

Spotlight on the Board

Notes from the District 15 School Board Meetings

November 18th, 2008

This was a Special Board of Education meeting. The main purpose was to further review the District 15 Facility Audit Study by Gilfillan Callahan Nelson Architects which was first presented to the Board at a Special meeting held October 18th.

Board member Nancy Lee Carlson was absent for the October 18th Special meeting.

Board members Nancy Lee Carlson and Kelly Keenan were absent for the November 18th meeting.

Board President Gerald Chapman – Stated that the district is in the midst of a rather lengthy process to assess our facilities and take a look at what needs to be done in the long term with the idea to develop a 10 or 20 year plan. Part of that is to get the Board “up to speed” relevant to where we are currently. It is going to take some time for that to develop. We had an extensive meeting last month (October 18th) and this is the second in the series.

Demographics Report and Audit Findings Follow Up

Pat Callahan, Architect – Said that there were three items that they followed up on. Dr. Quinn had some questions/comments that they attempted to respond to regarding changes in the documentation. There were some additional suggestions by Dr. Chapman and they tried to summarize that for the Board’s consideration.

Steve Nelson, Architect – Went over the written response from the demographer regarding Board concerns over the spread of 15% between the low and high projections of student enrollment in the district over the next 10+ years. It is cited that the swing in enrollment is never more than 8 to 15 kids per grade level. He did tighten up the district-wide projection realizing that the B projection is the most likely and the one that he recommends the district follow, it has proven to be the most reliable particularly in the Midwest. However based on the size of D15 and its overall demographics (type of student, type of housing, potential housing changes in different clusters or regions of district) that not all schools will likely follow the B trend. Some are trending up or down towards the A or C projected enrollment accordingly. The demographer still feels that it would not be prudent to change that number from his original report at this time based on the turbulent economic situation and the housing market which he took into factor as he put the report together. He still feels that the B series is the most accurate. Nelson and Callahan have adjusted the cover sheets for each of the schools to just follow the B projection right now so that it is uniform across all schools in this particular report snapshot in time.

Board member Sue Quinn – Agrees that all schools aren’t going to follow an A, B or C. In a general sense if you were looking at the district as a whole, looking at B is reasonable. However we have an additional set of data which she doesn’t think the demographer had access to which is our current 6th day enrollment numbers. He made projections last summer as to the next five years of which the first year is this year. So, we have a way to compare actual data for the first year with his projections.

She compared the data and found that certain schools follow the A trend, or B or C trend. Most follow B. But the schools that are a little slower or faster make sense. Because we do have a general trend where there are certain growing parts of our township, higher growth areas and other parts with declining enrollment in the schools.

Quinn handed out a chart that she developed (see links below). She gets somewhat different results than the A, B, or C projection the architect supplied. The first column is 6th Day Current Enrollment, the next is the architect’s B Series projection, then there is a series A, B, or C column as to which projection is the best for each school, then the change in the demographic projection for that school.

She would like the Board to at least consider looking at those different sets of projections when we are looking to the capacity for each school compared to what it is projected to be in five years.

Ref: **District Overview Core Space**

www.fcwpta.org/pdf/d15_111808_overview_corespace.pdf

District Overview Instructional Space

www.fcwpta.org/pdf/d15_111808_overview_instructionalspace.pdf

Callahan - Thinks Quinn's charts are appropriate to discuss at this time. Having the demographic data preceding the 6th day enrollment and now being able to test it against the 6th day enrollment is as good of a test as anything else as to what is actually happening within the school boundaries. He said that Quinn's approach is a very reasonable predictor. The capacity and the ability to predict what the buildings can hold in terms of delivering the programs and the number of students that they can house to adequately educate them is a fixed variable. This is a predictor of how that particular school is going to react to the demographic shifts. Thinks Quinn's approach should be tested against next September's 6th day enrollment to see if the trending is consistent and is a good test of the data.

Questions for Quinn from architects regarding her data -

Callahan - Asked her about the two charts - instructional space vs. core space.

Quinn - Referred to Instructional Space data: She appreciates that the architects went back and reevaluated the core space as she asked - which parts of the core space are actually instructional space co-opted to be used as core space. What the architects didn't do that she had hoped for was to take it one step further and say how much of that (space) can we pull back in if we need to have that instructional space back. How much can we access or not? The computer lab needs to stay the computer lab; the art room needs to stay an art room. That is one piece of data that she feels is still missing.

She still has issues with the instructional capacity that the architects had quoted. She referred to the cover sheet from the architects that summarized all of the schools - instructional and core. Has an issue with the numbers, some are wrong, the data needs to be checked - the # in the body of the text isn't the same as on the summary sheet. Kimball Hill, MJ and Winston Campus numbers are wrong. Those numbers did not include kindergarten space as she mentioned before (last meeting).

Nelson - That was addressed because you have kindergarten enrollment (numbers). In their opinion, it would be false to not account for 20 to 24 kindergarten numbers. In calculation of the % of instructional occupancy, they only used the larger of the two K classes, either a.m. or p.m. Enrollment wise they kept the numbers in.

Quinn - Which is not apples to apples because if you have 40 kindergarteners - 20 in a.m. and 20 in p.m. - and you add up all the rest of your kids, you have 40 kindergarteners, but the architects' report only has 20 spots for those kids to fit. Even if you used 24 instead of 21, it is not an apple to apples comparison. So what Quinn did was add back in for that p.m. (class) a fictional 20 kids (spaces) to match those kindergarteners, just to make it apples to apples. It doesn't radically change the outcome, but she would like that correction put in (the report).

