

BOARD OF EDUCATION
COMMUNITY CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL DISTRICT 64
Minutes of the Regular Board of Education Meeting held at 7:00 p.m.
October 8, 2020
VIRTUAL MEETING DUE TO COVID-19
Alternate Remote Attendance at Franklin School (Gym)

Board President Rick Biagi called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. All participants attended via remote participation unless otherwise noted. Board members in attendance via remote participation were Tom Sotos, Dr. Denise Pearl, Fred Sanchez, Rebecca Little, and Larry Ryles. Superintendent Eric Olson attended in person at Franklin School, along with Board member Carol Sales, Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources Dr. Joel T. Martin, Chief School Business Official Luann Kolstad, and Director of Student Services Dr. Lea Anne Frost. Also attending remotely were: Assistant Superintendent for Student Learning Lori Lopez; Director of Innovation and Instructional Technology Mary Jane Warden; Director of Facility Management Ronald DeGeorge; Public Information Coordinator Peter Gill (attending but not participating); Administrative Assistant to the Superintendent Natasha Nedeljkovic; and Board Legal Counsel Tony Loizzi. Approximately 40 members of the public were physically present at the alternate remote location, and 300 attended virtually.

Board of Education meetings are videotaped and may be viewed in their full length from the District's website at <http://www.d64.org>. The agenda and reports for this meeting are also available on the website or through the District 64 Educational Service Center, 164 S. Prospect Ave., Park Ridge, IL 60068.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Board member Larry Ryles led the pledge

OPENING REMARKS FROM PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD

President Biagi emphasized that we are a community, neighbors, and he expected the meeting to be civil despite strong feelings on both sides of the issue of bringing students back to school in-person. He stated that there seemed to be a feeling in parts of the community that the Board had been derelict in its duties and was not holding Dr. Olson accountable. When the pandemic started, Mr. Biagi noted that there wasn't a single meeting that the Board didn't discuss at length the issues with Dr. Olson. On a weekly, if not more frequent basis, the Board was kept in the loop on the progress and discussion. Mr. Biagi stated that the Board decided not to formally vote or ratify the plans as the Board is not to be an extension of the administration, but to oversee it. He then yielded his time to Dr. Olson, who introduced the president of the Park Ridge Education Association (PREA), Mrs. Erin Breen. She stated that the teachers care about the students and are committed regardless of the learning plan. She noted that 87% of the union members thought that the hybrid plan was not what is best and that they disagree with it. She stated that any hybrid plan should include input from the teachers. She stressed that providing education for three different groups will be very difficult. (remote, three-day-week remote, and in-person students), with a big concern on how

to teach remote and in-person students simultaneously. The teachers are concerned about the well-being of the students as well as themselves, and are asking to be heard. Mrs. Breen ended by saying that the PREA looked forward to continuing conversations with the District to get the best possible plan.

Dr. Olson then shared a presentation and said that the District was continually working toward bringing back students full-time, keeping in mind that the schools were not built for a pandemic. He noted that staffing was a major challenge, from bus drivers and lunch supervisors to teachers. Material needs were also difficult to meet at times. Dr. Olson stated that it had not been possible to bring staff back safely at the beginning of the school year when the District decided to start remotely. The plan released in July was on hold in September. The District felt that staggered starts, gradually adding more programs, was a safer way to start back in-person. He said there was quite a large cost to do an AM/PM hybrid model that would involve extra buses, an entire force of custodians to clean rooms for the afternoon group. The current hybrid setup allows us to help special needs students, and allows for kids to be in school all day long. The District is also looking to bring 7th and 8th grades back as soon as possible. The current plan runs through November 20, the end of the first trimester. Dr. Olson emphasized that the District wants to start school and stay in school; therefore, the focus needs to be to open our schools successfully next week. He didn't feel now was the right time to launch into a new plan, such as a full 5-day return to school in-person. He noted it would be important to study the next couple of weeks and imbed those results in the plan moving forward.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Public comments were invited through a posted email address on the District website and in the Board report. Public comments were also received at the alternate remote location.

