

Long-Range Facilities Task Force 2014

Minutes Long-Range Facilities Task Force

Tuesday, February 25, 2014

Meeting was held at the North Olympic Peninsula Skills Center, February 25, 2014 from 5:00 p.m. – 6:20 p.m.

Members in Attendance:

Jay Averill, Bernie Brabant, Brandon T. Scott, Barry Burnett, Amity Butler, Ron Craig, Mark Hannah, Michelle Haworth, Chuck Lisk, Tabatha Meadows, Sheila Roark Miller, Leslie Mraz, Stacey Nickerson, Steve Pazan, Kelly Pearson, Gary Pringle, Jane Pryne, Karen Ross, Theresa Rothweiler, Tina Smith-O'Hara, Judy Thomas, Mary Ann Unger, Kate Wenzl, Jane Wise, Darryl Wolfe, Jami Wood

Members Absent:

Quint Boe, Garry Cameron, Kyle Cronk, Cindy Crumb, Nolan Duce, Bill Feeley, Ron Garcelon, Gary Gleason, Mary Hebert, Ron Jones, Dani LaBlond, Cheri LeFevre, Sue Lindley, Andrew May, Cara McGuire, Steve Methner, Joyce Mininger, Jerry Nichols, Michelle Olsen, Bryon Olson, Laura Price

Welcome:

Dr. Pryne opened the meeting thanking everyone for meeting in their groups since our last meeting. She announced that several of the District administrators are not present due to attending a PBIS conference in Portland, OR.

Agenda:

Dr. Pryne reviewed the agenda for the evening:

- Decision Matrix Information
- Making Connections to the K-8
- Set Next Meeting Date and Topic

School Configuration Analysis

The Task Force prioritized in small groups then as a larger group averaged the scores for the items that were most important to them in a school configuration. See below.

	School Configuration Assessment	Priority Ranking
Musts	Highest Educational Achievement	5
	How to rate the configurations?	
	90-100? Not so much relative spread	
	1-10? 1 = Poor 5 = Excellent	
	Note--see factors affecting educational achievement below	
Wants	Need to be measureable or definable	
	Ratings from 1-10 here? If so, what is a 10 and what is a 1	

Should weight the wants also depending on priority
Have to play around with this a bit

> Fewest school changes	3.6
> Optimal total enrollment in schools (what is better?)	4
Optimal = Whatever this means to you - What is the Best?	
> Smallest number of schools	2.9
> Lowest capital cost for facilities	3
> Low operating cost	3
> Low transportation cost	3
> Highest security for students	5
> Collaboration Opportunities/Teachers & Staff	3.3
> Opportunities for remediation and enrichment	3.8
6. A new school configuration must meet the criteria of simplicity, fairness, transparency and acceptability to most families.	3
7. A new school configuration must account for current (projected) demographics, flexibility and	4
7A Fiscal responsibility	4.25
8. A new school configuration must strengthen the Districts ability to deliver quality educational opportunities to all.	5
9. A new school configuration must effectively address current family mobility realities.	3
Other wants?	

Next Meeting – Tuesday, March 25, 2014

At our next meeting the K-5 and the K-8 groups will each have 30 minutes to present which include questions and answers. The last 30 minutes will be utilized to rank order the three configurations first in small groups and then as a whole group. If there is time we will vote on the top two choices and discuss a recommendation to the Board of Directors on next steps. Groups K-5 and K-8 need to get together before the next meeting on March 25 and plan your presentation so you are ready to present.

Please send any PowerPoint or other materials to Marsha McKay by March 21, 2014.

Adjournment Closing: The meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.
Minutes taken by Marsha McKay