Looking at Quinn's data sheet, she put in the 6th day enrollment and color-coded it to show where the district is today. It is mostly in the yellow and green today. Today we are not ideal but certainly functional as a district. Start where we are today and figure where we are going to be 5 years from now in terms of capacity relevant to enrollment - is it getting worse, or better? Is it worse in one school but better in another school? (Looking at the chart/data) There are some schools that get tight, but in general, we (district) get better because overall enrollment is going down. Quinn has a different conclusion (than the architects) from the demographic projections.

Chapman - Presupposing that the C projection carries through very year which may or may not happen. **Quinn** - It does give you a range. For example, Lake Louise is our biggest and fastest growing school. Historically, it could be somewhere between an yellow and a red (on the chart) if you

look at the two projections. It is pretty close to the only school that is doing that, maybe we can tailor some things for that school which would not necessarily apply to the rest of the district.

Chapman – From his perspective, thinks there is a missing link. There also needs a look at those schools that are significantly under-sized relevant to the capacity and enrollment.

Quinn – She actually has that information in her chart if you look under the “starred” schools. Those are the ones that are way low. That is true, doesn’t want to miss that piece of it.

Chapman – His point is that he doesn’t know if those schools are “green” because they meet the criteria of being able to house the students. **Quinn** – This (chart) just tells you if you have a problem with overcapacity. It doesn’t tell you about under-capacity and what you might want to do about that.

Callahan – Asked how to categorize those buildings that had more than one class size. Perhaps there needs to be a way to categorize “under” more than “over”. **Chapman** – Quinn did it on her chart/data, which is fine. As a Board and administration, we have to realize that there is significantly “under” that we need to look at. He is not asking for anything beyond that.

Quinn – Asked if the architects wanted to talk about “core space”.

District Overview Core Space www.fcwpta.org/pdf/d15_111808_overview_corespace.pdf

Her issues with the Core space calculation are that the architects calculated core capacity based on three lunch periods. She takes that to mean – cafeteria size as the architects determined it. The cafeteria (multipurpose room) x 3 (lunch periods) and then that is your capacity for that core space and how it matches up to the enrollment (for that building).

For example: Marion Jordan – the core capacity as defined by the architects is 558 students. Core capacity according to Code is 684. The reason for the difference is because the architects said we want to have 3 rotations of lunch. If we only have 20 minutes for lunch, we can only fit so many kids through there. Why we have a 20 minute lunch is another separate question, but thinks if we had longer lunch periods to have more kids go through, we could go to the whole Code (capacity of students). She would like to address that.

Callahan – The limit of 200 students is more of a supervisory limitation, in conjunction with the seating capacity of the tables/chairs. It did not comply precisely with each building but was a good average on a cross-section of the district to use as the basis. So while there is more capacity perhaps there is a number of factors in getting that # of students through the hot lunch line, how many “free and reduced” students are going through the lunch period. It was not to say this applies in each building but was used as an average targeted # because it works and satisfies all of the other criteria regardless of which school it is applied to. How long a student eats is more of a policy/district driven issue. The # of students is going to fluctuate by year in terms of rotating kids through recess, eating and back out again. Limiting certain age groups from eating together because it is not compatible. Smaller kids can fit more in the room than larger kids.

We (architects) are not suggesting that this is right, but this was a good average balance throughout the district to use as the basis for Core capacity. It was indeed the multipurpose rooms that were driving the limitations of the Core, not toilet rooms, hallways, gym. Thinks it is important to recognize that the multipurpose rooms are the driver. This (lunch periods) was a means to apply it consistently through each building.

Quinn – Appreciates idea of having an average understanding of calculating Core space. At the same time, we have 20 individual schools that treat things very differently because they have a host of factors. That is why it is important to look at how lunch periods are handled today because we exist and function today with our limited core space. Looking at her Core capacity page – there are several schools “in the red” and we still serve lunch. Some of those schools have 3 lunch periods, some have 6. Some have 20 minutes for lunch, some have 30. They have clearly figured out for each school what works for them – maybe it is not ideal but it is working. The architects’ plan has a lot more schools “in the red” than what Quinn shows is in existence today. She thinks we need to be a little careful about how dramatic we say that we don’t have enough Core space (in a building).

If you take those enrollment #s out over the years, the data shows that it gets better for the Core space – lower enrollment = more Core space. She doesn’t see it as a 50% “red” problem the way it is portrayed (by the architects).

Chapman – Has a question. Should we have a standard that says “this is an appropriate length of time for lunches and the # of lunches to have?” If we have that standard, shouldn’t we be evaluating each of the schools against the same standard?

Quinn – That is a reasonable question. Understands standard of 20 vs. 30 minutes for lunch because it takes a student a certain amount of time to eat, get through the line.

Chapman – Put it in this context. If we are going to be looking at our spaces – Core and Classroom, it seems to him the way to do that is set a standard. Everything being equal, this is what the ideal will be for our students. Now we do not have that ideal at every school so people have to make accommodations and we recognize that. He thinks that the architects are trying to get at some level of standardization. The issue is that when you look at dollars and making changes at our schools – is Core capacity going to be a driver or the # of classrooms needed going to be the driver or the location of the schools or the appropriate size? He doesn’t see the lunch periods being much of a driver for him.