Public comments were received as follows from the public present at the physical location:

- The following parents and one student addressed the Board and administration on their desire to see a different plan, a 5-day return to school in person, the negative impact of virtual learning and lack of social interaction, the desire to see a comprehensive plan or a better plan, the students' struggle with online learning, desire to open the schools for a full return for those who want it, how other districts are coping and their plans, and the Board's lack of involvement:
Harmony Harrington, Doreen Currey, Diane Hamel, Katie Cassidy, Chandra Kearney, Ashley Kilburg, Krista Ward, Daniela Fuksa, Vicky Mutchler, Erin Stojakovic, Remy Patterson, Alexis Conway.

Board member Sotos stepped to the podium to address the Board and the public and stressed that the superintendent had worked very hard to create the plan. Mr. Sotos also stated that he was willing to spend as many hours as needed to work on a better plan, and the rest of the Board could do the same.

Public comments were also received via email and read aloud as follows:

- Beata DeFranco: would like a survey of parents for 5-day/week attendance
- Sarah Handley: would like to see a full return to school and gave an example of a school in Lake Geneva.

- Leon Kraut: would like to see a safe return to school, 5 days a week.
- Matt Drugan: stressed the struggle to learn remotely, while parents are working, and would like a return to school as soon as possible.
- Susan Farquhar: would like to know the numbers of remote learners across the district, broken down by school
- Laura Bilben: would like to see a full return to school, emphasized the negative effects of too much screen time.
- Kelly Lawrence: would like to see the current hybrid plan amended, would also like to see an AM/PM model that seems successful elsewhere.
- Nicole Ancona: would like to see an option for 5 days half days in person after this trimester.
- Amy Tecu: expressed her concerns with the current hybrid plan and grouping students by math levels, and lack of motivation that would result for some students when grouped with peers that do not challenge them.
- Stacie Janak: shared her son's drawing and the desire to see a better plan going forward.
- Dawn Parikh: expressed support for the slow approach to getting kids back to school safely, would like to see the results of the plan after a few weeks of implementation.
- Kristen Olson: would like to see a plan that explores alternative schedules in the early AM, weekends, evenings, etc; the use of other facilities and rentals; improved use of buildings and planning for future spaces.
- Matt Laske: asked for some clarifications on the current plan: teachers' input, synchronous and asynchronous teaching, etc. Would like a 5 days a week option.
- Elizabeth Juiris: would like to see more in-person attendance, exploration of the AM/PM model.
- Katie Prezas: emphasized the seriousness of the pandemic and the remote learning choice for her family. Expressed her concern with the potential and numerous risks of spreading the virus at school. Would like a better remote learning plan, but deemed a return to school not safe at this time.

APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

No changes were made to the meeting agenda.

STUDENT/STAFF RECOGNITION

Dr. Olson noted that October marked Principals' Appreciation Month, with October 23 being Principals' Day. He recognized the principals for their good work, professionalism, focus on students, the care they have for their staff, and their dedication to continually improve schools for the benefit of all. He stated that they had gone above and beyond during this COVID-19 pandemic and the new challenges it brought. Board president Biagi stated the Board was proud of the team Dr. Olson had assembled and thanked him for recognizing them.

REVIEW OF 2020 PROPOSED TAX LEVY & RESOLUTION #1253 TO APPROVE THE 2020 PROPOSED TAX LEVY & ESTABLISHMENT OF PUBLIC HEARING

Chief School Business Official (CSBO) Luann Kolstad stated that the tentative levy totals for 2020 saw a 3.93% increase over 2019, and would total \$73.8M. She said the District would receive a 2.30% increase and the taxes associated with new construction. The percentage increase was set high enough to capture the full tax benefit of new construction in the District. The District will hold a truth-in-taxation hearing at the November 12 Board meeting, with the final tax levy to be adopted at the December 10 regular meeting. She was proud to see the District live within its means, and added that the 2014 Bonds issued for construction work at Field School would be paid off next year. She said the Board will discuss the Abatement of the Debt Service Levy at the November 12 meeting.

ACTION ITEM 20-10-1

It was moved by Board member Sanchez and seconded by Board member that the Board of Education of Community Consolidated School District No. 64 approve the 2020 Tax Levy Estimate, establishment of the Date and Time of the Truth-in-Taxation hearing for November 12, 2020 at 6:45 p.m., and Publication of Notice of Truth-in-Taxation hearing.

