

Subject: Admin contracts / OMA requirements
From: Kelli MacMillan <macmillank@mokena159.org>
Date: 4/1/2025, 2:57 AM
To: Eric Bush <bushe@mokena159.org>
CC: Steve Stein <steins@mokena159.org>

Good afternoon, Eric,

I assume all fellow board members are aware of your response to my emails regarding my ongoing concerns of OMA compliance on administration contracts.

To be clear, this is not about appeasing my feelings or about someone making a mistake in board book. The issue at hand is our legal and ethical obligation to provide our public information on the business before us. It is important to me we provide that notice and transparency to our community, and I do not believe we accomplished it based on what transpired.

As stated multiple times, I have no intention to turning a blind eye or knowingly (suspecting) being non-compliant with OMA. I raised the concern to our Superintendent on a call 3/18, and again to the Supt and the board as a whole the day of the meeting 3/19. I received no acknowledgement or response.

Our public Board book changed multiple times after the agenda was published to the public on 3/17, and again even after the 3/19 meeting.

At this point, I believe my only option might be to ask the IL AG to review the chain of events because I do not have access to our attorney. If the board of education prefer me to speak with John Fester, I can go that route- with board approval. This email is my fourth attempt to encourage compliance with OMA on Administrative contracts. I suspect we cannot just pretend like nothing happened. I would expect we need to acknowledge what went wrong, why, and what we specifically need to do to correct it.

We can make this right,

Kindly share with the board.
Kelli

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Kelli MacMillan <macmillank@mokena159.org>
Date: Thu, Mar 27, 2025 at 1:31 PM
Subject: Fwd: Admin contracts / OMA requirements
To: Steve Stein <steins@mokena159.org>, Eric Bush <bushe@mokena159.org>

Update: our 3/19/25 public boardbook has again been changed, this afternoon, after my email last night.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Kelli MacMillan** <macmillank@mokena159.org>

Date: Wed, Mar 26, 2025 at 11:18 PM

Subject: Fwd: Admin contracts / OMA requirements

To: Steve Stein <steins@mokena159.org>

Cc: Eric Bush <bushe@mokena159.org>

Steve / Eric,

I never received a response to my email regarding OMA compliance on the Admin contracts. It should have been safe for board members to have relied on our Supt and BOE President to consult with our attorney on a concern of OMA compliance when it was suggested by a member of the BOE. It should be safe for board members to have assumed if our attorney said something was wrong or needed to be changed, that you would have responded and updated all board members with that information.

As it stands today, it's clear things were modified after my email to you (below) a few hours before our meeting.

As elected officials, we all took a vow to uphold and have an obligation to do our business in compliance with the IL Open Meetings Act, I have no intention of not doing that. I voiced my concerns with that prior to our meeting to help ensure we did not violate it. The board received no response.

I respectfully request the board schedule a special meeting to plan a corrective action to the 3/19/25 approval of administrator / director / coordinator contracts. This email is now my second attempt to encourage compliance by the Board of Education with OMA on these contracts.

Please update all board members tomorrow with information on what transpired, why, and what our next steps are to a corrective action.

Thanks,
Kelli MacMillan

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Kelli MacMillan** <macmillank@mokena159.org>

Date: Wed, Mar 19, 2025 at 2:22 PM

Subject: Admin contracts / OMA requirements

To: Steve Stein <steins@mokena159.org>, Eric Bush <bushe@mokena159.org>

Steve and Eric,

I've discussed some of my concerns with the admin contracts with Steve, but I've been thinking about the action item and OMA, which bring on another set of issues.

For clarity: board approval of the Personnel report tonight is not approval of administrator's contracts, it is only us approving the personnel report, as presented. The contracts are not included in that action.

Besides that, I am concerned we are not in compliance with OMA as the situation stands on these contracts, regardless. Please keep this in mind for when we have them as an action item next month.

1. The public was not provided notice of the action. The agenda provided the public does not state approval of administrator contracts.
2. The precedence has been long set our employment contracts are an action item, not just a reference on the Personnel Report. Part of this is due to the obligation for us to publish what we are voting on and give recital to that in the meeting. Nothing we've done shows we are approving contracts.
3. The precedence has been long set that the board (and public) are afforded information on action items a month prior to action. That was not done. These contracts were not referenced last month, and the board and public had no reason to believe they would be an action this month.
4. The precedence has been long set these contracts are voted on in April, sometimes May. Historically we have not acted upon Admin contracts this early in the year.

For these and many other reasons I have reviewed with Steve, I will ask that we move to separate out lines on the Personnel report so as to exclude those that are not complete.

Kelli