Quinn – That is where she is getting at. She is in agreement with Chapman.

She also agrees with Chapman’s comment that we consider in the total package, do we want to set a standard of 20 or 30 minutes (for lunch)? She would like to hear from the individual schools how they would work that out. Do they feel comfortable with the way it is or do they get a lot of parent complaints?

Board member Wendy Rowden – Thinks they need to be careful about Boards making decisions on that. Believes it is a site-based decision (lunch periods) driven by space, clientele. She said that there is a lot of different opinions on the appropriate amount of time for eating lunch. Rowden doesn’t think that the Board wants to set a standard policy. **Chapman** – Agrees, it should be set administratively.

Board member Tim Millar – Commented that a lot of the schools have students that are not in their attendance boundaries. You (architects) are including populations that may be lower or higher in certain schools because they are being transported to other schools for the ELL (English Language Learners) program, for a lot of those things that are more mobile. It doesn’t really give us the full picture. If you had a bigger school, how many kids would be in that school?

Callahan – The students are transported to the buildings in which they remain for lunch.

Millar – Explained that certain schools would have children transported that are really not in their attendance boundaries. **Rowden** – Added that we have programs that are not necessarily within the boundaries where students live. Those change sometimes from year to year based on space. You might have a gifted program going to one school based on space. In subsequent years, it could be in a different building based on space.

Callahan – As far as looking at each building, they looked at the numbers based on the Student Assignment Plan which takes those programs into account. Backing those programs out would be an apple to apples comparison. He wants to caution the Board in trying to create 20 different scenarios for each building taking into account its own special needs. It would be unbelievably challenging, impossible to do. We are looking at this as a snapshot in time, now we are adding 6th day enrollment and making adjustments. The study is a living document; it is supposed to be done that way. Important to not craft 20 different specialized applications for each school.

Millar – He is trying to get a handle on - How many children are in the attendance boundaries for each school? If the school had more capacity, programs would be there because you would not have to bus the kids as long in many cases. We shuffle them around the district where the capacity is.

Callahan – There was a great deal of discussion with the administration Cabinet regarding boundary areas and programs and where they reside. That is why we opted for the Student Assignment Plan knowing the number of students that were going to be in each building. Administration could get Millar those numbers. The scope of what they were trying to apply was something that was easily consistent, and didn’t have those extra variables about transportation, programs that might be here this year but not next year because it creates a moving target.

Chapman – Said that part of what we are trying to do as a Board is try to avoid, have enough knowledge so when we are putting programs at a school – the ideal would be to know if we have

enough capacity for that program and we don't have to move it in two years. He thinks it is something we can administratively do but agrees (with Millar) that we have to take the special programs out of the architects' numbers and then compare (space). That is something we will do internally, not asking the architects to do it. Part of our long term look is to develop some consistency to where the program locations are.

Quinn - Thinks we need a comprehensive list of where all of the different programs are housed. The #s of the kids that are housed in each building for separate programs are in the Student Assignment Plan but we don't know for example, ECDEC - is it all pulling from a sector (of the township) or is it pulling from the whole district. It is that kind of mapping, understanding where the kids are coming to (a school) and from (a school boundary) is needed, like an overlay. Knows that is not easy to compile but thinks it is important to have an understanding of that.

Nelson - We did have the current Student Assignment Plan and Jim Garwood did give the architects updated information as they went through it. In our plans, we do account for which rooms are ECDEC or ELL, etc. It is on the floor plan for the schools. He said that there may be a way for the architects to chart that information out for the Board. **Lukich** - What you don't account for if we have a particular program in a building, where did those kids come from (what school boundary)?

Chapman - He doesn't think the district needs to know where the kids are coming from (what school boundary). We just need to know the total # of kids in those special programs and where they are located because it has the impact on the capacity of that building. We would not be talking about sending those kids back to their original schools and dividing them up. We would be looking at that group of students and whether they are in the appropriate school in the long term.

Quinn - She was thinking of it in more of a general sense, not detailed as to where a student is coming from. We have an ECDEC program that might be pulling from a specific geographical location and a Special Education program that is pulling from a whole district. That might influence where you may place that program. Just wants a sense of where we are at, not trying to dictate it.

Callahan - As far as dialogue about the audit findings, perhaps we did not come to any conclusions last month. At this point, the architects are not suggesting any conclusions other than now you have a clearer picture of the facilities you have and how they are responding to the capacity of students and programs. They suggest that this Facility Audit document be considered additional information as the Board makes decisions on particular buildings for additional investment, whether it is Life Safety dollars or capital improvements and how those on how buildings are trending (enrollment), etc.

We will continue to make adjustments to the document (Facility Study) so it is more useable. That means re-manipulating the building information models, making some adjustments to the number discussed tonight.

Chapman - Two things so far that the architects are going to bring back to the Board are: Impact of flexible programs, those that are centered in a school but draw students from multiple schools. We need to identify the numbers because that has an impact on our . . . it is reflected in our capacity but it is flexible in terms of, if there are any of these "red flag" schools that are to be impacted by that. That is number one. He sees that as taking the current enrollment information and saying which of it falls into that category that is assigned to another school. He knows that Jim Garwood has that information.

