

ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION
MINUTES, DECEMBER 20, 2006

The Board of Education met at 7:00 p.m. on the above date at the Carol S. Parham Administration Building, Annapolis, Maryland. Members present were Ms. Johnson, President, Mr. Peterson, Vice President, Messrs. Bernson, Carey, Leahy, Melendez, Wayson and Ms. Walker. Kevin Maxwell, Superintendent was also present. Ms. Johnson opened the meeting with the Invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance.

EXECUTIVE SESSION, December 6, 2006: The Board met in executive session on December 6, 2006 at 8:30 a.m. in the Caucus Room at the Board of Education offices, 2644 Riva Road, Annapolis, Maryland 21401. While in public session, a motion was made by Mr. Peterson, seconded by Mr. Leahy to go into closed session pursuant to Section 10-508(a) (1) (7) and (9) of the State Government Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland to:

- (1) discuss the appointment, employment, assignment, promotion, discipline, demotion, compensation, removal, resignation, or performance evaluation of appointees, employees or officials;
 - (ii) any other personnel matter that affects one or more specific individuals;
 - (7) consult with counsel to obtain legal advice on a legal matter; and
 - (9) conduct collective bargaining negotiations or consider matters that relate to the negotiations.
- The motion was approved (6-0).

Persons present: Ms. Johnson, Mr. Peterson, Messrs. Carey, Leahy, Melendez and Wayson. Ms. Walker arrived at 8:40 a.m. Mr. Bernson arrived at 8:50 a.m. Also present were Kevin Maxwell, Superintendent, Mr. Bennett, Board Counsel, and Ms. Connolly, Board Assistant. Mr. Davis was present for negotiations.

ITEMS CONSIDERED, ACTION TAKEN AND RECORDED VOTES:

1. Mr. Bennett advised the Board on the status of an appeal regarding a bid protest. Mr. Peterson moved to dismiss the case. Mr. Carey seconded and the Board approved (7-0), Mr. Bernson absent for the vote.
2. Mr. Bennett advised the Board on an appeal of an employee termination. Mr. Peterson moved to uphold the hearing examiner's recommendation. Mr. Wayson seconded and the Board voted 5-1-2, Messrs. Peterson, Leahy, Bernson, Wayson and Ms. Walker in favor, Ms. Johnson opposed, Messrs. Carey and Melendez abstained.
3. Mr. Bennett advised the Board on a student appeal. Mr. Peterson moved to uphold the Superintendent's decision. Mr. Bernson seconded and the Board approved (8-0).
4. The Board engaged in discussion regarding the Superintendent's Performance Objectives. Mr. Melendez moved to approve the Superintendent's Performance Objectives. Mr. Leahy seconded and the Board approved (7-0-1), Mr. Bernson abstained.
5. Mr. Davis provided the Board with an update on negotiations.

Adjourn Executive Session: 10:00 a.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Mr. Peterson requests the typographical error on page 1 be corrected, to reflect that the executive session meeting on November 15, 2006 adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Wayson moved to approve the minutes. Mr. Carey seconded.

Mr. Bernson requested that the minutes be amended. Referring to page 5, he requested inclusion of his substantial comments regarding the question of religious discussion in our schools, pointing out that it is appropriate in his view to have Rosh Hashanah a recognized holiday in the school system, commensurate with that, there was further discussion that sometimes school systems can be overly politically correct and for example, have a “holiday tree” when it is really a “Christmas tree.” Mr. Bernson also requested that his motions on page 7 reflect that his motion was to amend the Superintendent’s recommendation on the Severna Park Middle School Feasibility. The Superintendent’s recommendation was for revitalization and Mr. Bernson had moved to substitute the term modernization for revitalization. Further down on page 7, the motion again, needs to be corrected to reflect an amendment to the Superintendent’s recommendation consistent with his comments. Mr. Bernson therefore moves to amend the minutes to fulfill the omission referred to on page 5 and also to address the specific incorrect way that it is written up to “approve the modernization.” Mr. Peterson said that since this will have a bearing on later discussions he wants to make absolutely certain that any amendments that the Board makes reflect the verbatim motion that was made. Ms. Johnson asked Ms. Connolly to review the tapes and return to the Board meeting with a verbatim account of Mr. Bernson’s motion. Ms. Johnson noted that approval of the minutes is officially postponed.

