

Reconfiguration 2.0 meeting minutes

2-DAY WORKSHOP

June 21 and June 22, 8 am - 8 pm / Green Bay School

Reconfiguration Team 2.0

Summary of Planning Meeting June 21-22, 2016

Moderated by Dr. Howard Feddema

Participating and in attendance were the 31 members of Reconfiguration 2.0 Team, Superintendent Michael Bregy and members of the Cabinet, and a representative of Nagle Hartray Architects. The group met for two days, twelve hours each day.

Day One Summary

The first few hours were devoted to introductions and background.

1. Team introductions
2. Review of historical background materials
3. District strategic plan
4. SCFFAC and Board/Cabinet Rubric
5. Nagle-Hartray review of previous process
6. Review of June 2016 survey results

Following presentation and discussion of background material and the rubrics previously used to evaluate potential reconfiguration models, the team moved into a review and discussion of specific reconfiguration options that were developed during the previous process. This approach allowed the team to consider the past process and decisions that led to the previous referendum, and achieve a working team dynamic that could assist in the Team's charge to generate two to three viable reconfiguration options with community input. The previous models were simply starting points for discussion, and were not used as possible 2.0 reconfiguration proposals.

To this end, Dr. Feddema provided five specific reconfiguration options selected from work to date, representing a broad range of options including 7-, 8-, and 9-building models. These models included a variety of middle school site options on existing and new middle school sites. 2.0 reviewed these as a large group, and then broke into small groups to discuss the limitations and merits of these reconfiguration options, before reporting back to the larger group. Dr. Feddema moderated this large group reporting, with 2.0 questions addressed by NSSD112 cabinet members, including Jennifer Ferrari, John Fuhrer, and Mohsin Dada; Don McKay of Nagle Hartray was also present to provide cost and site-challenge perspectives.

2.0 then decided to determine if these options--as a starting point--could be refined, and amended, to move toward possible new configuration proposals. In the afternoon, small groups once again discussed the options and reported back. The strong 2.0 consensus was that any preliminary options need to provide diverse options for community input, and the discussions at the close of day one incorporate both 5-8 grade and 6-8 grade middle school models, at both new and existing school sites, comprising a range of likely total project costs.

Day Two Summary

The day opened with further discussion of options and small group discussions based upon the previous day's work. 2.0 also discussed Budget Deficit Reduction 3 (BDR3) and NSSD112's plan to close four schools at the start of the 2017/18 academic year. Further, 2.0 determined that in the spirit of maintaining the broadest possible continuum of options for community input, a "baseline" option would prove beneficial.

Such a "baseline" would begin with something like BDR3, a not optimal but low-cost outcome, and work toward enhancements desired by the community requiring incremental investments toward a reconfiguration option that would approach the full-set of previously identified criteria (i.e., the community and district's "wish list"). Put simply, the "baseline" option would answer this question: If we start with the closure of some buildings--not necessarily those identified in BDR3--and then add various pieces (full-day K, additional classrooms, a/c, etc.) what would the costs be for each enhancement? This is a bottom-up approach, and is complicated by the fact that each enhancement generally impacts some other aspect of cost, facilities, or education. Nonetheless, 2.0 believes a "baseline" approach may help further clarify community values and the acceptance of any future reconfiguration plan.

Following large-group discussion of options for each reconfiguration, with ongoing Q&A with the Cabinet and the architect, the group once again broke into small discussion groups focused on further refining individual options. We ended with large-group discussion of four possible

configuration options that might be investigated as the launchpad for revised proposals, representing a broad continuum of cost, facilities, and geographic location options. 2.0 determined these to be a starting point for further study. The group operated consistently with its mission in mind of ultimately providing the community with multiple viable options, rather than attempting to narrow prematurely to one model.

Accordingly, these options will be taken up by the Steering Committee and the subcommittees as we move forward as a starting point for further exploration, modification, refinement, and community input. No final decisions were made, or will be made, without further analysis and broad community input. Our purpose here was to simply get started, and we spent 24 hours over two days doing so.

Selection of Steering Committee

Each 2.0 Team member interested in serving on the Steering Committee or a subcommittee was given the opportunity to address the team, and from 21 nominees (selected by the 31 members) the team elected a Steering Committee of five members. This committee replaces the Launch Team that helped initially select the 31 members and organize the survey, although it should be noted that three members of the six member Launch Team were elected by the group of 31 to the new Steering Committee. **See 112information.org for the names of team members.** The team noted with pride the level of engagement and dedication shown throughout the two days, including the continued willingness of a majority of members to dedicate themselves to leadership positions.

Key conclusions and takeaways for the team

- It was valuable to receive grounding in district strategy, SCFFAC, and the work to date on reconfiguration as markers of what happened before.
- Understanding of community input via review of survey results notably revealed strong sensitivity to overall project costs.
- Based on results of referendum as well as the survey data (click [here](#) for survey results), the Reconfiguration Team believes there is insufficient community support to further pursue a single Middle School Campus model.
- The team will need to actively and effectively engage all community groups in two-way communication with regard to finance, facilities, and educational programs.
- Due to referendum results and survey feedback, the team determined it must first explore a “baseline” approach in order to fully assess lower-cost options. For example, BDR3 is a

useful reference point in this process to develop a set of bottom up options, but 2.0 does not, from this meeting, endorse BDR3 nor take a position on its specific closures.

- The team felt that the idea of having a single school that provided full-day kindergarten for the smaller elementary schools (Baeside, Ravinia, Lincoln, Red Oak and Sherwood) was a concept worth exploring. This is a creative way to offer full-day kindergarten without overcrowding the elementary schools or necessitating additions.
- In discussing the merits and concerns of various models, certain considerations and choices emerged as important. These include, but are certainly not limited to:
 - Middle school sites
 - Kindergarten/EC Center
 - Full day kindergarten/ half day kindergarten
 - 5th grade in middle school
 - Class size
 - Open/capped dual language enrollment
 - Importance of comparable middle school size
 - Challenges of building on park land
 - Competitive benchmarking
 - Equitable distribution of resources across the district

Next Steps

- Determine subcommittees (complete)
 - Communications
 - Finance
 - Facilities
 - Education
- Appoint subcommittee co-chairs (complete)
- Provide progress update to Board of Education
- Kick off subcommittees and develop work plans for each aligned to a master project timeline and major milestones for design, input, and presentation to the Board