The other item the Board is asking the architects for is an update on the Core capacity based on the modification of the kindergarten numbers because that is an issue on the instructional capacity.

Status of 2005 Life/Safety Study

Rebecca Allard, Asst. Superintendent for Business - Outlined Life Safety requirements as defined by Illinois School Code, concentrating on Priority Codes A, B and C. "A"s are urgent, they identify items that present an immediate hazard to the safety of students in reference to specific rules of the Code that are applicable to the building. These must be corrected within one year. "B"s are required, they identify items that are necessary for a safe environment but present less of an immediate hazard. These items must be corrected within five years.

All other items (designated "C") within the Life Safety Survey that were accepted by this Board in January 2006 are recommended but not necessarily required by Code and are not necessary to do exactly.

A summary of the items categorized in January 2006 as A, B or C carried a 10% contingency fee and a 10% architect and engineering fee. The value of unfinished projects and what they were previously valued at are **a little over \$4M in A projects, \$10,759,000 in B projects and \$5.8M in C projects**. She also provided detail, by school, that follows the same order as the summary identifying in the order of A projects that were completed – yes or no, if not completed it gives the estimated date of completion and who is going to complete them – internally by district staff or externally with the assistance of the architects.

Chapman – Asked if the A projects summarized are the ones that have not been completed and those are the ones that were supposed to be completed within on year? Also asked how the State likes that we didn't do those (projects)? **Allard** – They do not however, the staffing at the State Board of Education is very minimal. **Chapman** – So what you are telling us is that they do not know we didn't do it. But there is an opportunity to ask for an extension in time. The B projects are supposed to be completed over a 5 year period so there is about \$15M worth that have not been done. Asked if there was a plan over the next period of time to do the projects and fund them?

Discussion regarding funding the projects, selling bonds without referendum

Allard – Believes that the A projects are within either the fund balance or current allotments, those can be accomplished. Some of them the Board will see on the list that was emailed last night – the reorganization of the \$2M that had been designated for Summer 09 work. Some of the A items will be completed during that process. The fund balance in Operations and Maintenance has increased, so we can draw down on that fund balance. There is also the ability through a concept in the tax cap legislation that allows you to sell bonds without referendum. The district has about \$9M in bonding capacity with that methodology. There is access to money but that is a decision to be made in the future by the Board of Education.

Chapman – Asked Allard to talk a little bit about funding without going into detail.

Allard - There is about \$750K available in the Life Safety Fund and about \$153K has been designated to do the Pleasant Hill roof. **Chapman** – Said that the district would levy under Life Safety and that would be subject to the tax cap. So any levy under Life Safety has the potential to remove monies that might otherwise be spent in the Educational Fund. Chapman asked "With the bond capacity that the district has, when would those bonds would be paid off?" **Allard** – That would be a decision made by the BOE. Under Illinois School Code, you have 20 years to repay those. **Chapman** – How much money could we pay off in bonds next year if we levied for or sold bonds? **Allard** – You could either repay the whole \$9M and it would increase your tax rate. **Chapman** – Is that payment of those bonds subject to the limitations of the tax cap? **Allard** – No.

Quinn – She didn't understand entirely what Allard said about selling \$9M worth of bonds without a referendum. Her understanding is that District 15 is bonded out. We are at our debt ceiling and cannot sell more bonds without a referendum. **Allard** – Explained that with the payment of those Limited Tax Bonds that have been done over the last several years, the capacity as of Aug/Sept was about \$9M.

Quinn – She knows that the district paid down, but doesn't think they went down below our cap. For example we paid off about \$6M just last year. That money was essentially taxes refunded to the public because we paid them off. **Allard** – Yes, the tax rate has been reduced.

Quinn – So we had \$12M in payments and \$12M of taxes coming in to match that. We paid off \$6M so our tax amount that we collected was \$6M. She didn't think that the district could go back up to \$12M without a referendum because she thought that money was a tax refund to the public. Asked Allard where Quinn was wrong?

Allard – When legislation was passed in Cook County in 1994, it made the exception that you could sell bonds as long as the debt payment in any single year didn't exceed some number that the district was

paying that year. So if we analyze the debt that has been under-issued with that methodology, we then have the capacity to issue \$9M. **Chapman** – And over what period of time can that \$9M be paid off? **Allard** – Over 20 years, but could be shorter. **Chapman** – So we can start to pay it off immediately. **Quinn** – So it is raising the ceiling. She would like to see some documentation on that – it is still not clear as why that is different from what her understanding was before.

Discussion regarding prioritization of capital projects, shift in projects from A to B

Quinn – We absolutely need to do our A projects but doesn't think that what is on our list are the A projects. We need to discuss reprioritizations. **Chapman** – We do need the A projects. We are behind in the A projects, and we have not yet developed a plan to complete the B projects over that five year period of time. Doesn't think the A projects have a higher priority than the B but is interested to find out why they were prioritized as they were.

Millar – Whenever we talk about these different funds, it really is the same pool of money except when we talk about Bonds. When you talk about the Life Safety Fund, we just happened to have levied into it and we can only use it for certain things. Normally we wouldn't have levied into that and could still take the money out of the Ed Fund to pay Operations and Maintenance, anything we want to do.