ESTABLISH AGENDA ORDER: Mr. Peterson moved to postpone 4.03 Policy Revisions: Third Reading: 4.03a Selection and Changing of High School Courses – Policy Code IG/606, 4.03b Graduation Requirements – Policy Code IIC/608.03, 4.03c Graduation Activities – Policy Code IIC/608.04, 4.03d High School Diploma by Examination – Policy Code IIE/608.05 until a later date. Mr. Wayson seconded and the Board approved (8-0.)

RECOGNITIONS: The Board recognized Filipino math and science teachers who have been teaching in county schools since August. There are 16 teachers across the county, all recruited from Manila and Cebu, Philippines in March 2006, who were granted visas to participate in this cultural exchange endeavor. They have contracts that span one to three years. The educators are teaching math and science courses throughout the county schools, in middle and high school placement, and are certified and highly qualified teachers.

CRASC REPORT: Sage Snider, 2nd Vice President informed the Board of current activities of CRASC.

CAC REPORT: No report.

PTA REPORT: No report.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: Mr. Otha Thornton, President Meade Senior High PTSA addressed the Board about student ineligibility in high schools. Mr. Peterson believes that athletes sitting on the bench because they do not meet academic eligibility sends the wrong message. He requested information from the Superintendent regarding the possibility of implementing a No Pass No Play school policy.

ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL APPOINTMENTS: The Superintendent recommends the following personnel actions for Board approval: Thomas Johnson,

from Retired, AACPS, to Acting Principal, Crofton Elementary School, effective January 2, 2007 (Temporary through January 31, 2007); Donna Ruhsam, from Assistant Principal, Folger McKinsey Elementary School, to Principal, Folger McKinsey Elementary School, effective December 21, 2006; Victoria Swainz, from Teacher, Broadneck Elementary School, to Assistant Principal, Folger McKinsey Elementary School, effective December 21, 2006.

Mr. Peterson moved to approve the Superintendent's recommendations. Mr. Wayson seconded and the Board approved (8-0).

The Superintendent provided the following reassignments for the Board's information: Lisa Leitholf, from Principal, Folger McKinsey Elementary School, to Principal, Seven Oaks Elementary School, effective December 21, 2006, and Courtney Disalvo, Teacher, Chesapeake Bay Middle School, to Acting Assistant Principal, Chesapeake Bay Middle School, effective December 11, 2006.

SCHOOL YEAR 2007-2008 CALENDAR: Teresa Tudor, Chair of the Calendar Committee informed the Board that pursuant to Policy IB and Regulation IB-RA, the calendar is developed by a Calendar Committee, which is comprised of parents, students, teachers, administrators, union representatives and central office staff. The school year 2007-2008 was presented to the Board for information on December 6, 2006. It returns to the Board for action.

The Superintendent recommends approval of the school year 2007-2008 calendar.

Mr. Wayson moved to approve the Superintendent's recommendations. Mr. Carey seconded and the Board approved (8-0).

POLICY REVISIONS: SECOND READING: Laurie Pritchard, Director of Legal Services and George Margolies, Chief of Staff, presented the following policy revisions for second reading:

- Appointment, Qualifications and Terms of Office – Policy Code BB/201
- Board Meetings – Policy Code BC/202
- Public Participation – Policy Code BCB/202.02 Mr. Bernson spoke to the value of public participation during Board meetings and that it should be stated in policy. Mr. Margolies, said that language can be inserted in the policy stating that public participation is welcomed and valued.
- Board Meeting Minutes – Policy Code BCF/202.06 In response to questions by Mr. Bernson, Mr. Margolies explained that there was a language change to acknowledge the fact that there is a dichotomy in that COMAR language speaks for all 24 LEA's in the state that the Superintendents of Schools shall have the responsibility of keeping the minutes. However, here, the Board has delegated that responsibility to the Board's Executive Assistant to do so. The language had to be finessed because the Superintendent is not going to keep the minutes. There is also language referring to this in the implementation section.
- Promotion/Retention of Students – Policy Code IIB/608.02. Regarding this policy, Mr. Bernson expressed the importance of making a very strong statement regarding social

promotion. He can provide the exact language, but the policy ought to read must stronger than it does now. As an example, he provided the following suggested language: The Board of Education is strongly committed to the academic achievement of every Anne Arundel County Public Schools student. Where individual students are not reaching desired academic achievement established by the Superintendent, principals and responsible individuals, under no circumstances would the Board of Education condone social promotion in exchange for desired academic achievement. Ms. Johnson noted that when the policy comes to the Board for action, Mr. Bernson can propose an amendment for substitute language.

