



**21st Century Schools**  
**Facilities Team Minutes**  
**Wednesday, October 7, 2009 – 6:00 p.m.**  
**Taft Elementary Media Center**

---

**Chairperson:** Tony Spisak

**Present:** Tony Spisak, Mike McCusker, Gil Adams, Nick Thornton, John Besek, Angela Black, Russ Bonsall, David Carpenter, Jeannine Day, Helen Glandon, Barbara Hastings, Gary Martin, Carol Middel, Jen Munson, Julie Mytych, Don Nicholson, Jon Riebe, Kim St. Peter, Dwayne Walker, Jeff Rahmberg, Char Sherman, John Goci

**1. Welcome – Review Minutes**

Tony Spisak welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked them for attending. He asked everyone to sign the attendance sheet. He indicated that the minutes from the previous meeting were e-mailed to the team and asked if anyone had any questions or comments. There were none.

Visitors to the meeting (Jeff Rahmberg, consultant for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Schools Committee, Char Sherman, Deputy Superintendent, and John Goci, Board member) introduced themselves to the group.

**2. Facilities Assessment Results (Review Rubric)**

The team agreed that the goal of the meeting was to reach consensus regarding the results of the facilities assessment and to provide the information to the Enrollment Team. The group reviewed the chart of the current district configuration and the pattern of how students move from school to school. It was then compared to the chart of the proposed configuration with two sections, each containing (5) elementary K-4 buildings, (1) 5-6 building, (1) 7-8 building, and (1) 9-12 building. The team determined that they would focus tonight on the K-4 grade levels at the 17 elementary buildings.

The team reviewed how the rubric was developed. First, the survey results were reviewed to determine what characteristics were considered most important to the team. The feedback on the 19 criteria was combined with the results of the bond study and the feedback from the District's architect, construction manager, and maintenance & operations staff. Based on this analysis, each criterion was assigned a weight factor of 1 to 10, with 10 being the most important. For

example, age, capacity, air conditioning, and recent work were all assigned a factor of 10. Then, each building was scored on a scale of 1 to 10 in each of the 19 criteria, with 10 being the highest score. The score was multiplied by the weight factor to determine a total score for that criterion. All 19 scores for the building were added to arrive at a total score.

The team reviewed the charts of the current and proposed configurations, the rubric, and an alphabetical listing of the buildings with their total score. Each table discussed the results among themselves.

### **3. Consensus to Give Facilities Assessment Results to Enrollment Committee**

The team determined that they would give the scores to the Enrollment Team for their evaluation to see if the higher scoring buildings would work in terms of location, bussing, etc.

There was discussion about ensuring enough capacity to have the appropriate number of “swing rooms” for art, music, special education, etc. The number of lunch periods that would be needed was also brought up as a concern.

The potential closure of Tinkham was also brought up, with a question as to whether the programs housed there will stay in place. Tony explained that the Instruction Team will give direction on what programs will run. The Enrollment Team will look at where the students are physically located in the district and whether the higher scoring buildings could accommodate them.

Gary Martin explained that at this point, we are not recommending that any specific buildings be closed. We are simply looking at whether this configuration will work. The team may decide not to close the suggested configuration number of buildings, but we have to cut something, as there is not enough funding available from the State. In the end, the Board will do what is best for the students.

The team approved sending the data on to the Enrollment Committee. There were no objections. Tony indicated that at the next meeting, we would review the middle school facilities in regards to the 5-6 and 7-8 configuration.

### **4. Round Table: Thoughts and Questions**

Jeff Rahmberg commended the group for all of their hard work and dedication. He reminded the group that the entire 21<sup>st</sup> Century Committee would be meeting on 10/13 at the Career Tech Center for an update from all of the teams.

Char Sherman explained that the final decision will not be based only on the facilities, but that we have to have a starting point for evaluation. She also explained that the Facilities Team is not providing a recommendation, but rather an assessment.

The group discussed several questions and comments as follows (with responses from Mr. Spisak):

- Was all day kindergarten considered in the capacity figures at all buildings?
  - Yes
  
- Does the ranking as a result of the rubric fairly address the mechanical systems and the condition behind the walls?
  - Yes. Russ Bonsall (from the District maintenance department) commented that he agrees with the results based upon his own knowledge of the buildings and his independent assessment.
  
- How were additions and renovations taken into account when determining the age of a building?
  - The scores would take that into account. For example, Patchin was scored low for age, but was ranked higher for recent work. So, the blended score of the two criteria fairly score the overall building.

Gary Martin reiterated that the ultimate goal is to provide the best instructional program for our kids. We need to make \$8 to \$10 million in cuts. So, if our recommendation to the Board does not provide for that, then we have to do something else, such as looking at other areas within the District's budget.

**5. Next Meeting – October 21, 2009, 6:00 PM, Schweitzer Elementary**