The votes were cast as follows:

AYES: Sotos, Little, Ryles, Pearl, Biagi, Sanchez, Sales

NAYES: None

PRESENT: None

ABSENT: None

The motion carried.

DISCUSSION OF SUMMER 2020 CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

CSBO Kolstad was joined by Director of Facility Management Ronald DeGeorge and lead architect from Studio GC, Mr. Rick Petricek. They presented a summary of all construction projects over the last 5 years and their costs to the District, noting that the Board had adhered to its commitment not to issue bonds but use Working Cash funds. The presentation concluded with the current Washington project, which is in its final stages. Mr. Petricek stated that the various contractors were completing punch list items this coming Friday and Monday. He noted that while a few unexpected items had arised, such as sewer and drainage issues, the project was on track and the students not being in the building during the pandemic had helped construction move along. Mrs. Kolstad and Mr. DeGeorge responded to questions from the Board to clarify that they were only a handful of touchless sinks across the District buildings, with newly installed ones at Washington School during the construction of the addition. Mrs. Kolstad also explained that the District was keeping track of COVID-19-related expenses by assigning them a specific accounting code. Mr. DeGeorge said that the District was using SchoolDude, an automated work order system, to keep track of tasks that need to be completed during the school year, such as gutter cleaning, roof inspections, and other tasks. The system allows for timely reminders to keep maintenance of facilities up to date.

FIRST READING OF POLICIES FROM PRESS 105

Dr. Olson and Board member Sales noted that the Board Policy Committee had met on September 15, 2020 to review these policies and were recommending their adoption. No changes were proposed to the policies as presented, with the exception of policy 5:330 *Sick Days, Vacation, Holidays & Leaves*. The District will retain its customized policy that is aligned with the collective bargaining agreement in effect.

APPROVAL OF RECOMMENDED PERSONNEL REPORT

It was noted that the Board is relying upon the recommendation of the Superintendent and administration in their professional judgment as to the hiring of these individuals per Policy 2:130.

Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources Dr. Joel T. Martin informed the Board that the District will need to hire additional staff to cope with the pandemic situation. Mainly, the District is looking to hire 8-10 additional custodians and 1-2 floaters, to deal with additional cleaning. 7 health assistants need to be hired to support the nurses at the buildings. In addition, 12-13 teacher assistants and long-term substitutes are needed to deal with the certified medical absences and other leaves or absences. Mr. Martin explained that these hirings are strictly connected to the pandemic situation. The District wanted to apprise the Board of its intentions and would hire these individuals prior to the next Board meeting, with their permission; the Board would then approve the hirings on the personnel report on November 12. This process is similar to the summer hiring. CSBO Kolstad explained that these hirings were not part of the original planned budget, but that money was available to cover the needs. These hirings would be coded under the COVID-19-related expense previously mentioned. Dr. Martin also encouraged parents and anyone from the community to visit the District's website and look for job postings, as the District is looking for help with lunch supervisions and other positions.

Rebecca Bergeron - Resign as Teaching Assistant at Roosevelt School effective October 14, 2020

Angela Krischon - Resign as 1st Grade Teacher at Field School effective October 9, 2020

Lauren Masciopinto - Resign as Teaching Assistant at Roosevelt School effective August 24, 2020

ACTION ITEM 20-10-2

It was moved by Board member Pearl and seconded by Board member Sanchez that the Board of Education of Community Consolidated School District 64, Park Ridge – Niles, Illinois, approve the Personnel Report for October 8, 2020, noting that the Personnel Report is based on the recommendation of the Superintendent and not upon the Board's direct knowledge regarding any of the specific individuals selected for employment.

The votes were cast as follows:

AYES: Sales, Little, Pearl, Biagi, Ryles, Sotos, Sanchez

NAYS: None

PRESENT: None

ABSENT: None

The motion carried.

CONSENT AGENDA

Policy 4:180 was removed from the consent agenda prior to the vote.

