

FACILITIES ADVISORY TEAM COMMITTEE MEETING  
Thursday, January 29, 2009 – 6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.  
Administration Building

**MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** M. Ginalski, J. Delorme, A. Danquah, B. Cameron, K. Murdock, J. Reilly, S. Romans, P. Webster, T. Decker, R. Kimble, T. Tunney, J. Tobia, M. Whittenhall, M. Roe, M. Franklin, R. Gillespie, K. Monastra, J. Meteer, S. Bathrick, V. Zingler, J. Castiglione, K. Keeney

**ARCHITECTS:** C. Woodcock, J. Robbins, R. Smith, R. Gosden

**ABSENT:** B. Pierce, N. Jakobson, K. Wilson-Houck, A. Knowles, V. Zingler

**GUESTS:** R. McMaster

**RECORDER:** K. Dutcher

**VISITORS:** There were several visitors in attendance.

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Facilitator, Mr. Anthony Danquah. He reviewed the agenda and noted the addition of Mr. Roy McMaster, Capital Management Advisors, to the agenda. The Team also reviewed and approved the minutes from January 22 and January 24 by consensus.

Mr. Jeff Delorme, Assistant Superintendent for Administrative Services, and Mr. Paul Webster, School Business Official, reviewed information regarding the current operational costs by building. They provided a breakdown of personnel salaries and utility costs, along with an overview of operational costs, which is the combination of utilities and salaries. They also reviewed the current elementary staffing guidelines and what SED would support for class sizes in building projects.

Mr. Roy McMaster, Capital Management Advisors, reviewed “What If” scenarios for full use of Maximum Cost Allowance with \$43,500,000 Serial Bonds; Building Condition Survey and State Education Department with \$57,525,000 Serial Bonds and Building Condition Survey-State Education Department and Program with \$94,440,000 Serial Bonds for the Elementary Buildings only. He also reviewed the annual building debt, state aid and district share with respect to each of scenarios.

The Team reviewed the list of Criteria developed at the January 24 meeting. They discussed at length the issue relative to Pre-K in the buildings. They accepted the Criteria by consensus with the following changes (Highlighted in Red)

**CRITERIA**

- Building size of 400-500 students/enrollment/equity
- Maximize state aid/tax impact
- Health/safety/security
- Dedicated related arts spaces
- 900 square foot minimum classroom space
- Operating costs to include staffing efficiency, also to include “Green” design
- Multifunctional space
- Special Education needs must be met in buildings
- Pre-K will be in the buildings

- Building renovations will enable instructional technology growth for future years
- Storage (instructional and building use)
- Custodial space/storage
- Eliminate portables

Mr. Mike Ginalski discussed next steps with regard to bringing the Board of Education up-to-date. He felt that it is important to let them know what is going on every step of the way prior to just “diving ahead”. Mr. Ginalski noted that he would like to put a subcommittee together to present to the Board at a special meeting. Mr. Ginalski announced that the Facilities survey went on line “live” on Monday and to date nearly 100 responses have been received. The Facilities Advisory Team Committee will receive a full report relative to the outcome of the survey in the future.

The Team separated into two groups to discuss and develop the framework for an Elementary Plan. Each group shared their idea.

The **First Group** discussed the idea of 3 sets of “sister schools”

PreK-2 and 3-5

1. Staff utilization
2. Program equity
3. Same number of transitions
4. Cost effective

PreK-5

1. 6 buildings
2. Continuity
3. No elementary transition

PreK-4

- **Group One** did not reach a consensus with regard to an Elementary Plan.

The **Second Group** discussed reducing the number of buildings to six buildings; each building would have 3-4 sections per grade level; and the possibility of grade reconfiguration. However, the group discussed the need for more information on various models and the pros and cons of each relative to grade configuration. Redistricting also needs to be considered.

- The **Second Group** reached consensus with regard to determining that an Elementary Plan can not be developed until the middle schools are considered.

The Team continued discussion around the formation of an elementary plan. They noted that it should be programmatic and presented as such even though it will be dictated by money and size; a plan needs to be developed and then figure out how to execute; and feasibility of six elementary buildings needs to be determined

- The group reached consensus regarding the following statement:

**The Committee will look at an Elementary Plan of 400 to 500 students with an undefined configuration at this time and without placing a number on the amount of buildings for consideration until the middle schools are discussed.**

Mr. Danquah announced that the next meeting will be at Corning Free Academy on February 12<sup>th</sup> at 6:30 p.m. The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.