

**Growth and Capital Needs Committee**  
**April 26, 2016**  
**Meeting Notes**

Karin reminded all of the charge: *The Growth and Capital Needs Committee (GCNC) is charged by the superintendent to study district needs and issue findings and recommendations related to new construction, facility additions, per pupil school improvement dollars, capital renewal/improvement, and district infrastructure technology needs.*

Karin advised the GCNC of the following as they began their small group work.

1. Remember that we are answering the What, not the How ...
2. Consider: What do Dr. Hatchell and the Board need to know about what you have seen, heard, and considered regarding your charge?
3. Your recommendations are a place for them to start.
4. We are trying to bring objectivity to something that is subjective.

The GCNC norms were shared again with the small groups:

1. All voices will be heard.
2. Consensus will be our decision making process.
3. We will be respectful of competing needs.
4. We will focus on topic at hand/charge.
5. We will complete homework assignments.
6. We will not have sidebar conversations.
7. We will start and end on time.
8. We will silence cell phones.
9. We will be confidential about deliberations.
10. We agree that no question is a stupid question.
11. We agree that we will not be predisposed to outcomes.

Tom explained that members will receive data when they break into small groups tonight. He explained the projects may be put in buckets where they could best compete. Tom clarified that the square footage on the sheet does include modular buildings.

#### **Group Processing of Site Tours**

Small groups debriefed site tours and reported out about their feedback around the following: Shared two or three big ideas from the concerns, and prioritized 26 remodel additions that rose to the top of their matrices after the school tours. (Results compiled from all groups are attached to these minutes.)

#### **Per Pupil Formula discussion/decision-making**

Small groups debriefed site tours and reported out about their feedback around the question: Which formula would you recommend, or with what modifications? (Results compiled from all groups are attached to these minutes.)

### **New construction discussion/decision-making**

Following review of growth data, developer information, tours of new construction sites, residential analysis, and other future needs discussions we have had, how would you define our new construction needs? (Results compiled from all groups are attached to these minutes.)

### **Large group Questions/Discussion following small group sharing:**

Discussion of how Option C might have different weights (focus on enrollment or square footage?). The group seemed to be in consensus about this option if the weighting were adjusted.

Major discussion points:

- Age or enrollment gets more? It's a linear scale for age.
- 70/30 too drastic, favor more to 60/40 with enrollment over sq. footage.
- Argument for square footage – if you have a larger roof or more classrooms your needs are more.
- Put the money where the kids are.
- Philosophy of not putting money into small schools, the age factor would offset that.
- You can't treat all schools as the same, some get much more on building rentals. (Is this an issue of annual process changes that need to change v. bond dollars spent?)
- Four Title 1 schools – probability is they don't have the monetary resources to support the kids (through PTO) so we need to categorize their needs to be a baseline for Title 1 schools that brings them back to equity in terms of available cash.
  - Karin explained that Title 1 schools do receive federal funds.
- A member is fine with Option C and okay with 60/40, but would like to see a higher factor for older schools.
  - You can't solve entire older vs. newer issues. The school board has another way to balance things out. Tom said the ballot question is shorter, the companion resolution piece outlines the things.
- All members agreed they like Option C, along with taking the three things into account. Tier age factor differently or linear track.
- A members wants an economic factor added (Title 1). With no rental or PTO support – make recommendation to look at that. Also discuss a bond oversight committee and make that recommendation.
- What about online schools? There is not currently as much need.
  - GCNC can make a recommendation that online could be included in an Innovation Center and get space.

Adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

**Remaining Meetings:** Monday, May 2nd, 5:00 – 6:00 public forum at the EAC  
Tuesday, May 10th, 5:30 – 8:30 at RHS Tech Wing

GCNC documents are available at <http://www.asd20.org/committees/gcnc/Pages/default.aspx>

Attendance: Kathy Armacost, Ralph Braden, Megan Chura, Gary Coulter, Cindy Hardin, Vernita Hare, Kim Hollm, Tammie Mohr, Dan Olson, Matt Pacione, McKenzie Palmer, Vish Paradkar, Jackie Priessman, Henry Reitwiesner, Patrick Schumaker, Tony Scott, Anthony Sibley, Robin Stanforth, Jason Stejskal, Vicki Taylor, Will Temby, David Tubb, Mark VanGambleare, Jackie Walls, Stephen Zamborelli

Absent: Kelly Goyden, Francine Henderson, Ryan Henkel, Ruth Schoen,

Ad Hoc Members Present: Dr. Susan Field, Brian Grady, Tom Gregory, Anne Krajcovic, Shelley Kooser Dr. David Peak, Karin Reynolds, Linda Warhoe

Absent: Nanette Anderson, Mark Bissell, Greg Stephens