Mr. Peterson shares Mr. Bernson's concern. He would like the Board not only to look at the language that is going to be proposed, but there are school districts, nationally that have developed policies on social promotion. He would therefore favor looking at what other language school districts have developed, and then see if there is a need for a separate policy on social promotion.

The Board took a five-minute recess.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF DECEMBER 6, 2006 (continued): Ms. Johnson announced that during the break the audiotape of the last meeting was checked so that the Board could determine if the minutes reflected accurately the motion made. Ms. Johnson further announced that Tyson Bennett, Board Attorney and Molly Connolly, Board Assistant, reviewed the tape and Ms. Connolly typed verbatim what occurred. Noting that the minutes are correct, Ms. Johnson distributed copies of the verbatim motions made on December 6, 2006.

Mr. Leahy asked if anything was left out, to which Mr. Bennett responded that there are two sections with space in between the sections. There was no other discussion on this motion or proposal between the verbatim sections. Ms. Connolly went to the point in the minutes about which Mr. Bernson had a question. She typed verbatim what was on the tape at the point when Mr. Bernson made his initial comments and when Ms. Johnson appeared to have treated that as a motion, and then later when it actually come up for a vote.

Mr. Leahy's concern is what he believes is an inconsistency between the motion and the action later. Mr. Bennett explained that Ms. Connolly and he listened to the entire track of the tape, and there was nothing between the end of the first section of the transcript and the beginning of the second section of the transcript that addressed a vote on a motion and then moving to another motion. Mr. Bennett's interpretation of the words that were spoken is that Option 3 was Revitalization, Option 4 was Modernization and Option 5 was Replacement School, and by Mr. Bernson moving to amend that "which we are about to vote on..." was referring to the Superintendent's recommendation for revitalization. Mr. Bennett further clarified that is what Ms. Johnson was referring to when she said, "we don't have a motion on the floor." The Superintendent had stated his recommendation, but no one had moved to adopt that recommendation by that point. That is why Ms. Johnson treated Mr. Bernson's amendment as a main motion instead of an amendment to a motion. On a motion duly made and seconded the Board voted (7-0-1) to approve the minutes of December 6, 2006 as amended. Mr. Bernson abstained. All others in favor.

SEVERNA PARK MIDDLE SCHOOL FEASIBILITY STUDY: The Superintendent recommends approval of the Revitalization Option, inclusive of site and traffic improvements, on the existing property with a State Rated Capacity of 1478 for Severna Park Middle School.

Mr. Wayson moved to approve the Superintendent's recommendation. Mr. Peterson seconded.

The following citizens spoke in public participation: Stuart Martin, Julie Weber, Edward Swanton, and Councilwoman Cathy Vitalie.

In response to questions by Mr. Melendez, Mr. Bennett said that the Board is required to follow *Roberts Rules of Order* in questions of parliamentary procedure. Generically, a reconsideration of a vote can only occur if there is a motion to reconsider made by someone on the prevailing side of the previous vote. There is also a provision in *Roberts Rules* which says that that motion to reconsider must be made at the same meeting where the first vote was held. Therefore, this being the second meeting, the time has passed when a Board member can make a motion for reconsideration. That said, *Robert's* allows revisions to motions. For example, there could be a motion for a modernization project if it included some elements that were different than those that were voted down previously.

Mr. Melendez therefore asked if it is true that Options 4 and 5 as originally proposed and voted against, cannot be put on the table tonight. Mr. Bennett confirmed that parliamentarily, options 4 and 5 as originally opposed at the previous meeting cannot be re-voted on tonight. And what can be considered are options 1, 2, and 3, or a revision made to option 4 or a revision made to option 5.

Ms. Walker asked if she could bring back the motion, being that she was not present at the last meeting, to which Mr. Bennett responded that that would be equivalent to a reconsideration, and since Ms. Walker did not vote and was not on the prevailing side, she would not be allowed to bring back the motion.

Mr. Leahy thanked the community for all their work on this project. He believes that the Board is not applying this project to the approved educational specifications adopted by the Board. He appreciates Dr. Maxwell's expertise and his attention to fiscal matters, but he believes that ed specs are not being followed.