Allard – you can reserve the dollars in the O&M to do these projects. **Millar** – one of the big questions is, when we approved the original list for the Life Safety fund (1/2006) - the numbers were very different. The original list had more money in the A items and they were switched to the B, in particular roofing. The numbers he had from the architects going back to 1/2006 showed only \$1.3M in A, and \$16.9M in B. Did we file amendments? How did items get shifted from one category to another?

Chapman – If the Board gets a report that says an item is either an A or B priority, how it is that we can get a report later that has those items switched from an A to a B? He asked for an explanation.

Pat Callahan – When the architects gave their initial report to the BOE, there was Board discussion as to what items was an A or B priority. The architects then had a conversation with the Illinois State Board of Education. The ISBE said it was acceptable to make the roofs a B priority since it was a larger expense. Then the architects made some internal adjustments to those original numbers. However, at this point in time, it does not matter if it is an A or B.

Quinn - Those roofs that were the A priority items originally that were moved to a B, are now failing as witness to Pleasant Hill's roof and Paddock is on its way. **Chapman** – The Board has allocated \$2M for capital projects. We asked the administration to review the original list and see if those items are still a priority. There is \$600K in the fund and there is \$15M worth of work (A and B items). The list of items needs to be identified so the bidding process can start.

Millar – Regarding the list, asked who can complete the work, what can be done in house? Specifically on lot of the plumbing maintenance, why would we go outside to have that done? We can hire a licensed plumber ourselves as opposed to having to pay an overhead fee to do that (through the architects). **Craig Phillips, D15 Maintenance Manager** – We have identified what can be done internally or externally for A, B and C items. Roughly ¼ of the \$2M can be done by internal staff – includes come carpeting and paving.

Chapman – Roughly \$500K is internal so we don't have the architects developing specs. But it is work that will be bid, will be done by awarding bids. Internal staff will do the specs for awarding bids for carpeting, etc.

Quinn – Has issues with the list presented, feels that the A priority roofs are not on there. The previous list had Lincoln, Willow Bend, PH and Paddock on it. She would like to see all \$4M worth of A projects done. The Board is working with two budget years – there is \$2M allotted now (2008/09) plus what can be allotted for next year (2009/10). Quinn thinks the Board should commit to doing the entire A projects which would include all of the roofing and everything else on the list plus more. She is not sure what the whole total is.

Chapman – Commented that as the Board builds next year's budget with a similar allocation (\$2M), plus the remaining money in the Life Safety Fund (\$600K), the district could probably do all of these items. He suggests a plan be put together for the completion of the Life Safety work. It should include a timeframe and also the funding aspect. Agrees with Quinn that we can handle the funding of A projects. The difficult part would be the B project list (\$15M) and the Board would have to be more creative for that plan. **Allard** – Thinks they can bring that plan to the Board in January.

Chapman – Asked what projects need to be approved by the Board in order for work to be done in the Summer 2009? Could items be added to the list? Is it reasonable to have that supplemented to this list by the December 10th BOE meeting? What projects need the most lead time?

Phillips – Explained the situation with curtain walls at several schools. Complaints have been received by the staff and air quality tests have been done, patching. Water main has to be replaced at Paddock; sewer work needs to be done. They do not fall under Life Safety now.

Millar – Commented that it fits into a long range plan. We have a simple business model – there is guaranteed income, contracts are set. If it is planned out, and there is \$2M in each year (for projects) or more in some years, a lot of these items can be done. Now we are jumping to conclusions without actually planning some of these things out. If we can do \$4M in these two years, we are not worrying about \$10M (at a future date) because it is really \$7M when it is done. It was cheaper to do the projects on the previous list with the exception of roofs. Had a question about the PH roof, the estimate was \$10 per square ft and the cost came in at \$14 per square foot.

Callahan – Prices of roofing are going up.

Quinn – Has question regarding carpeting, it is not urgent in the general sense but becomes urgent at certain times. You have Jane Addams carpeting being replaced at one time; she understands the logic to doing a whole building rather than doing piecemeal. Quinn is concerned about the repeated leaks at Paddock. Asked if the Board could get the longer term status of our carpets? And can we start plugging that in. She likes the idea of the whole school model but some places cannot wait ten years while we get through all the rest of it (the schools).

Phillips – He went to every building and based on his observations, Jane Addams actually needs the full replacement of carpeting. That doesn't mean that Paddock or other buildings do not need it. It is a question of what dollar allocation he will be given (for carpeting) in order to do the work. Given the fact that he only had \$2M to work with – that doesn't mean that if there is a room at Paddock, PH or any building that needs remediation. We will do that (repair) out of the Operations and Maintenance fund. The only capital fund aspect is when we are doing a large undertaking. At the present time, Paddock has another 24 months before we hit that chart to say it is a total replacement (of carpeting). That is not what a lot of people want to hear but when you look at all of the buildings that is where it falls. **Rowden** – Asked Phillips if replacing a whole building's carpet is the right way to do it? Are there higher traffic areas and other places where it would wear down sooner?

Phillips – Replied that there certainly is. Again it goes back to an administrative decision – Are we going to identify all of those buildings? Years ago, he did that - the high traffic areas, then did some classrooms. We did do it that way, we did 4 or 5 buildings a year where we did a hallway here, or a hallway and classroom there, and he did this wing or that wing. In conversations with various administrators, it was felt that while that satisfies a lot of avenues, it may not be the best way to say that building is done, move on to the next. Then when he runs into a shortfall (with money), then nothing is done and they seem to fall in a limbo stage and it doesn't look well.

