

School Board

Public Participation at School Board Meetings and Petitions to the Board¹

During each regular and special open meeting of the **School Board** or **Board Committee**, any person may comment to or ask questions of the **School Board** (*public participation*), subject to the reasonable constraints established and recorded in this policy **guidelines below**.² The Board listens to comments or

1 The Open Meetings Act (OMA) requires public bodies to have rules (a policy) on public participation. Public comment is synonymous with public participation. They are used interchangeably in the footnotes below. 5 ILCS 120/. Customize this policy to ensure it is responsive to the community's public participation needs.

OMA and the School Code grant any person the right to address a school board during any open meeting. See 5 ILCS 120/2.06, 105 ILCS 5/10-6 (board of directors), 5/10-16 (board of education), and **Public Access Opinion** (PAO) 19-2. See f/ns 2, 4, and 5 below for more detailed discussions.

Policy 2:110, *Qualifications, Term, and Duties of Board Officers*, governs the board president's duties, one of which is to preside at all meetings, including presiding over public participation and enforcing this policy. Enforcing this policy is key to the board conducting a successful meeting. The board president should speak with the board attorney to: (1) craft opening statements for the public participation portion of the meeting related to enforcement of this policy and consequences for violating it or any other related board policies, and (2) discuss whether the presence of security and/or law enforcement is advisable, especially when public participation is expected to be long or contentious. For resources on best practices for managing challenging public comment periods, including a sample opening statement, see: www.iasb.com/policy-services-and-school-law/guidance-and-resources/managing-challenging-public-comment-periods/ and other learning opportunities through IASB's Online Learning Center, at: www.iasb.com/conference-training-and-events/training/online-learning/online-courses/.

While it does not apply directly to school boards, the Empowering Public Participation Act, 5 ILCS 850/, prohibits law enforcement agencies or officers employed by them from intentionally conducting background checks of individuals based solely on the fact that they are speaking at an open meeting of a public body. Consult the board attorney for a discussion related to the appropriateness of board members and school officials using search engines and/or other social media platforms to search for information about individuals speaking during public participation.

2 This sentence combines 105 ILCS 5/10-16 and 5 ILCS 120/2.06(g). Prohibiting public comment and/or restricting public comment to written filings violates the mandates and overarching purpose of OMA. Roxana CUSD No. 1 v. EPA, 998 N.E.2d 961 (Ill.App.4 2013).

While some courts have upheld public bodies limiting public comment to certain subjects, such as only subjects on the agenda or only related to the business of the public body, this sample policy does not provide default sample text for limiting public comment to certain subjects. This is because 105 ILCS 5/10-16 requires school boards to allow members of the public "to comment to or ask questions of the board." The cases in which courts upheld limiting public comment to certain subjects involved public bodies with no governing statutes that required the public body to allow the public "to comment to or **ask questions of the board.**"

Consult with the board attorney for guidance before adopting a maximum time limit for public participation; public comment rules are frequently challenged. The Ill. Public Access Counselor (PAC) has issued only unpublished, non-binding opinions approving of 30- and 60-minute overall time limits for public comment under OMA. The PAC has issued a binding opinion finding that a public body violated OMA when, pursuant to an unrecorded rule, it limited public comment on a controversial topic to 15 minutes. PAO 19-2. The PAC noted that while the lack of an adopted policy on the time period for public comment did not "necessarily mean that public comment must be allowed to continue indefinitely," the public body presented "no evidence that limiting comments was necessary to maintain decorum or that extending the comment period

questions during public participation; responses to comments to or questions of the Board are most often managed through **Board** policy 3:30, *Chain of Command*.³

To preserve sufficient time for the Board to conduct its business, any person appearing before the Board is expected to follow these guidelines:⁴

would have unduly interfered with the orderly transaction of public business.” *Id.* If the board wants to establish a maximum time limit for public participation, it may revise the first sentence of the paragraph as follows:

For a maximum of 60 minutes ~~During~~ each regular and special open meeting of the School Board or Board Committee, any person may comment to or ask questions of the Board (*public participation*), subject to the reasonable constraints established and recorded in this policy. The time limit for public participation at a meeting may be extended upon the majority vote of the Board members at the regular or special meeting.