- Bills, Payroll and Benefits

Bills

<u>Fund</u>	<u>Fund Total</u>
10 - Education Fund	\$ 1,250,241.38
20 - Operations and Maintenance Fund	\$ 324,471.49
30 - Debt Services	\$ 14,933.34
40 - Transportation Fund	\$ 2,025.40
50 - Retirement (IMRF/SS/MEDICARE)	\$ -
60 - Capital Projects	\$ 35,461.06
61 - Capital Projects-2017 Debt Certificates	\$ -
80 - Tort Immunity Fund	\$ -
90 - Fire Prevention and Safety Fund	\$ -
Total:	\$ 1,627,132.67

Payroll & Benefits

<u>Fund</u>	<u>Fund Total</u>
10 - Education Fund	\$10,586,264.67
20 - Operations and Maintenance Fund	\$ 1,531,058.74
30 - Debt Services Fund	\$ 40,651.44
40 - Transportation Fund	\$ 6,756.18
50 - IMRF/FICA Fund	\$ 177,032.89
51 - SS/Medicare	\$ 181,527.42
60 - Capital Projects Fund	\$ 3,170,269.85
61 - Cap Projects Fund - 2017 Debt Certs	\$ 0.00
80 - Tort Immunity Fund	\$ 500,361.50
Total:	\$16,193,922.69

The Accounts Payable detailed list can be viewed on the District 64 website's business services page at www.d64.org.

- Approval of Financial Update for the Period Ending August 31, 2020
- ~~Second Reading and Approval of Policy 4:180 (removed prior to vote)~~
- Approval of Reciprocal Reporting Intergovernmental Agreement between the Village of Niles and the Boards of Education of School Districts Nos. 63, 64, 67, and Cook County, Illinois
- Approval of Hold or Release of Closed Minutes
- Destruction of Audio Closed Recordings (none)

ACTION ITEM 20-10-3

It was moved by Board member Sanchez and seconded by Board member Little that the Board of Education of Community Consolidated School District 64, Park Ridge – Niles, Illinois, approve the Consent Agenda for October 8, 2020, which includes: Bills, Payroll and Benefits; Approval of Financial Update for the Period Ending August 31, 2020; Approval of Reciprocal Reporting Intergovernmental Agreement between the Village of Niles and the Boards of Education of School Districts Nos. 63, 64, 67, and Cook County, Illinois; Approval of Hold or Release of Closed Minutes; and the Destruction of Audio Closed Recordings (none).

The votes were cast as follows:

AYES: Biagi, Pearl, Sotos, Sales, Little, Sanchez, Ryles

NAYS: None

PRESENT: None

ABSENT: None

The motion carried.

DISCUSSION AND ADOPTION OF POLICY 4:180

The Board resumed discussion of policy 4:180 *Pandemic Preparedness; Management; and Recovery*. Board member Little stated that she found the language in the policy “squishy.” Board member Little explained that the sentence “The District will approve the plan” was not clear to her, especially when it came to the term “District.” She wanted clearance on who was considered “the District;” The majority of the Board thought it meant the superintendent. Little preferred that it meant the “Board.”

It was moved by Board member Pearl and seconded by Board president Biagi that the Board of Education of Community Consolidated School District 64, Park Ridge – Niles, Illinois, approve policy 4:180 as presented.

The Board discussed Policy 4:180. Board member Sales explained that the policy committee began with the version contained in PRESS Issue 104, which stated that the Board shall adopt the plan. However, a majority of the Board did not agree with that. Board attorney Tony Loizzi provided options for the proposed policy. One such option contained the statutory language with the addition of a few words. Loizzi explained that he suggested the statutory language and that the issue was whether the Board would take a formal vote on the plan that involved remote hybrid learning: Does the Board want to take formal action on this plan, or is it delegating this authority to the superintendent? Both options are viable.

Board member Sales stated that when the Illinois statute states “the district shall adopt,” it still means that the Board has to do so. Sales said that the board could adopt the current version of the policy because it must follow Illinois law, but she disagreed with the interpretation that did not require Board action. She was in favor of the IASB’s clarification. Mr. Loizzi stated that the IASB clarification changed the statute. The legislature expressly stated “the board” when it wanted the board to take action. The statute also stated that the superintendent could amend the plan at any time, which flies in the face of when we usually need board approval.

