to a full day. It seems irrational that we would expect these kids in TK, those already in need of additional support and already behind the general population, would have a chance at being ready for mainstream 1<sup>st</sup> grade when they attend school for the same amount of time as the general population kindergarteners. Increasing the TK day would benefit these children greatly and they could receive their resource minutes such as speech, OT, PT and social work and still have class time left to focus on academics. It would also benefit the district financially because increasing the TK day to full-day would result in more kids ready to mainstream into 1<sup>st</sup> grade or later. It would save the district financially in the long run. Some parents of preschool children currently in special ed have advice from outside experts that say our kids need a full day kindergarten. TK is the only special education kindergarten program in the district that is not currently a full day. Knows the Board has a full agenda and has undertaken a large initiative that includes the facility study to map out the future of our district. She is asking on behalf of a group of parents and herself that the Board consider now changing the four sections of TK to a full day program beginning next year. The benefit to the kids would be enormous.

**Lisa Traina** – Co-chair of SPARK (Special Education Parents Accessing Resources and Knowledge) She has a child with autism, is an educational surrogate trained by the state and a parent of a Special Olympian. Her life is Special Ed and felt that she had to respond to a few things that have been said tonight. She is truly impressed with everything that has been put on the table (Special Education Update), all of the changes being made, therapists in the classroom is phenomenal because the teacher then knows what the child has learned, what they should know and follow through. Her child is high functioning autism and is now at Sundling, his first year in a regular school – before he has been in self-contained schools and programs. She said that for kids in autism, least-restrictive is not a typical classroom. Least-restrictive is low lights, sensory, not as many people – that is what they need to do well. We have to be cautious when we do collaborative teaching – putting a kid in with regular kids, having an extra teacher, extra assistant – putting more people in a classroom in an unstructured environment is not good for kids with autism. They do not pick up social skills easily; it is something they have to be taught.

## **ED-RED Council/Legislation**

**Quinn** – Regarding the Federal Stimulus package – Illinois is going to get approximately \$3 billion as it looks right now. That is divided into two pots - \$1 billion is appropriations for school districts and \$2 billion is what they call State fiscal stabilization funds. That is money that the federal government is giving to the State to make sure the State doesn't cut their education budget. It is stabilizing the education funding that is expected to come from the State over the next two years which is the window of time that the stimulus money is expected to be expended.

The appropriations money – the money that comes straight to us – is going to be for Title I which is for Special Education, Early Childhood – a lot of the discussions that we have been having for our planning. There is some potential there for us to reap some benefits. Special Education is a huge piece of the stimulus money. That also includes Early Childhood Special Education so Transitional Kindergarten (TK) is definitely in there somewhere. Also as discussed earlier, there is money for educational technology. That includes teacher training and curriculum development. That is an integral part of the process. It is nice that they recognize that it is just not buying new laptops. The stabilization funds include some grants that D15 might be able to apply for some innovative things we are doing in our district.

There is potential out there, we don't know how much or when. Hopefully we will know soon in the next few months. We had some numbers last month; those numbers are not going to stay the same. They are probably going to go down. So don't get your hopes pinned on that but it should be firmed up soon. Then the Board will have to have some serious discussions on what to do with that money.

**Lukich** – We are hopeful that at the April 1<sup>st</sup> Committee of the Whole meeting there will be some more viable update in terms of solid numbers so we can budget that/present that alongside the five-year and long-term planning.

## **Committee of the Whole Agenda – April 1st**

Ref: April 1<sup>st</sup> Agenda - [www.fcwpta.org/pdf/BOE\\_COW\\_apr\\_1\\_09\\_agenda.pdf](http://www.fcwpta.org/pdf/BOE_COW_apr_1_09_agenda.pdf)

**Quinn** – Wants to make sure that there is something we are talking about regarding the Middle School concept which is we have this disconnect between D15 and D211 or D214 where our standards are misaligned somewhere at the State levels. Some of our kids are meeting standards all along the way and then not necessarily meeting standards when they go into D211. We are starting to do some initiatives to address that. D211 has their summer opportunities program where they help kids get ready for high school. We are starting to do some of that at the junior high level. Quinn would like to see the educational focus in our conversation about what we can see doing differently going forward in a middle school concept or our current model.

**Keenan** – Asked Quinn where she is getting that information about people meeting standards here but getting to high school and not meeting standards? She didn't see that information.

**Quinn** – Replied anecdotal information from parents but also from the ISBE when the State Superintendent Chris Koch talked about starting a committee to address that standards misalignment issue. **Keenan** – She has heard the exact opposite – that a lot of the kids that aren't getting into accelerated programs here are getting into the accelerated programs in high school.