If a board wants to establish a time limit other than 60 minutes, substitute with the time limit desired. Note that any extension of a public comment period cannot be based on the viewpoint of a speaker(s).

3 The law does not require board members to respond during public participation, and best practices for meetings instruct board members to refrain from engaging in commentary with members of the public during public participation.

4 OMA does not but PAO 19-2 does provide specific rules. These guidelines may be amended. The guidelines for public comment and the time limits (if any) should be reviewed with the board attorney. Restrictions on public comment during board meetings must respect free speech rights guaranteed by the First Amendment. Do not use viewpoint-based restrictions on public comment time unless approved by the board attorney. Many decisions address the tension between free speech and rules for public comment during meetings. See, for example:

Mnyofu v. Rich Twp. High Sch. Dist., 2007 WL 1308523 (N.D.Ill. 2007)(school boards may impose guidelines for running meetings to maintain effectiveness).

PAO 19-2 (The PAC ordered a board to refrain from applying unestablished and unrecorded rules to restrict public comment at future meetings stating, “Though a public body has inherent authority to conduct its meetings in an efficient manner and need not allow public comment to continue indefinitely, there was no evidence that capping public comment to 15 minutes was necessary to maintain decorum or that extending the comment period would have unduly interfered with the orderly transaction of public business.”).

PAO 21-9 (The PAC found a board violated OMA when it required public comments about retention of a coach to be made in closed, rather than open, session).

PAO 26-1 (The PAC suggested that a public body can cut off inflammatory comments that disrupt a meeting because the content is profane or insulting, even in the absence of a specific rule; however, a public body cannot cut off a speaker simply because they name a certain member of the board). Note that this sample policy incorporates the rules in sample policy 8:30, Visitors to and Conduct on School Property, which, in part, prohibits threats, harassment, and obscenity).

Lowery v. Jefferson Co. Bd of Educ., 586 F.3d 427 (6th Cir. 2009)(upheld a rule prohibiting speakers from being frivolous, repetitive, or harassing).

Steinburg v. Chesterfield Cnty. Planning Comm’n, 527 F.3d 377 (4th Cir. 2008), *cert. denied* (upheld removal of a man from a public meeting for behaving in a hostile manner).

Norse v. City of Santa Cruz, 629 F.3d 966 (9th Cir. 2010)(remanded a decision upholding community member’s removal from city council meeting after community member gave a Nazi salute in presiding officer’s direction, which is

1. Address the Board only at the appropriate time as indicated on the agenda and when recognized by the Board President. This includes following the directives of the Board President to maintain order and decorum for all.
2. Use a sign-in sheet, if requested.⁵
3. Identify oneself and be brief. Ordinarily, the time for any one person to address the Board during public participation shall be limited to **threefive** minutes.⁶ In **unusual extenuating** circumstances, e.g., **to accommodate a person's disability or language interpreter**, and when an individual has made a request to speak for a longer period of time, the Board President may allow a person to speak for more than **threefive** minutes. If multiple individuals wish to address the Board on the same subject, the group is encouraged to appoint a spokesperson.
4. Observe, when necessary and appropriate, the Board President's authority to:
 - a. Shorten the time for each person to address the Board during public participation to conserve time and give the maximum number of people an opportunity to speak; and/or
 - b. Determine procedural matters regarding public participation not otherwise covered in Board policy.

considered as classic viewpoint discrimination for which city council members were not entitled to qualified immunity).

Fairchild v. Liberty Indep. Sch. Dist., 597 F.3d 747 (5th Cir. 2010)(upheld a policy banning discussion of personnel matters during public comment; the rationale turned, at least in part, on the Texas open meetings law).

Bach v. Sch. Bd. of the City of Virginia Beach, 139 F.Supp.2d 738 (E.D.Va. 2001)(struck down a rule that prohibited personal attacks during public comments at meetings).