Sales stated that another issue with the statute was the existence of two different verbs: “adopt” and “approve.” The party taking action to adopt would be the district, and the one taking action to approve would be the superintendent. The statute contemplates two different actions and also contemplates the superintendent’s ability to make changes to the plan. The board would have to vote in certain instances previously given in examples by Mr. Loizzi, such as moving from purely remote to hybrid, or from hybrid to fully in person, such that a board meeting would not be required for every change. She agreed that the statute was poorly written, but it does not place all of the authority and burden on the superintendent.

Board member Sotos stated that regardless of the argument of the statutory language, the Board has additional information. A large percent of people are unhappy with the proposed plan. Almost all of them want Board members to be actively involved. Sotos has been on the board for a long time. This was a large movement of people who expressed their dissatisfaction. The Board should assist with a plan that the residents would be happy with.

Dr. Olson said that because 70% of the parents chose in-person, and that would be thousands of parents, we have heard from a small minority--not the majority. Sotos said the majority spoke when they said they wanted to go to in-person learning. A lot of people sent emails about the issue. The board has made changes based on much less community input. 50 people speaking at a board meeting is a large email. In addition, the board received many emails.

Biagi stated that there was an elephant in the room with the statutory language. Board members disagree with Mr. Loizzi’s interpretation. Under that language, the board could go either way. Loizzi said that could happen anyway. The issue being discussed is whether the district is reconsidering the hybrid plan that was presented. Whether the policy is presented pursuant to the IASB or the statute as drafted, that shouldn’t get in the way of the open dialogue.

Little stated that the board had been talking about the “squishy” language before people spoke tonight. Biagi asked Little what her proposal would be to clarify the policy. Little stated that the policy should state that the Board must adopt the plan proposed by the superintendent. It was discussed in a policy meeting, but that wasn’t what the majority wanted, so it wasn’t drafted that way.

Biagi stated that the board could reject the language and add language requiring the Board to adopt the plan. The motion on the table was the language as proposed. Loizzi stated that everyone should be able to understand what the language means. Public comment was received as follows:

- Kelly Lawrence: asked for the clarification of the word “squishy.” Little stated that it meant “unclear.” What does “the district” mean? It was not clear who was supposed to act.

Board member Pearl asked Little if the policy should state “the board” or “the superintendent.” Little stated that the administration should come up with the plan, but the board votes. Pearl’s reservation: with COVID, things are changing quickly. She doesn’t want the board to impede that or make it go slower. Little stated that if the district is moving back to remote because of a public health issue, the state could shut down in-person learning.

Biagi stated that we could vote on the language as drafted or choose not to vote on that language and vote on something else. Biagi called the question. Dr. Pearl asked board member Sanchez his opinion. Sanchez was fine with mirroring the statutory language. The board has the power to overrule the superintendent

anyway or change course; the policy doesn't bind us. Sotos stated that the board agreed to go by the statutory language. Nobody identified that this many people would be upset. He thinks we should draft a motion that specifically states the board's involvement going forward. Sotos wants to see a full blown plan about what happens now; what happens if we revert to in-home learning because of a spread; and not something that is on the fly. Biagi stated that Sotos was out of order and could not create a motion.

Biagi asked for a roll call vote.

The votes were cast as follows:

AYES: Pearl, Biagi, Sanchez, Ryles

NAYS: Sotos, Sales, Little

PRESENT: None

ABSENT: None

The motion carried.

Biagi stated that Policy 4:180 was adopted with the statutory language. The board has latitude to go in either direction, as it sees fit. The board can't formally vote on Sotos's suggestion because it wasn't on the agenda. The only way the board could entertain that idea would be to have a discussion under new business; the board was prohibited by law from voting on it.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

No further changes were made to the minutes as presented in the report.

ACTION ITEM 20-10-4

It was moved by Board member Pearl and seconded by Board member Little that the Board of Education of Community Consolidated School District 64, Park Ridge – Niles, Illinois, approve the minutes from the Closed Meeting on September 10, 2020; and the Regular Meeting on September 10, 2020.