**Quinn** – That is at the other end of the spectrum.

**Mary Zarr** – Both Keenan and Quinn are correct. It is not a misalignment of the standards; it is a misalignment of the assessment because the ISAT is aligned to the Illinois standards. The high school students take a two-part test – the ACT and the WorkKeys. The high school has a dual problem that they are facing. They are finding that their kids who score above a 19 on the ACT, which is considered college readiness level, may or may not meet on the ISAT because the Work Keys section that Illinois uses for the PSAE is not aligned. They (high school) have had children that have scored in the mid-20s on their ACT that on their PSAE did not meet standards because of the WorkKeys area. Many high school districts, D211 included, have filed petitions with the State that what they are measuring, is that their measurement piece is not standard.

Ref: **D211 Incoming Freshmen Summer School Initiative – Memo dated 11/20/08**

[http://www.d211.org/pdf/Enhancement\\_Incoming\\_Freshmen\\_Summer\\_School\\_Initiative.pdf](http://www.d211.org/pdf/Enhancement_Incoming_Freshmen_Summer_School_Initiative.pdf)

**ACT** [www.act.org](http://www.act.org) **WorkKeys** [www.act.org/workkeys/assess/math/](http://www.act.org/workkeys/assess/math/)

**ISBE – ISAT Student Assessment** [www.isbe.state.il.us/assessment/ISAT.htm](http://www.isbe.state.il.us/assessment/ISAT.htm)

**Lukich** – On April 1<sup>st</sup>, we are here to discuss the middle school concept. In listening to Quinn, he thinks she is talking about articulation and thinks that is more of a DOI (Dept. of Instruction) curricular issue although it could be a middle school discussion. We will touch on it but won't focus totally on it. There is so much more to talk about in terms of middle school. **Rowden** – She would like to know that when we are presented with information about middle schools and what is good or bad – she would like to see some information on improved continuity or transition into high school. Does having a middle school concept improve that and is there data out there that will show her that?

## **Financial Report Card Update**

**Lukich** – Before the Board is a modified Financial Report Card (FRC) from the February 25<sup>th</sup> meeting. He said that Rebecca Allard, Asst. Superintendent for Business is unable to speak to the Board this evening about some of the changes that have been made. Lukich thinks that the changes that were requested have been made to the FRC. It is now before the Board for one more discussion.

**Keenan** – Asked what changes were made? **Lukich** – He couldn't be specific and is not able to answer that. **Quinn** – Thinks that Allard put in the capital (improvements).

**Millar** – Thinks that there still needs to be a discussion on whether things should be included.

**Quinn** – Asked if that could be done in closed session and this item could be tabled until then.

**Carlson** – Shouldn't we wait until Allard is here? She would feel more comfortable to ask certain things of what changes were made or not made of her personally.

**Keenan** - Why can't we talk about that in Executive Session? This has been going on for about 6 months. **Quinn** – That is exactly her point. **Carlson** – She is aware of that.

**Chapman** – Well is April 1<sup>st</sup> too late? **Quinn** – It is just another month of delay. It seems like we keep delaying and delaying. **Chapman** – The reason he is saying that is that the 5-year financial projections is on the agenda for the April 1<sup>st</sup> meeting.

(After a few inaudible comments, it appeared that this item was going to be further discussed in Executive Session.)

## **5-Year Financial Projections – Revised from the February 25<sup>th</sup> COW meeting**

**Keenan** – She had asked that this item be on the agenda and now asks that this Action Item be moved to after the Executive Session takes place.

## **District 15 Participation in PMA, the Energy Consortium and CLIC**

**Keenan** – Following up from the last BOE meeting, Keenan is interested in looking into the district's participation in these organizations and would like to get some information first. How does the money flow to the different organizations? How the money is used? For example, for the Energy Consortium – they take a percentage of the money and give it where? Who are the people that benefit? What organizations - the Assistant Superintendents for Business or the Superintendents? Who are the other parties that are in on making the decision that their organization is getting the money? You can see some of it on their Web sites. For example, on the Assistant Superintendents for Business Association – last year they made \$750K which is a substantial amount of money, from the schools participating. The School Business Officials are the main people who make the decisions that are presented to the Board. Gave an example from Banking – one of our Banking CDs was in for 80 days and we were told that was the highest rate for 80 days. Most Banks don't give 80 day CDs, what they do is 90, 75 or 60 day CDs. So what was the best rate for a 75 day CD from Harris with 5 days in the Money Market? Was that a better rate than the PMA? She doesn't know if these are massaged to make them look like the best rate? Until a couple of months ago, she didn't understand that PMA was giving money to the Superintendents' association. They got \$750K from school districts selling these services. What do they then do with the money? Are they lobbying the government? If they are lobbying, is it on behalf of our schools, our student population? Or are they lobbying on behalf of themselves? Are they giving their members legal fees? What is done with the money that we are providing?