Ison v. Madison Local Sch. Dist. Bd. of Educ., 3 F.4th 887 (6th Cir. 2021)(found a policy prohibiting statements that were personally directed, abusive, or antagonistic constituted viewpoint discrimination in violation of the First Amendment).

Platt v. Mansfield, 162 F.4th 430 (4th Cir. 2025)(holding a board policy prohibiting public comments that target, criticize, or attack individual students likely did not violate the First Amendment if applied in a nondiscriminatory manner).

5 Optional. A public commenter cannot be excluded for refusing to provide his or her home address **or because he or she is not a district resident**. PAOs 14-9 and 19-9. Generally, a board should consult with its attorney regarding the practice of excluding public commenters for reasons relating to the sign-in sheet.

6 Time limits for any one person to address the Board during public participation may be adjusted up, but **consult the board attorney before setting time limits below three minutes**. Based upon I.A. Rana Enterprises, Inc. v. City of Aurora, 630 F.Supp.2d 912 (N.D.Ill. 2009), many attorneys agree that speaker time limits should be a minimum of three minutes per person, but some public bodies have successfully implemented two minutes per person. This sample uses **threefive** minutes because it is a frequently used time limit. See I.A. Rana Enterprises, Inc. (finding a three-minute time limit reasonable citing Wright v. Anthony, 733 F.2d 575, 577 (8th Cir. 1984) which upheld a five-minute time limit for individual public comments and holding time limits serve "a significant governmental interest in conserving time and in ensuring that others ha[ve] an opportunity to speak"). Note that the Ill. Municipal Code, which applied to the City of Aurora in I.A. Rana Enterprises, Inc., did not have the same requirements as the School Code to allow members of the public to "comment to or ask questions of the board." I.A. Rana Enterprises, Inc. also predated the 2011 amendments to OMA allowing "[a]ny person an opportunity to address public officials under the rules established and recorded by the public body."

Based upon I.A. Rana Enterprises, Inc., many attorneys agree that speaker time limits should be a minimum of three minutes per person, but some public bodies have successfully implemented two minutes per person. Consult the board attorney before setting time limits below three minutes.

5. Conduct oneself with respect and civility toward others and otherwise abide by Board policy 8:30, *Visitors to and Conduct on School Property*.⁷

Petitions or written correspondence to the Board shall be presented to the Board in the next regular Board packet.⁸

LEGAL REF.: 105 ILCS 5/10-6 and 5/10-16.
5 ILCS 120/2.06, Open Meetings Act.
I.A. Rana Enterprises, Inc. v. City of Aurora, 630 F.Supp.2d 912 (N.D.Ill. 2009).

CROSS REF.: 3:30 (Chain of Command), 2:220 (School Board Meeting Procedure), 8:10 (Connection with the Community), 8:30 (Visitors to and Conduct on School Property)

⁷ See sample policy 8:30, *Visitors to and Conduct on School Property*, at f/n 23, for a discussion regarding exclusion of persons from board meetings for their failure to follow conduct rules.

Initiating lawsuits against citizens over their uncivil public comments is tricky. Always consult the board attorney, and in some instances, a board member may need to consult his or her own private attorney. The Ill. Citizen Participation Act (CPA) (735 ILCS 110/15) provides citizens a mechanism to stop lawsuits brought against them for their public comments. The law, referred to as *anti-SLAPP legislation*, prohibits public officials from suing citizens for “any act or acts in furtherance of [their] rights of petition, speech, association, or to otherwise participate in government.” SLAPP means *Strategic Lawsuits Against Public Participation*.

The CPA does not bar public officials from seeking relief when they can allege that (a) the citizen’s comments were “not genuinely aimed at procuring favorable government action, result, or outcome,” and/or (b) the citizen engaged in defamation or another intentional tort causing the public official damage. See Sandholm v. Kuecker, 962 N.E.2d 418 (Ill. 2012).

⁸ A board of school directors must reply to a written request for consideration of a matter within 60 days from the board’s receipt of the request. 105 ILCS 5/10-6. Boards of education may treat petitions or correspondence according to a uniform, locally developed process, e.g., a board may wish to limit petitions and written correspondence presented to the board to those that are received at the district office via mail or hand delivery.