Ms. Walker echoed Mr. Leahy's concern about the educational specification. She thanked the public for their concern and addressed the needs of other schools in the county.

Mr. Peterson respectfully disagrees with Mr. Leahy that AACPS is in violation of the ed specs.

Mr. Bernson thanked the citizens of Severna Park for all their hard work and for their participation in the project. He said that Mr. Bennett has indicated the means by which the Board might take another substantive vote on all three options. Mr. Bernson pleaded with his colleagues to support his motion to revise the Board's conformity with *Robert's Rules* so that all the options can be taken up again tonight. Mr. Bennett has opened the door and there is a way to do this. Mr. Bernson moves that the Board do just that. As a point of explanation, he said that at the last Board meeting the Board voted down 2 of the 3 options, options 4 and 5, before a full community meeting was held. Since then the meeting has been held and he believes the Severna Park community spoke loudly and clearly at that meeting. Mr.

Bernson believes it is the right thing to do to give a full vote to all the options tonight, subsequent to the public input.

Mr. Bennett, Board Counsel, interprets Mr. Bernson's request to be a substitute motion for the previous motion. This would require a vote first on Mr. Bernson's motion. If Mr. Bernson's motion fails, the motion that was previously on the floor would prevail.

Mr. Bernson repeated his motion. I move a substitute motion to take up a vote on these three options in a substantive manner at this time, in place of the present motion that is existing on the table in front of us at this time.

Mr. Bennett said that the way Mr. Bernson stated his motion, it is not a motion to reconsider. He is not asking the Board to adopt any particular option, but he is asking the Board permission to allow that to occur. That is a procedural motion, as opposed to a substantive motion, which if seconded, is appropriate for the Board to vote on.

Mr. Leahy seconded the motion.

In response to questions by Ms. Johnson, Mr. Bennett clarified that Mr. Bernson's motion did not specify any particular adoption of an option – rather to bring back to the table the options 3, 4, and 5 for consideration.

In response to questions by Mr. Melendez, Mr. Bennett explained that parliamentarily, Mr. Bernson's motion is a procedural motion, as opposed to a substantive motion.

On a motion duly made and seconded on Mr. Bernson's substitute motion the Board voted (2-5-1), Messrs. Bernson and Leahy in favor, Messrs. Carey, Wayson, Peterson, Melendez and Ms. Johnson opposed, Ms. Walker abstained.

Ms. Johnson believes that there is a misunderstanding in the community that revitalization is some sort of a short shift to what will occur in the building. Ms. Johnson asked Alex Szachnowicz for clarification that revitalization is the same improvement as a modernization, where all the systems will be replaced and a new cafeteria will be built in a new location. Mr. Szachnowicz said that the material differences between the options are very succinct. Those differences between options 3 and 4 really come down to whether or not interior loading-bearing walls will be moved slightly in order to accumulate the square footage to come into full compliance with the Board of Education approved ed specs. Short of those space constraints and short of the issue with the platform adjoining the Gymnasium, in lieu of adjoining the cafeteria, options 3 and 4 are largely aligned. The major building systems, the roofing, electrical, plumbing, communication systems and others would be replaced and would be new, irrespective of whether option 3 or option 4 is selected. In option 3 the walls are block, between classrooms and between classrooms and hallway. Under option 4 the walls would be drywall between classrooms and block between classrooms and hallway. Mr. Szachnowicz noted that the revitalization option is a \$46M renovation.

The Superintendent addressed the question of "floating teachers." There are exactly the same numbers of classrooms, albeit there are some size differences, in all three of the options there is no difference.

There are eight teachers floating in option 3, 4, and 5. None of those things instructionally change. What Dr. Maxwell has maintained is that the difference between option 3 and 4 is not worth the money that it costs. Ten million dollars, 3% of additional space, sheetrock walls and other kinds of things to him do not represent that value. Great instruction can take place in a lot of different ways. It is the teacher and the kids and the engagement and instructional practices that make a great school.

