

**MEETING MEMO**

Facilities Steering Committee  
Facilities Master Plan  
Cedar Rapids Community School District

Meeting Date: September 25, 2012

Location: ELSC Cedar Room B & C

Attending: Dave Benson, Lori Bruzek, Christine Butterfield, Sue Clapp, Jim Craig, Mike Dawson, Steve Graham, Julie Grotewold, Tim Gustin, Steve Hannah, William Hill, Tom Hobson, Paul James, George Kanz, Suzy Ketelsen, Rob Kleinsmith, Sheila Lehman, Mary Ellen Maske, Gary O'Malley, Emmett Scherrman, Lindsay Schumacher, Chad Simmons, Sandy Stephen, and Dale Todd

Not Attending: Dave Parmley

Visitors: Gary Anhalt, Lorie Bateman, David Dobson, Todd Dorman, Michael Gumm, Steve Hill, Ann Rosenthal, Eric Rosenthal,

Meeting Facilitator Julie Grotewold (GWAEA) Grant Wood Area Education Agency, welcomed the committee, and each committee member introduced themselves.

Julie reviewed the information on page one of the agenda packet including:

- Agenda
- Committee change
- Collective Commitments
- Visitor ground rules

After being introduced Steve Graham the District Leader for the Facilities Steering Committee introduced Dr. Benson.

Dr. Benson thanked Committee for responding to request to participate and for their contributions to the Facilities Master Plan at the five scheduled meetings. Dr. Benson reviewed the Committee change and explained the effort of the committee is about “what” and not about “how”. The “what” is the prioritized list of facility improvement projects the district may consider implementing to improve learning and teaching at the Cedar Rapids Community School District. The “how” includes how to pay for improvements and “when” improvements will be made. The work of the committee will be used by the current and future Boards of Education. “Good schools serve the Community.”



Dr. Benson said “the facility needs are greater than resources available.” Ultimately the Board of Education will be deciding which of the improvements to implement.

Dr. Benson stated “committee will learn about sources of funds.” Physical Plant and Equipment Levy (PPEL) and School Infrastructure Local Option Sales Tax (SILO).

Dr. Benson said “while he was the leader for the Enrollment Study Committee efforts, Steve Graham is leading the effort for the Facilities Master Plan.”

Steve Graham then talked about the process (see page two of the agenda packet) and the schedule (see page 33 of the agenda packet). Ultimate goal is Board of Education approves a ten year investment plan for improvements for facilities coming out of Master Plan. Master Plan will have a much larger list of projects than the 10 year Investment Plan.

George Kanz, Shive-Hattery presented (see pages 4-29 of agenda packet). Dale Todd asked for copies of the reports. The reports will be made available per request of Dale Todd. The Executive Summary of the reports is on the District website as a part of the Enrollment Study Committee efforts.

Rob Kleinsmith, Manager of Buildings and Grounds presented a power point “Buildings and Grounds Operation and Maintenance Manual.” A copy of the slides are attached. Rob provided draft copies of the actual manual for Committee Members to pass around. The manual is a continuous work in progress.

Rob was asked about playgrounds. Rob responded playgrounds are not included in operations and Maintenance Plan currently. Each campus is currently responsible for playgrounds as the Campus Leadership usually replaces the playgrounds before the end of expected life of the playground. Dale Todd asked this policy be reviewed as some campus’s lack resources for playground replacements.

Steve Graham then presented Resources of the District. (See pages 30 and 31 of the agenda packet).

Steve Graham presented how the document on page 32 was developed. “Project Evaluations/Facilities master Plan.”

Julie then asked the Committee to visit within their group about all the information they have heard and develop list of questions and list of comments. The Committee was divided into 4 groups at the beginning of the meeting. After 15 minutes, discussion with the entire group was held.



**A Work of the Facilities Steering Committee**

1	Find the scope of what we want to do in the future as a District.
	15 guiding principles for Campus Leadership Committee.
2	Transparent, fair and equitable process.
3	Projects that are beyond the basics that are visionary but not bank busters.
4	Alignment of submitted project to the vision statement and score appropriately.
5	Want the process to be fair.

**B Items beyond scope of Facilities Steering Committee**

1	Projects expand the capacity of the building.
2	Not charged with defining large strategic project.

**C The process of prioritizing the projects.**

1	Campus submit score on 15 guiding principles.
2	Blind data provided to Steering Committee.
3	Submit projects from Campus Committee without cost of project.
4	Steering Committee score the projects.
5	Steering Committee to set the priority of future projects.
6	Steering Committee report to Board of Education.

**D Questions/Comments on the Evaluation Form.**

1	When confronted with projects multiple million dollar projects how does the committee decide?
2	Narrative on similar project descriptions? Everyone crafts narratives differently?
3	Provide enough information in the narrative to judge the project
4	Test drive some narratives with the Steering Committee.
5	Is there value in knowing where the project narrative comes from – Urban vs. Nonurban
6	More information from Principals and importance from the Campus Committee
7	How do you prioritize the same project over multiple schools?
8	Example narrative along with the vote on whether or not to see school information with the project statement.
9	Blind on first round and not on second?
10	Test run at scoring process? 4 – 5 projects
11	Is there a vetting process of the projects before submitting to the Steering Committee?
12	How can we work the bullets so we can grade it?
13	Need more information than 200 words.
14	Some lines of test don't make sense.
15	Some aren't applicable



**E Questions to be addressed at next meeting more thoroughly.**

1	McKinley missing from the facility report scores?
2	Copy of facility report to each committee member?
3	\$67 million today's values? Don't think as constrained by resources
4	How does the Committee's work connect to the Visionary Statements?
5	Does each of the 15 vision statements have equal weight?
6	Does the leadership work on clarifying and delineating project information from the campus based committee – standardize?
7	Re-work the 15 vision statements to a more scoring friendly statement?
8	Is there a way to address surprise or unknown projects? Contingency is planned.
9	Is Kingston Stadium included? Need better grasp on Kingston
10	Did Vision Committee know how "Vision" was going to be used? Yes
11	What if one school is better at crafting their case? Maybe we give a few a test drive.
12	Without knowing the full story, it's like making a decision in a vacuum- Show us what it's going to look like – knowing the schools does make it personal. We're crippled when we're reacting, rather than knowing the full story. Is there a more efficient way of handling everyone's money. We're looking at efficiencies, might need to expand the scope if they leave off elements that need done.
13	Is there a way to weigh the Principals comments with regard to comparison to what other districts are doing?

Julie and Steve thanked the Facilities Steering Committee for their efforts.

Meeting adjourned at 7:45 pm

Next meeting ELSC October 16, 2012, 5:30-8:00 PM. Every building Principal will be in attendance.

Attachment: Rob Kleinsmith Power Point

