



SKSD LRFP Task Force

Meeting Minutes

From	Elisa Warner	Date	February 20, 2017
Project	SKSD LRFP	Project No.	14026
Subject	SKSD LRFP Task Force		

Subcommittee Work

Task Force members divided into two (2) subcommittees to conduct focused discussions on building condition and enrollment/capacity needs by school. The highlights of the subcommittee discussions are summarized below.

Building Condition Subcommittee

Topic: Consensus Items

- The focus of the Subcommittee discussion was to reach consensus on the remaining discussion items. Mary Paulson distributed a list of the items that were tabled from last week. Each item is listed below, along with the discussion highlights.
- **Provide voice amplification systems for classroom teachers.**
 - A subcommittee member informally asked several teachers if they felt classroom voice amplification systems were needed. All consulted said that they personally would not need this, but that other teachers might. It was acknowledged that this was a very small and informal sample of teachers, and they had not witnessed the system in action.
 - There was some discussion over the potential benefit of voice amplification systems to hearing impaired students. Such systems could help mainstream special needs students, creating a more inclusive environment. These systems also save teachers' voices.
 - The Subcommittee discussed the possibility of making the systems available on an as-needed basis. Another alternative would be to purchase portable systems.
 - The Subcommittee ultimately reached consensus that the item should be forwarded for Board consideration.
- **Upgrade and increase the number of computers for staff and students.**
 - "Devices" is a preferred term over "computers." Technology will change, but the need will remain. Provide some examples (e.g. laptops, tablets, handhelds, etc.).
 - There was discussion over whether this is an item that should be covered under the District's operational fund. Computer upgrades are bondable – this was a recent change. However, there are

other ways of funding equipment purchases that might be more appropriate (e.g. levy, etc.). Joel explained that the technology plan does *not* include bringing the District to a 1:1 ratio within the next five (5) years.

- The Subcommittee ultimately reached consensus that the Board should consider the item. Change the tech language (e.g. “devices” instead of “computers,”) and mention possibility of other funding sources.

- **Enhance up to 41 CTE opportunities at all high schools by adding equipment and space. Add nine (9) new opportunities across the high schools which would require equipment and space.**
 - There were concerns last week over whether the District could commit to staffing the proposed CTE programs. There were also equity concerns, as not every program would be offered at every high school. One of the subcommittee members informally asked several high school students (from different high schools) how difficult it was currently to attend CTE programs at different schools. They unanimously said that it was an easy process. This was a high-achieving group – it might be different for students facing socioeconomic challenges. Add verbiage to ensure that resources would extend opportunities for students with the greatest needs.
 - There is also the issue of class size for CTE programs. Will they serve fewer students? Group work and mentorship relationships keep class sizes manageable.
 - Subcommittee members were impressed by the statistics over the increased graduation rates of CTE completers.
 - The Subcommittee ultimately reached consensus that the language would be changed to remove specific numbers of programs, and emphasize the equity focus (especially around access and transportation).
 - Consider alternative funding sources where feasible (for this and other options).

- **Relocate the main office at 17 schools to assure natural surveillance of the entrance and parking lots. Remodel main offices at 17 schools to improve natural surveillance.**
 - The Committee discussed whether the second item was as important as the first. Should they perhaps be separated? Joel Smallwood explained that the second improvement category would improve sight lines, etc.
 - Should these items only be addressed if there is other work planned at a particular school? Joel explained that in cases where other work was needed (due to building condition and/or capacity issues), this would be rolled in. Other subcommittee members expressed concerns over being able to enter certain school buildings without being intercepted due to placement and/or configuration of the main office. Also, lack of passive supervision requires active supervision from teachers, which means that they are less available for instructional activities.
 - Is surveillance a suitable alternative? Subcommittee members felt that cameras were more reactive than proactive. There may be a deterrence factor, assuming people are aware that the cameras are in place.
 - The Subcommittee ultimately reached consensus that the language would be changed to combine the two items.