Rowden – Her follow-up question is – When do we consider a carpet section a hazard? For example, tape holding a carpet together? For example Winston Campus, Rowden asked how can we have tape holding together a carpet in front of the café and have that be safe. **Phillips** – We don't generally tend to think of that as being safe. That is an intermittent position where then we can authorize our staff overtime to do the corrective work to fix it. **Rowden** – Is the tape temporary? **Phillips** – Yes, where we have tape now we consider it temporary pending us getting authorization to allow these guys overtime to do the corrective action. We have trained our custodians to do carpet installation and they know how to remediate it. But again there is two categories, one is they cannot do it during school activities. **Rowden** – Asked if this is something the Board has to say that we do not think that tape

holding carpet together is good and that it is important for you to fix that quickly? Do we need to say that? What is the timeline on doing something like that? Can it be like that all year (tape holding carpet together) or will it be fixed in two weeks? How quickly do we fix those things? Is it a money issue?

Phillips – It is a money issue. All he needs is authorization by the Board that says give Phillips the money, go fix it - Hire whoever, get it done. If you want your staff to do it and buy the product to get it done, fine or if you want to do a contract under the Board guidelines because it would require an RFP (Request For Proposal) or it would require us to go out to bid. If the area is big enough, we are required to go out to bid. So we have to put a document together and do that. That is usually reserved for summertime activities. If it is a small area, the custodians go around and cut, paste and patch until we can take an appropriate action at a later date. Some of this has been a monetary situation. Phillips said to remember many years ago at one point; we were at \$14M. For the last three years, we have been at \$9.5M.

Chapman – Wants to respond on the part of the Board. Told Phillips to use part of that \$9.5M for carpets and fix it sooner. **Lukich** – The comment is then, that the money is in the budget. We are not waiting on the Board authorization, just use the money to do it.

Allard – There is money in the budget. There was \$1.9M in capital expenditures in the O&M fund. She thinks as she looked at it last week, we have spent \$700K of that to date.

Callahan – Wants to respond to the question about the roof at PH (from Millar earlier). The remediation project was a very short duration project, it was a phased project. The inflationary \$14 per square foot vs. \$10 is because it was a very compressed time frame, and short bid. They could only do half the roof at one time because the other half was occupied. Callahan thinks that the additional \$4 per sq ft was based on that specific project. If it was a much larger roof, he thinks the \$10 per sq ft. would have held true. **Millar** – We do have some huge projects in roofing and if we are off that much (estimate vs. actual), that is not good.

Conclusion/Follow Up

Allard – The schedule that will be brought back to the Board in January will be by type of project - for example carpet. We will say this is the schedule for carpet over a ten year period. These are the schools that require the work and how we would do it. Mechanicals would be done the same way.

Chapman – Summarized. Allard/Phillips will bring priority items to the Board in December and then a complete plan hopefully by the January Board meeting. **Lukich** – The Board expects to see this list reprioritized from the standpoint of Life Safety addressing much if not all of the \$4M.

Chapman- Added – unless there are some items for rationale under B that are more critical.

Cluster Study of Future School District Initiatives

Lukich – Commented that he believes that the architects have completed their review of the Facility Audit and considerable time has been spent discussing the Demographic Analysis (of the district). The next presentation (by Mary Zarr) focuses on “anticipated program expansion.” Since July 1st, the leadership team has begun, on behalf of the Board, to think about the following items:

- Grade Level Centers including All Day Kindergarten
- Curriculum Enhancement
- Community Usage
- District Technology Plan and Implementation

A few other items appear under “Facility Redevelopment Options”.

Leadership is not at the point of talking about suspending or retiring buildings from service, but he says that the Board is going to hear a little bit about the team’s thoughts of restacking or reorganizing in terms of grade levels. We are not here to talk about new facilities. Zarr will talk about what has taken place in Phase Two of the cluster meetings with building principals and what the leadership team sees as the future of what needs to be investigated for District 15.

Asst. Superintendent for Curriculum, Mary Zarr – Stated that while the rest (of the audit) is a necessary and very important part, obviously if you are in curriculum instruction, this is the lifeblood (phase 2) of why we are here. This was very exciting to all of us. We included our entire leadership team in this process which consisted of our 20 building principals, five Cabinet members and three instructional directors. We started the very first strains of this towards the end of last year and in our summer leadership sessions when we started to talk about Strategic Vision 2010. We looked at our mission, key goals, Student Performance Target, Core Values, what are we doing to still support them and do they still reflect where we are. Through different activities that we did this summer, the mission statement is well aligned to future focus; **there are no recommended changes at this time**. The leadership team does believe that the Student Performance Targets need to be revisited and revised.

Going into our Core Values – Our first round with the architects was a lot of the “nuts and bolts.” A lot of the report that the architects brought to the Board last month and again tonight, was in terms of that snapshot in time. How are the buildings being used? Where is everything? What are the district boundaries? What are the overlays and what ramifications do they have?

Our second set of cluster meetings were designed to get at the heart and core of kids. We asked ourselves, what do we need to do to produce 21st Century World Class Learners? What are we doing now? What do we see our needs at in the future?

As the team went through that process, everything that came out of the meetings could be categorized into five different areas - Guiding questions, philosophical core values, limitations, curriculum, potential programs or program alternatives to research. And then increase after school, during or before school opportunities that all centered around those 21st Century World Class Learners.

