

FACILITIES ADVISORY TEAM COMMITTEE MEETING
Thursday, October 9, 2008 – 7:00 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, B. Pierce, M. Franklin, R. Gillespie, K Wilson-Houck, A. Knowles-Skowvron, K. Monastra, J. Meteer, S. Bathrick, V. Zingler, J. Castiglione, K. Keeney

ABSENT: N. Jakobson

RECORDER: K. Dutcher

GUESTS: William Carlson, Bob Recotta, Charles Woodcock, Russell Smith, Robert Gosden

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by the Facilitator, Anthony Gyetua-Danquah. Mr. Danquah welcomed the Committee and each member was introduced. Mr. Danquah outlined the Agenda for the evening.

Mr. Ginalski outlined the charge of the Board of Education which states: *“The Board of Education authorizes the Facilities Advisory Team Committee to develop a comprehensive facilities proposal that encompasses grades Pre-K through 12 for the period 2009-2029, which includes all school building renovations, reconstruction or additions necessary to implement adopted instructional goals for Board approval on or before June 30, 2009.”*

Mr. Ginalski provided a PowerPoint presentation which outlined the history of various facilities committees over the past 30 years. Following the presentation Mr. Danquah introduced “parking lots” and asked the group to write down a brief thought and “park it” relative to their feelings as we go through the facilities process. Comments are as follows:

- We can do this!!!
- Do not want to be like the past groups.
- What will it take to get it done in terms of a real plan that meets the needs and community can support.
- Oh My God, why didn't any of those plans move forward? Lack of involvement, communication, public relations?
- How will we succeed this time? What will be different?
- This could have been done long ago!
- Reasons for instances of “No Vote Taken?”
- Changes dynamics (even) during various studies.
- That this has been going on for a long time and its time for us to find a way to resolve the issues.
- Central themes occur.
- 1981 to 2008, committee, committee, committee and so on...why can't we solve this problem?

- What made each plan fail over a 30 year period, community support, financial impact and economic conditions, what can we do differently.
- It is about time!
- With the economic problems, loss of jobs, etc., for this area-will taxpayer vote turn down a proposal because of fear, increased taxes?
- There are some common suggestions each time a new plan was given, we should consider these.
- Frustration.
- Why the least money to middle schools which are the oldest?
- We need a realistic financial target to work within.
- When costs decrease, no votes increase/how will we know we are on the “right track?”
- Failure to follow through with plans/unwilling to fund proposals.
- Enough looking, lets get the job done!
- It is embarrassing to think we have put all this work into planning yet NOTHING gets done.
- How do we as a committee keep the community from making a decision before a plan is revealed, very emotional.
- Been there, and there and there! We need to get it done this time.
- Community members are accountable for the existing conditions and now MUST be responsible.
- Lots of work already done-lets not reinvent the wheel.

Mr. Danquah then asked each member of the group to briefly mention what stake they have in the process. It was noted that many were long-time or life-long residents of the District and either have children or have had children go through the Corning-Painted Post Area School District system. They feel the children of this District deserve more and need facilities that they can be proud of. Many in the group expressed the need for more space, better layout, technical and other resources, appropriate heating and ventilation, etc.

Mr. Danquah provided the Committee with a PowerPoint presentation outlining his role as the facilitator and what he will do for the group as well as the role and function of the team. He also discussed the Team Process Consensus Model (thumbs up=agreement, thumbs down=disagreement, and thumbs sideways=need more information). The Committee agreed to use this model. Mr. Danquah also reviewed the Code of Cooperation which states:

Every member is responsible for the team’s progress and success

- Attend all sessions and be on time
- Listen to and show respect for the contributions of other members; be an active listener
- Criticize ideas, not the person
- Resolve conflicts constructively
- Pay attention-avoid disruptive behavior
- Avoid side conversations that are disruptive
- Only one person speaks at a time
- Everyone participates-no one dominates
- Be succinct, avoid long anecdotes and examples
- No rank in the team
- Attend to your personal comfort needs at any time but minimize disruption
- HAVE FUN!

The Committee reached a consensus to approve the Code of Cooperation as a guideline for conducting business during the process.

The Committee reviewed the list of upcoming meeting dates and locations. They felt that the 2 hour time frame to tour buildings and conduct business, is limiting. A suggestion to move the meeting start time to 6:30 p.m. with the flexibility to adjust as necessary was discussed.

A consensus was reached that the meetings would begin at 6:30 p.m. with flexibility to adjust the beginning and ending times depending on the need. The Committee also agreed that all members should tour the buildings (even if it is their own building) and that an outline of each building being toured at that time, will be provided prior to that meeting which will highlight trouble spots or issues that the group should be aware of while touring the building.

The Committee also expressed a concern with some of the dates and Mr. Ginalski will take another look at the dates and locations and provide a revised list at the next Committee meeting.

The Committee broke out into two groups, lead by Mr. Murdock and Mr. Reilly, and toured the entire District Office Building. After completion of the tour Mr. Danquah asked for some feedback from the group regarding the condition of District Office building in relation to how it supports instructional and administrative business. Comments are as follows:

- Safety issues-control of where and procedure of how people enter the building/handicapped entrance.
- Heating and air (boiler rooms) very inefficient.
- Lack of elevator.
- If new to community and you come to this building, first impression would be “scary”
- Lack of meeting space/departmental space
- Poor location and presentation relative to where our leaders are located in the District.
- It is a positive to have so many people and departments in one location to service needs and interface.

The Committee reviewed the outcomes of the evening in defining what and how they need to move forward.

Positives: Need to establish some structure
 Make-up of Committee is good
 Great comfort level amongst members

Negatives: Concerns with how to conduct business and incorporate tours
 How are we applying instructional goals against what we are trying to achieve

Suggestions: Need to establish process as we move forward (Roadmap)
 Possibility of having tours during the day while children in buildings to get real feel
 Need to include Transportation building.

Mr. Ginalski announced that the first Town Hall meeting will take place on October 23rd and that the role of the Facilities Advisory Team Committee will be one of support. He noted that it is not mandatory to attend however, they may be asked to participate if necessary.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 30, 2008 at Lindley-Presho Elementary School at 6:30 p.m.