- **Upgrade and increase surveillance technology to deter theft, vandalism, and property damage, while promoting a safer environment.**
 - Concerns voiced at previous meetings related mostly to student privacy. There were also questions on the effectiveness of cameras that are not monitored real-time. Additional SROs are preferred, but this would be cost prohibitive. Cameras have limitations, as there is not audio to determine what led up to an incident. Joel explained that the District is working toward providing parity across schools in terms of security resources.
 - The Subcommittee was generally more comfortable with the idea of external security cameras. Addition of external cameras would help cover current dead zones, discouraging vandalism and graffiti. The District does often receive restitution following identification of responsible parties. Also, exterior cameras capture students engaging in risky behavior, such as climbing on a roof.
 - The Subcommittee was not able to reach consensus on this item. The report should explain the areas of hesitancy.

- **Retrofit the electronic badge access systems of 53 schools and seven (7) support facilities with new hardware, which will improve physical safety as well as the interface of access with bell schedules, surveillance, lockdown procedures, and communications.**
 - There were some concerns over whether these improvements should be conducted in cases where other work is not scheduled. Also, there were questions regarding the longevity of the systems. Joel explained that these upgrades reflect the latest technology. Card lock systems are only positioned at major entry points. Each door and badge can be programmed to only open certain doors at certain times. Such systems eliminate the need to re-key entirely if a key is lost (badges can be immediately deactivated). Current systems are proprietary and will no longer be supported in the future. The lifespan of a new system will be approximately 15 years. Long-term cost savings will be realized.
 - The Subcommittee ultimately reached consensus that this item should be recommended to the Board.

Enrollment/Capacity Subcommittee

Topic: Scenarios to Address Overcrowding

- The subcommittee reviewed the draft document, “Draft Themes/Concepts” for accuracy. The following items or issues should be noted in the Subcommittee’s report:
 - The cost difference between constructing classrooms vs. replacing portables. Also note the educational benefits of brick and mortar classrooms. The subcommittee would like to send message to Board that it is important to consider brick and mortar additions for community pride, spatial efficiencies, possibility of lowered class sizes, etc.
 - CTE programs often require much more space than a typical classroom, depending on equipment needs, etc.
 - Describe the difference between classroom capacity issues and the core infrastructure issues.
 - Include and describe “equity” as a decision-making principle.
 - School boundary adjustments will be carefully and thoughtfully considered. The District will be mindful of demographics and seek balanced enrollments. Reference the nine boundary principles used by the District when making these changes.

- Provide additional background on the PSU study and the projected growth patterns. While Salem-Keizer (as a district) is growing, this is not uniform across all communities.
- Report Format
 - Tell the whole story at each level. Lead with the strongest points - capacity issues at high schools are reaching crisis levels.
 - The preamble narrative should explain the stress on core infrastructure.
 - Full-day kindergarten implementation added to capacity issues.
 - The PE mandate (H.B. 3141) will have facility implications, if implemented.
 - Salem-Keizer is the second largest school district in the state; however, as the state capitol, a high proportion of land in Salem is off the tax rolls.
 - Quote statute ORS 195.110, compensation for restriction of use of real property due to land use regulation.
 - Include the PSU study.
 - Identify each school's capacity and core infrastructure needs.
 - Renew assumptions, current and future capacity issues.
 - Make sure to discuss viable options as well as recommended solutions.
 - For the elementary capacity analysis, there is one proposed solution. Include the cost to rebuild Auburn ES. Explain why Auburn was selected for replacement.
 - For the middle school capacity analysis, there are two possible solutions: brick and mortar classrooms or portables.
 - For the high school capacity analysis, there are two possible solutions - the 2200 model or build a new high school.
 - Integrate educational adequacy, seismic upgrades, safety and security, CTE, science labs and technology. Create stand-alone sections where they do not integrate.
 - Place funding information at the end as a wrap up.
 - Jim Edmonds offered to assist in the writing of the report.

Task Force Subcommittees Reconvene / Additional Items

- The Subcommittees reconvened to share the highlights of their discussions.
- Upcoming Task Force meeting will be held on February 27th at the Student Services building. Each subcommittee will present their recommendations, and provide an opportunity for asking clarifying questions.

The meeting concluded at 7:40 p.m.