The votes were cast as follows:

AYES: Sales, Biagi, Little, Ryles, Sanchez, Sotos

NAYS: None

PRESENT: None

ABSENT: None

The motion carried.

OTHER DISCUSSION AND ITEMS OF INFORMATION

Dr. Olson noted that the draft agenda for the November 12 regular meeting was included in tonight's report. He also said that he continued to meet regularly with the PTO/A presidents and found their feedback valuable.

Board member Sales noted that the Board Policy Committee had also discussed policy 4:60 *Purchases and Contracts* during their last meeting on September 15 and found that further information and discussion was needed before bringing any recommendations to the Board. She requested input from the board members.

NEW BUSINESS

Biagi stated that he was at a loss for words. He was watching his phone light up; commentary on a Facebook page about elected officials was appalling. How people handled themselves tonight was appalling. He's embarrassed for his city; embarrassed for Dr. Olson; embarrassed for one of our board members, who did something "uncool" at the meeting.

Board member Sales asked about whether communications during a board meeting are public records (whether internal or with the public) were public records. Loizzi stated that the *Champaign v. Madigan* case involved messages between board members. Sales wasn't sure what messages Biagi was receiving. Biagi clarified that he wasn't receiving messages. He was seeing comments about the board members. Sales was wondering what was a public record that needed to be preserved.

Board member Sotos stated he didn't appreciate that Biagi said he was embarrassed for our community. Sotos needed to clarify a statement made by Mr. Biagi in his opening monologue. Sotos went to the podium because he couldn't appear via Zoom. He was also a parent in the community. Sotos felt he was extremely fair to Dr. Olson and administration. His request to be more involved didn't mean he had no confidence in the administration. The board should consider having an agreement to be more actively involved in a long-term plan. Parents don't want to have to wait a week or two weeks to find out what the next step is. We understand that it will be fluid and that there will be minor changes. The information should be given to the public. We need an outline, with an explanation of pulling back from in-person learning. Everyone in the district is frustrated because they don't know.

Sales stated that she agrees with more board involvement and explained that the IASB's proposed pandemic policy would have addressed those issues. If the superintendent knew that he needed the board to adopt the plan, then all of the steps that Sotos mentioned would have been necessary. If there was a chance that the board would reject adoption of the plan, the superintendent would be risking that the board would not adopt it if four board members were not on board.

Biagi wanted Dr. Olson to address the assumption that there was no plan. Dr. Olson stated that the board only has as much of a chance to see the plan and talk things through as it does. He understands that and works for the board and serves it in any way he's directed. Board involvement is difficult because it adds another layer. He has a lot of groups that have to be involved. The board would be another group that's weighing in on the plan. It changes a lot of the context when the board has to vote. The board might have suggestions, but he would have to go back to five groups. He doesn't blame the board for wanting to be more involved. He will be available to the board to go into the level of detail of the plan. It will add layers of challenge to what the administration is trying to accomplish. If the board feels they are necessary layers,

he would support that. He also wants the board to know that he received three times the number of emails from parents thanking him for the hybrid plan, thanks for sticking to the plan, and that they're looking forward to in-person learning. There are a lot of points of view out there; he doesn't want us to get too focused on only one of those.

Sales responded to Biagi and said nobody's alleging that there is no plan. The board has received three versions of the plan. The one presented to the public was different. Biagi stated that the board and superintendent know why the plan wasn't implemented. Biagi stated that Sotos listed a lot of things he wanted Olson to go back to, thereby alleging there was no plan. Sotos asked for a comprehensive plan about what it will look like going forward and going backwards. As a board member he has not seen anything of that. Dr. Olson stated that everything about going backwards is already in the plan. The administration has been working nonstop to prepare for this plan to start. He's had to unpack many layers and design systems. We're on the eve of trying to launch it, and now we're deterring from it. We're trying to get school started, and then we can start talking about the next phase of the plan.

Sotos's concern is that as a board member he has no idea what the plan is beyond what was presented to regular residents. As a board member, he wants to be involved or at least know what that plan is moving forward so he can state his opinion. Board members found out about the current plan not much sooner than everyone else. How can we do our jobs as board members when we haven't been given the power or respect to offer our opinion, because we don't know it. At the last board meeting, when we gave the authority to the administration to move forward, he specifically asked for information to become more involved. Unless another board member has information or he missed it somehow, Sotos wants to know.