The team’s recommendation on the Core Values is that they still do believe the underlying belief of the administration team in this district. As we go through and involve more stakeholders in the process, a similar activity in terms of defining core values will be done with each one of those groups to see if there is another Core value needs to be added.

Guiding questions – Core Values - Definition: Question reflective of the leadership team’s core values and beliefs. They would be used as the team goes forward in the planning stage doing research on different programs. An example of a guiding question is “How do you convince a BOE of needed changes and initiatives to produce world class learners?”

What the team would expect out of their guiding questions is as they move into the implementation and action stage, they would bring back a recommendation to the Board. The Board would expect to see not only the research but the reasons why the team thinks the Board should go in that direction. Not just because the team would really like to try something. It would be a best practice, well documented research so when the Board talked about the program as a group, the Board would be able to look at all of the different pieces and make a decision about a particular program.

Limitations - This is a laundry list of questions they asked themselves. For example: “If this is such a good idea and what is needed to produce world class learners, then why haven’t you been doing that?” That is where we bared it all and said these are the limitations we are feeling. This becomes a very important list as we go forward in the planning. Administrators need to refer to the limitation list and be able to show the BOE how we intend to overcome a current limitation and go forward.

Curriculum – In reality, curriculum is anything that is written, used or taught to get across whatever it is that is taught to the children. It could be books, lesson plans – it is all considered part of curriculum. Curriculum would be clearly interwoven into anything that we do.

Potential Programs or Alternatives - The list is divided into two categories.

1. New Programs to be Researched and Developed

Investigate the merits of All Day Kindergarten

The type of students involved would be dependent on what the research showed.

Middle School

Maintenance Program for Native Speakers

- A child would be supported to become literate in both languages, by maintaining and enhancing their skills in their native language (reading, writing, etc) and producing a truly bi-lingual literate child. It differs from a dual language program. A dual language program includes speakers of English as a native language and another language. That could be explored under the concept of Magnet schools.

Magnet Schools or Academies

- Could explore dual language programs (see above) or Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) Magnet "schools within a school"

Zarr – These items are meant to sound like very broad topics. She said that it would be remiss of the administration to zero in and give the Board specifics before the research was done. They would not put the Board in that situation.

2. Programs to be Researched and Expanded

Summer Academies (Enrichment and Remedial)

2nd language instruction for all

- Currently there is 2nd language instruction open to all students at the junior high level. Expansion would mean offering it at the elementary schools.

University partnerships

Lower class sizes

Value added initiatives

- Means more investigation into the growth model for all children. Taking a child from where they are at now and moving them forward.

Examination of Current Schedules

Lukich – Stated that none of these program determinations (above) were made based on the district's current facilities or hopes for new facilities. They were made on what was in the best interest of kids.

Chapman – Thinks that when the Board originally talked about this issue, they had asked the administration to give their initial thoughts to the kinds of programs that might impact the district because the Board is looking at a facility plan for the next 10 to 20 years. There will probably be curriculum changes at some point, we need to talk about these and the impact they would have on facilities. As the Board makes decisions on facilities, we will not make the decision based on today's curriculum. Chapman would like to take this list (of programs) and see how they relate to facilities; put it on the agenda for the January 28th meeting. Talk about these programs to see how we lay the basis for the kind of information we need to make a good curriculum decision. Then fold that into the impact that they may have down the line relative to facilities.

There has to be priorities and he recognizes that a decision made today may not be the one made on a curriculum five years from now. We don't want to build or say our facilities are adequate today based on what we are doing, when in fact the Board may have some ideas on relevant priorities. He feels that the Board needs to have a discussion broader than this one. Asked if any Board members objected to putting this issue on the agenda for the January Committee of the Whole meeting?

Quinn – Doesn't object, just doesn't quite understand what Chapman is saying?

Chapman – Explained, here (list) are potential programs that they (administration) have. Many of which would impact facilities. If we as a Board say, over the next five years we are not interested in lowering class sizes that has an impact on us. If we as a Board say that should be a high priority for us, then it does have an impact and we have to give direction to the administration that these are the ones (on the list) that you convinced us and now come back and tell us the impact on facilities in the long run.

Quinn – So you are looking in January for the administration to come to us saying for example, All Day Kindergarten - this is what the administration thinks about it and this is the impact on facilities?

Chapman - That might be, but what he would really like to do is take this list (from Zarr) and have a better understanding of each one of the items. Then the Board can react as to whether that is anything

the administration should even spend time on. There may be things on this list that we as a Board are not even interested in. **Rowden** – She doesn't know how the administration would have enough time to actually research that for January. **Chapman** – Wanted to clarify his answer. He is not asking them to research; he is asking that the Board put these items on our agenda as a follow-up to this meeting and then talk with the administration about how important they believe some of these items are. Then try to reach a consensus as to whether we would consider it in the future.

Rowden – She is struggling with the idea of how do we (Board) determine what is important if we do not know the research? In regards to the item "Examination of Current Schedules", she knows a bit of research about that but before it is brought to the Board to say that it is important, the Board needs to examine our current schedules including our calendar year. We are going to need a lot of information because each member will be in different places as to their understanding of the subject. How could the administration possibly give us enough information to make us think that is important?