**Chapman** – How do we find that out? **Keenan** – It is on their Web site, on their financial reports. So we see that they got that money. She is not suggesting that anyone is doing anything wrong, but it has the appearance that things could be done wrong. Before we get involved with any more of these organizations, she would like to see who they fund? Is there an association for Superintendents?

**Chapman** – Yes there is an association but doesn't know how the funding, how this ties in.

**Rowden** – This is why we developed bidding procedures in the first place. When bids come forth, we can then do our due diligence to see what this business does before we are affiliated with them. When you have consortiums that are making a bid for a service, we can go to their Web site and see who they are affiliated with – like the IASB or IL School Business Officials, or IASA. It is all upfront. More importantly, we also have to compare costs and services and have to know what they are doing with the money. We have to have a good contract that is in the best interests of what we need in the long-term. Thinks that the bidding process allows us to see who is bidding and do our homework on them.

**Keenan** – Agrees with the bidding process but by doing it that way, it almost becomes too cumbersome. There is only so much time you can research all of this when you are getting it. If you know that these organizations are giving marketing fees back, those are kickbacks. If you are getting a kickback, Keenan doesn't think that she wants to be involved with it. Understands that sometimes the bidding process, like the banking example - If you are not a banker, how are you going to know

that banks don't give 80 day CDs? She does it everyday so she knows. If she wants to give \$5M to PMA – okay to make it look like the lowest bid, let's do an 80 day CD instead of a 90 day CD. As a Board member, you almost can't figure all of that stuff out.

**Carlson** – It is not just PMA; other banks (Harris, Chase, etc.) have charitable giving programs and Carlson doesn't know what they are giving to. Every one of our bidders has things that they give to, everyone is aware of that. She thinks that what Keenan is saying is very important. Why don't we simply ask our bidders for their annual statement? Then if we have questions, we can have a representative come in so we can ask those questions.

**Millar** – Along a similar line to make things a little easier is to just have a Disclosure Statement for those companies that do have associations and do have money being transferred to our employees' associations. Then we will get that information. Then like Carlson said, Harris Bank and some of these others they are going to give money to thousands of organizations.

**Quinn** – PMA is not making a charitable contribution to the IASB when they are listed on their Web site as a preferred resource for providing financial instruments. It is not a charitable donation. But she loves the idea of the Financial Disclosure because that is what the essence of this is – we want a financial disclosure of any conflict of interests in providing monies to employee organizations and/or school board organizations that might be in a position to provide these contracts.

**Keenan** – It is kind of what we (Board) have to fill out every year. Harris Bank is not the same thing as PMA. She does not object to seeing what Harris does but giving back marketing fees to the person that makes the decision – the Business official – is much different than Harris giving money to a Cancer Foundation. **Chapman** – Likes Millar's idea about a Financial Disclosure but he thinks the Board needs a recommendation on that – how it would work with the bidding process.

**Keenan** – Can we also have the Business Officials sign the same kind of statement that Board members sign that they aren't getting anything?

**Millar** – Has one more item that has come up similar to this bidding of CDs and things like that. We need to expand the number of banks that we are getting quotes from. Thinks it is only 3 or 4 right now. We do have a much larger list of financial institutions that for some reason are not getting notified. If we can open that up, in this environment, even if they are not calling us, we can call them.

**Chapman** – Agrees. **Carlson** – Suggests reaching out to our minority vendors, we do not do that.

**Keenan** – Can we find out how Business officials spend their money? Where is that money going? Are they lobbying? What do they do? **Rowden** – Do you mean the association? Like the association for school boards, we get some newsletters, reports – these other associations have the same thing on their Web site so you can see what they are doing. They do lobbying but they also provide education services to school business officials, updated information to keep up with the trends.

**Chapman** – We are going to get a recommendation from the Superintendent on how this can be done with our bidding process. **Lukich** – He'll work on it for next month.

## **Executive Session**

The Board went into Executive Session at approximately 9:45 p.m. to discuss Collective Negotiating Matters between the Public Body and its employees. They were expected to come out of Executive Session and Vote on the **5-Year Financial Projections – Revised from the February 25<sup>th</sup>, 2009 Committee of the Whole meeting.**

A Summary of Board Actions with the action taken on the **5-Year Financial Projections** should be made available on the District 15 Web site at [www.ccsd15.net](http://www.ccsd15.net) Go to "Board Agendas" and check for the summary for the March 11<sup>th</sup> meeting. Actual vote counts are not available until the Board approves the minutes at a Regular Board meeting which is not scheduled until April 15<sup>th</sup>.