Dr. Olson said he's had long, drawn out conversations with board members. Dr. Olson wants to be able to give Sotos the information. Sotos suggested presenting it to the board. Having individual conversations circumvents the board process. It doesn't work the way the board is intended to work. When Olson has a plan, it should be presented. Sotos doesn't know why the board is left out of the process.

Biagi said there's a reason we're not having the conversations publicly: We're in the midst of a collective bargaining agreement. Mr. Loizzi said we can discuss the issues in closed session. Biagi was speaking about why Dr. Olson has to do it the way he does. Dr. Olson can't just lay out a plan. Mr. Loizzi said not everything needs to be agreed upon, but it has to be discussed.

Biagi stated that Sotos's request for a plan is not publicly feasible. If Sotos had called Dr. Olson and asked any of the questions, he would have had the answers. It's not Biagi's problem. He doesn't want it to be discussed publicly. Sotos explained that Mr. Loizzi said we don't need approval for every decision. For Dr. Olson to present a plan does not violate anything. Dr. Olson can propose the plan and then talk to anyone he wants. There's no violation by proposing a plan. Sotos should not have to call the superintendent to ask him what the plan is. The plan should be sent to board members. He has no problem asking Dr. Olson, but under the current process, Dr. Olson doesn't have to do anything with Sotos's opinion. If we discuss it at a

meeting, it's done transparently and out in the open, and we're doing it the way we should be doing it. If there are unions that want to object to the plan, then let them do it.

Biagi asked where the board should go from here. He asked Mr. Loizzi how other districts are handling collective bargaining issues related to the plan. Loizzi stated that he would be more comfortable having the discussion in closed session instead of in an open session. He asked the board for a motion to move to closed session. Sotos said he's available now. MJ stated that she could set up a meeting and would send the board a Zoom link to join.

Pearl asked if everyone wants to go into closed session. Biagi asked if there are administrators who would be able to leave. Biagi asked for a consensus about a closed session. Sales said yes. Pearl said no. Sanchez said he would, but that he questions the wisdom at this late hour. Little agreed with Sanchez. Biagi was not in a good emotional place. Ryles was not in favor of going into closed session: Two meetings ago the board had a lengthy discussion about what Dr. Olson was going to do. The board has provided input. Ryles understands where Dr. Olson is going and understands about collective bargaining. Biagi stated that a couple of board members wanted the board to get involved. He stated that another option was an emergency meeting next week when the board was fresher. Sales was fine with either. Sotos said it wasn't a long conversation, so doing it tonight would be the best idea. The board would go into closed session and discuss it. Biagi stated three no, two maybe, and two yes. Loizzi stated that there was a limited scope of the discussions: just the labor issues.

A public comment was received as follows during the conversation:

- Karen Hein: wanted to know why Mr. Sotos was not visible on camera. She only heard a voice. Sotos said the camera wasn't working on his phone.

BOARD ADJOURNS FROM THE REGULAR MEETING AND CONVENES TO A CLOSED MEETING

At 11:05 p.m. it was moved by Board member Biagi and seconded by Board member Sotos to adjourn to closed session to discuss collective negotiating matters between the public body and its employees or their representatives [5 ILCS 120/2(c)(2)].

The votes to adjourn to the closed meeting were cast as follows:

AYES: Little, Biagi, Sotos, Sales

NAYS: Pearl, Sanchez, Ryles

PRESENT: None

ABSENT: None

The motion carried.

BOARD ADJOURNS FROM A THE CLOSED MEETING AND RESUMES THE REGULAR MEETING

At 12:03 a.m. the Board returned from their closed meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12:04 a.m. it was moved by Board member Sanchez and seconded by Board member Little to adjourn.

The votes were cast as follows:

AYES: Biagi, Ryles, Sotos, Pearl, Little, Sales, Sanchez

NAYS: None

PRESENT: None

ABSENT: None

The motion carried.

Signed Date: November 12, 2020.

President

Secretary