



**Grosse Pointe Board of Education
Minutes of the Regular Meeting of August 12, 2013
Board Work Session of the Whole
Board Room, Administration Building
389 St. Clair, Grosse Pointe, MI 48230**

MEETING MINUTES

I. CALL TO ORDER

President Dindoffer called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Board members present: Trustees Dindoffer, Gafa, Jakubiec, Pangborn, Roeske, Summerfield and Valente

Also Present: Superintendent Harwood and Deputy Superintendents Dean and Fenton

II. APPROVAL OF BOARD AGENDA FOR AUGUST 12, 2013

It was Moved by: Trustee Pangborn

Supported by: Trustee Jakubiec

THAT the Board approve the agenda for the Regular Meeting of August 12, 2013 as presented.

Ayes: Trustees Dindoffer, Gafa, Jakubiec, Pangborn, Roeske, Summerfield and Valente

Nays: None

Motion carried by a 7 – 0 vote.

III. CURRENT STATUS OF PROPOSED TECHNOLOGY BOND

Dr. Harwood spoke about the current status of the proposed technology bond as presented in July. The three original bond proposals included:

1. A 10 year - \$40 million bond issue which would have the lowest millage rate for taxpayers over the life of the bond
2. A 7 year - \$40 million bond issue which would have a higher millage rate but a lower total repayment amount (2.5582 mills)
3. A 10 year (two series bond) - \$48 million bond issue which is a higher principal amount with a proposed rate of 2.264 mills.

He noted that with input from members of the Board Technology Steering Committee and administration, along with suggestions from the community, a Request for Proposal (RFP) was recommended. This third party would work collaboratively with the administrative team to confirm the architectural structure of the items identified in the final proposal put before voters to provide the necessary upgrades to the technology infrastructure and future educational systems. At this time, the Board and administration engaged in dialogue on the recommendation to post an RFP for services and delay the bond election until February. If the bond proposal goes to voters in February, the Board would need to pass a resolution for bond proposal ballot language by December 16, 2013.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION TECHNOLOGY STEERING COMMITTEE

Board members had an opportunity to express their preferences and differences regarding the direction in which to proceed for the technology bond proposal.

Trustee Gafa said that the Steering Committee has worked long and hard to address all aspects of the technology bond proposal. Due to the inability of the Board to have a unified voice, she feels that a 3rd party is needed to bring clarity and consensus on weighty aspects of the proposal.

President Dindoffer noted that the committee seems to be at a different point than they were two weeks ago. She noted previous agreement on a \$48 million, 10 year, 2 series bond proposal. She also questioned the recommendation for a consultant to answer questions and set parameters.

Trustee Summerfield questioned the cost of a consultant and the necessity of redoing work that has already been done by the administration.

Trustee Roeske agreed with Mr. Summerfield noting that the Board has done a 180° turn from two weeks ago. He appreciates the work of the technology committee but has spoken to community members who want the Board to move forward with a proposal on the November ballot.

Trustee Jakubiec said that the Board needs to be realistic in making a decision about the direction in which to proceed and what the Board is asking of the community. He added that the Board needs to ask themselves what is the logical approach over time and where will technology be in 7 – 10 years.

Superintendent Harwood noted that ballot language must be submitted by August 26th to be on the November ballot and by December 16th for a February ballot. He also said that a community meeting will be held this Thursday, August 15th to engage the community in the decision process.

Trustee Summerfield asked what the cost and purpose would be of hiring a consultant. He also asked what was being gained by delaying a vote.

Trustees Roeske and Summerfield addressed the details of projects in the sinking fund and the timing of the details coming to the Board and community after it was voted on, not before.

V. DISCUSSION AMONG FULL BOARD REGARDING QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED AND PARAMETERS TO BE CONSIDERED REGARDING TECHNOLOGY NEEDS AND PROPOSED TECHNOLOGY BOND

Trustee Valente addressed an analysis of what is missing for her to make a decision at this time. She emphasized the importance of doing “due diligence” ahead of time, before bringing a proposal to the voters, not after a vote.

President Dindoffer asked the Board what they wanted a consultant to do. Board responses included:

- Trustee Pangborn : have a handle on the future of technology
- Trustee Jakubiec: look at the current plan and show the Board what the district needs for the future to be on the cutting edge
- Trustee Gafa: what does the district need to sustain itself at each proposal (\$48 million, \$42 million and \$20 million)

Board members asked Mr. Fenton what the approximate cost of a consultant might be. He responded that the cost could range from \$20,000 to \$25,000.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON NON-ACTION ITEMS

Cathy Abke, Grosse Pointe Woods, asked the Board to put the technology bond proposal in the hands of the voters and put it on the November ballot. She added that the Board should trust the administration, not a consultant, and move forward by voting on ballot language on August 26 for a November election.

George McMullen, Grosse Pointe Woods, shared his thoughts on the proposed technology bond.

Chris Profeta, Grosse Pointe Woods, asked the Board to let the community vote in November on the technology bond.

Megan Fleming, Grosse Pointe, asked what the technology bond proposal would accomplish.

Andrew Dervin, Grosse Pointe Farms, requested that the Board get a consultant to help with the technology proposal.

Bill Vogel, Grosse Pointe Farms, asked the Board to consult with professional firms that have experience with the technology needs of the district and can recommend a proposal that voters will accept.

Maria Thompson, Grosse Pointe Farms, spoke regarding a petition to allow students to attend (or have a choice to attend) South High School if they went to Montith and Brownell Schools.

Gina Liverpool, Grosse Pointe Farms, also shared her thoughts about residency boundaries and which schools certain students are allowed to attend.

Tracy Gusmano, Grosse Pointe Farms, also petitioned for North-end Grosse Pointe Farms students to be able to attend South High School instead of North.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

President Dindoffer adjourned the meeting at 7:42 p.m.

Lois Valente, Board Secretary