Mr. Peterson noted for the record that the Board of Education adopted the ed specs for 1 simple fact – this county does not want to pay for the extra cost for masonry walls. The Board decided that it could meet the taxpayers's needs and deliver a sound educational program by going to the plasterboard walls and cutting back on space. The basic bottom line is we keep trying to do champagne programs on a beer budget and it doesn't work. The Board adopted the specs to be in line with the community's desire to be fiscally responsible. The Board felt that money could be saved by having look alike facilities, elementary, middle and high school throughout the county. The Board also looked at the \$10 million in question between options 3 and 4. What does \$10 million dollars buy? Ten million dollars is one third of the cost to make schools have the safe environment needed. Ten million dollars would buy approximately four schools that could be fully enclosed with walls. Until the taxpayers, appointed officials, and elected officials address the reality of \$1.5 billion dollar shortfall in capital, maintenance, and modernization, it is not going to get any better.

On a motion duly made a seconded, the Board voted (5-0-3) to approve the Superintendent's recommendation; Messrs. Wayson, Carey, Peterson, Melendez and Ms. Johnson in favor, Messrs. Leahy, Bernson and Ms. Walker abstained. The motion carried.

ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION 2007 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM:

The Superintendent recommends approval of the revision of the 2007 Legislative Program. Mr. Carey moved to approve the Superintendent's recommendation. Mr. Wayson seconded.

Mr. Bernson moved to substitute the revised legislative program that he passed out to the Board a few weeks ago. Mr. Leahy seconded.

In response to questions by Mr. Melendez, Ms. Johnson clarified that the Legislative Program is an overall viewpoint. As each proposal comes before the legislature, the Board will either vote to oppose, support, or take no position. So the time for discussion on each item is when it is before the legislature. What the Superintendent is proposing and what Mr. Bernson is proposing are more global looks at the Legislative Program.

Mr. Peterson said that the two documents have two different intents. The Superintendent's document basically lays out the philosophical basis and rationale for what we are going to do as a school system. In that case, the Board is voting for that as a philosophical document. Mr. Bernson's document basically is more of a tactical statement and as Ms. Johnson said, when these issues come up, the Board will have more than enough time, issue by issue, to review. Discussion ensued on the philosophical differences of the two versions of the Legislative Program.

Mr. Leahy made a substitute motion that the Board table this legislative agenda and in its place address each issue specifically when it arises before the Board. Mr. Bernson seconded.

The Superintendent said it is important to take positions on specific pieces of legislation. What he has read and studied since coming to Anne Arundel County, speak very clearly to the issue of inadequate funding of the school system. His recommended legislative program is an avenue for advocating and promoting adequate funding for the school system.

Mr. Wayson spoke to the importance of the Board of Education having a legislative program. At any time, the legislative liaison to the Board could be asked about the school system's position on an issue and it is important that a legislative program has been adopted by the Board.

Mr. Leahy voiced strong objection to certain Board member's interpretation of his views and believes that the Board is acting too hastily to simply approve the Superintendent's recommendation simply because it is the Superintendent's recommendation. Mr. Leahy believes each item should be debated individually because of the philosophical differences. For those Board members who do not see the differences is to consider this issue of little importance.

Mr. Melendez said that if the State Assembly and Governor pass any type of slot machine bill he would like to see the Board be supportive of monies from the slots be put into education, and capital projects.

Mr. Wayson's comments were not intended to diminish Mr. Leahy's views, but to say that no one accepted one Board member's opinion because he handed something out, maybe Mr. Wayson simply didn't agree with Mr. Bernson's views. No one called Mr. Wayson to determine his views on the revised Legislative Program. There are two proposals and he is all in favor of debating the two different philosophies, but the Board still needs to have a position, as the legislature begins on January 10, 2007.

Mr. Leahy proposed calling the question on Mr. Bernson's substitute motion to table the Legislative Program. The Board approved (8-0).

On a motion duly made and seconded on the motion to table the Legislative Program, the Board voted (2-5-1), Messrs. Leahy and Bernson in favor, Messrs. Wayson, Carey, Peterson, Melendez and Ms. Johnson opposed, Ms. Walker abstained.

Mr. Bernson offered a final summary comment. From his perspective in drafting the substitute, he personally viewed the pre-existing document as an unacceptable, politically left-wing document that he could never support, and it essentially calls for – there are many different things in there – but the essence is that the Board needs to go to the legislature and ask them to throw additional money at the Board, and that money will be the Board's fantasy and Mr. Bernson cannot support that. Hence, he drafted the substitute document that takes a more traditional approach to education and seeks to stay neutral on certain questions of funding. It certainly advocates for increased funding where it is appropriate, but in general seeks legitimate reform and not just additional monies.