Chapman – Replied, well we may not. His guess is that in some of these areas, the administration will have a lot of information and some not.

Millar – In putting the two together, the Board can ask for what the impact would be on facilities if some of these programs were implemented. That information would be helpful ahead of time. The Board needs the research to know these are good programs before it takes the next step. Millar would not knock any items off the list without having the research to show it is beneficial or not beneficial.

Quinn – She would like to see that whatever the Board does is driven by instruction, what the needs of the kid are not the facilities' needs. The facilities should be matching our instructional needs. Quinn is hesitant for the administration to say what the impact on facilities is and start that conversation – when we don't even know if something like middle school is something we want to consider.

Lukich – Agrees. To start the conversation about middle school, if the question is "how does that match up with our facilities?" The answer is easy, it doesn't. Case closed. Lukich thinks it is going to take a different question. **Quinn** - The question should be, "Is middle school a concept that educationally benefits kids enough that we want to explore it further?" She thinks that is the question that the Board could possibly reasonably answer. This is a whole lot to talk about in one night.

Rowden – That is what she is saying. To her, getting this (list) means that the administration is going to go back and research these things and then make presentations to us on whether they are good for our district or not.

Lukich – Here is the first question from Zarr and himself. Have we hit the nerve endings of what you most had in mind? Is there something missing from their thinking that the Board had in mind? Or is this overreaching? **Quinn** - Doesn't think it is overreaching but she does have one thing that doesn't fit into these two categories. She thinks that the ideas of having the 21st Century learner and 21st Century teacher speaks to the global economy that you have now and the focus that there should be a Math and Science rigorous part of the education. We are an elementary education that is highly focused on Literacy. It is necessary but she thinks that there needs to be a cultural shift. Thinks there is already a shift in the culture that math and science are essential parts of learning at the elementary level. She doesn't think we made that shift as public education. Quinn doesn't see it as an Academy because it is elementary education; it needs to be Math and Science for all. She would like to see some thoughts about that from the educational perspective.

Zarr – Quinn referred to several guiding questions that Zarr didn't mention. For example: "Have the schools fit the students' needs as opposed to the students fitting the facility needs?" Also, "What are those skills that define a 21st century learner?" "What does a 21st century teacher look like? What does a 21st century classroom look like?" The topic of Math and Science came up. Other ideas tossed around were the "school within a school" where you focus on your certain piece. You could have a Magnet school within your school that your kids rotate into. The team felt that by not breaking the individual subject areas out by themselves, that they could be covered in the research under Magnet

school or Academies - schools within the schools. The team knows that the Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) are four strands that cannot be ignored as we go forward.

Lukich – We thought about putting together some Action teams of administrators and maybe some classroom teachers. We haven't had classroom teachers involved in this whatsoever. Over the next 6 weeks to two months, asked if it would be helpful to the Board if they put together a "briefing paper" that we would present to you about "What does middle school mean?" etc. It would help in your discussion if that is something that applies to District 15.

Chapman – He doesn't think that anyone is objecting to any of these items on the list. So what Lukich is saying is that groups would pursue these items and when you are ready, you would come back and tell us when it is in that format? Maybe January is too early? He is not advising January.

Rowden – She would like more information on all of these things but specifically more on things that seem to be able to be done quicker like the second list, if they are deemed something that we want. It says "to be researched" or "to be researched and expanded". **Chapman** - that is what he was getting at. If we can get enough information about this, then the Board can say to the administration "this is where we would like you to put your priorities". He would like to have more information about them all.

Quinn - Asked when the community would be brought into the discussion regarding the vision/future direction of the district? She thinks it would be valuable to get community input even at this preliminary stage. The Board has intensively consulted our educational experts and they have given us a list. However the community may have something else to add to this list that the Board should consider as we go forward. **Rowden** – Understands what Quinn is saying but doesn't know if the Board is at that place yet especially regarding new programs. **Chapman** – Also doesn't know but asked the superintendent for his thoughts. Chapman does think the Board needs community input but the question is when? **Lukich** – Replied, maybe the first of the year, after the holidays.

Rowden – Asked if research gathered for the Board could be put on the district's Web site for the community to look at before conducting a survey? The community would need information/research to some extent on different programs before we can ask what their opinions are. **Quinn** - Agrees for the items that are on the list provided by the administration. However there may be something else that comes out of the community. For example, Math and Science are not on this list, although it may be covered under Magnet Schools. **Lukich** – Believes that the community piece has to be a part of it, the district may be a little premature at this point in terms of comfort level when talking about some of these things with the community. He suggests more research and development, at least in a preliminary way of educating themselves and then get back to the Board. Then once the Board sees the information, maybe it is time to go "Primetime"

Quinn – This meeting is being taped, it may take some time for the public to figure out that we have been talking about these issues, and then they will start to respond.

Lukich – The administration may be ready with information on a few of these items by the end of January, more at the end of February and then March. He wanted to add that this process (meetings with the architects, then cluster groups) has really brought together and galvanized the team. One quarter of which are new in their positions. He thinks that it has done a lot of good to bring this team together to look at the future of District 15, it is time well spent.

Adjournment

This Special meeting concluded at approximately 9:15 p.m.

A Summary of Board Actions for this meeting can be found on the District 15 Web site www.ccsd15.net

Compiled by: Jennifer Mondy fcwnews@comcast.net

Posted: Wednesday, January 7th, 2009