Mr. Melendez addressed the term "left-wing" as he believes that the Board is bi-partisan. He asked for further clarification of the program. Ms. Johnson clarified that the Board has an overall legislative program which sets forth general direction, but when specific legislation is before the legislature, it will be presented to the Board for a vote of support, opposition, or no position.

Mr. Margolies, Chief of Staff, said that votes on legislation don't always necessary coincide with Board meetings when the Board can vote on its position. The purpose of having the legislative platform is to allow the legislative liaison to make the Board's views on certain issues known and to be able to react quickly. The platform is essentially what the Board adopted last year with minor revisions.

On a motion duly made and seconded on Mr. Bernson's motion to substitute his revised draft legislative program proposal, the Board voted (2-5-1), Messrs. Leahy and Bernson in favor, Messrs. Wayson, Carey, Peterson, Melendez and Ms. Johnson opposed, Ms. Walker abstained.

On a motion duly made and seconded to approve the Superintendent's recommendation, the Board voted (5-2-1), Messrs. Wayson, Carey, Peterson, Melendez and Ms. Johnson in favor, Messrs. Leahy and Bernson opposed, Ms. Walker abstained. Mr. Bernson left the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

NEW GOVERNMENTAL ACCOUNTING RULES FOR HEALTHCARE (GASB 45): The Governmental Accounting Standards Board Statement No. 45 (GASB 45) will require governmental employers to recognize the cost of post employment benefits (i.e. medical, prescription, dental, vision) provided to current and former (retired) employees (up to a 30 year term.) Currently, governmental entities account for such expenses using the "pay-as-you-go" method. GASB 45 requires accounting for the future cost of healthcare for active and former employees to ensure future healthcare funding. As a result, this new GASB requirement will impact AACPS expense and liability financial statements beginning fiscal year ending 6/30/08. A brief GASB 45 overview was provided by AACPS' benefits consultants, Aon. Mr. Wayson left the meeting at 9:35 p.m.

Public Participation: Jim Snider spoke to the need for public debate on the issue and the need for more documentation on the county school system web site. Leahy left the meeting at 9:40 p.m.

MONTHLY FINANCIAL STATUS REPORT: James Goodwyn, Budget Supervisor, presented the financial status report as of November 3, 2006 for general and grant funds.

BI-ANNUAL REPORT OF FINANCIAL STATUS: The Education Fiscal Accountability and Oversight Act of 2004 requires two financial reports to be submitted to the Maryland Department of Education throughout a fiscal year. The first of these reports, covering the period from July 1, 2006 – November 30, 2006, is due December 31, 2006. The report, although similar to the regular Monthly Financial Status Report is a separate report in a slightly different format required by MSDE.

Mr. Carey moved to bundle consent items 6.01 and 6.02. Mr. Peterson seconded and the Board approved (5-0). Mr. Carey moved to take the items from information to action. Ms. Walker seconded and the Board approved (5-0). The Superintendent recommends approval of the following schematic design documents:

FREETOWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SCHEMATIC DESIGN DOCUMENTS: Alex Szachnowicz, Acting Director of Facilities presented the Schematic Design booklet prepared by Rubeling & Associates for Freetown Elementary School, dated December 20, 2006. Mr. Szachnowicz reminded the Board that the preceding phase of this project has been approved by the Board of Education as follows:

- Freetown Elementary School Educational Specification – December 7, 2005
- Freetown Elementary School Feasibility Study – May 17, 2006

The Schematic Design phase puts the educational specifications in plan format and establishes the space requirements, adjacencies, and interrelationships. This design is a modification of the prototype elementary school. The major modification is designing second floors for both classroom wings. The architect's schematic design estimate is \$15,336,910.00 without the add alternate that compares favorably to the construction budget of \$ 22,949,000.00.

LAKESHORE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SCHEMATIC DESIGN DOCUMENTS: Alex Szachnowicz, Acting Director of Facilities presented the Schematic Design booklet prepared by SHW for Lake Shore Elementary School. Mr. Szachnowicz reminded the Board that the preceding phase of this project has been approved by the Board of Education as follows:

- Lake Shore Elementary School Educational Specification – January 4, 2006
- Lake Shore Elementary School Feasibility Study – June 7, 2006

The architect's schematic design estimate is \$16,859,339 without the add alternate that compares favorably to the construction budget of \$19,773,000. The Board adjourned a 10:10 p.m.

Approved January 3, 2007