



# 2016 School Study Committee

**Meeting Minutes**

**April 18, 2017**

**5:00 – 9:00 p.m.**

**Harvey Education Center, Board Room**

**Present** Ted Berryhill, Susie Disselkoen, Steve Duane, Liz Evans, Shelly Fanson, Josh Galloway, Matt Hall, Amy McVaugh, Patrick Meyers, Kerry Minshall, Christopher Mumby,, Mitch Perrault, Mike Prelesnik, Jerry Schaffer, Sandy Smalley, Joe Starch, Mike Thompson, Sally Trout, Chris Waltz, Russ Whipple, Tim Williams, Chris Wright

**Absent** Tim Ayres, Brian Bushey, Erik Cargill, Jessica Curtis, Lance Delbridge, Jon Droscha, Laura Fenger, Emily Kress

**Also Present** Superintendent Ronald Drzewicki, Mike Kenney, Steve Merriman, Ted Moore and Mike Kounelis

## **Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

## **Approval of Minutes**

Minutes were approved following an amendment under Favorable Configuration Options:

- Moving kindergarten to the Harvey Center. The text was changed to read: "This configuration option had a strong level of support."
- Renovating and expanding elementary schools.

### **Request/Clarification Forms**

There were no request/clarification forms presented.

### **Facilities Tour Report**

Four committee members reported on their recent trip to Haslett Public Schools Wilkshire School, a 4/5th grade building in Allendale, MI and a 9th grade building in Hudsonville, MI. The buildings visited were newer structures meant to demonstrate 21st century classrooms in action.

Committee members reported that buildings were light, bright and welcoming with everything geared to kids and making resources quickly available. Buildings were designed thinking outside the box with lots of space for group work. All furniture was moveable and there was an abundance of white board space. Additionally, temperatures were controlled individually in each classroom space.

At Hudsonville, there was a centralized locker area away from the classrooms providing better supervision by staff and dramatically reducing hall noise, thus not interrupting classes in session. This plan also allowed for better use of hallways for small group study areas.

Security was described as awesome with secure entrances and exits. All buildings had lots of windows which provided natural light in addition to allowing clear observation of other areas. There was also the ability to create common spaces for such things as lunches, group activities and overflow from the auditorium. This was a more relaxed atmosphere much like a college environment.

One member was impressed by the flexibility of the classroom furniture. Desks and tables could be easily moved to create specific study areas even in the elementary buildings and libraries. Designs of the new schools impressed another committee member who was struck by the collaborative possibilities. There were a lot of special spaces for 9th graders, rooms were spacious, airy and, bright - it made for an inviting environment. "It would be neat if our kids had some of these classroom features," he said. With no lockers in the hallways, it presented a whole new environment.

A committee member supported incorporating some of the design ideas, but especially supported providing more flexible furnishings. Mason school furnishings are generally original to each building with the average age of Mason school buildings is over 56 years old.

### **Rules of Order**

In response to the committee's request for tighter control of meetings to speed up discussion and decision-making actions, Chairperson Waltz presented a list of rules for future meetings. It is important to be efficient in order to observe time limitations, she said.

Rules included:

1. Start and end on time.
2. Begin final public comments no later than 10 min. prior to scheduled meeting end.
3. One speaker at a time.

4. Speakers to be recognized by Chair prior to speaking.
5. No side conversations while another is speaking.
6. Chair determines begin and end times of agenda items.
7. Speaking time may be limited at the discretion of the Chair.
8. All meeting participants will be treated with respect.
9. No "beating a dead horse."
10. Committee members are expected to hold themselves and others accountable to these rules.

The new rules were adopted by unanimous vote.

### **Committee Roster Update**

Chairperson Waltz suggested the committee roster be updated as there are some people still receiving committee communications who are no longer actively involved in the committee process. She proposed the names of Tim Ayres, Laura Fenger and Emily Kress be removed. This was approved unanimously.

### **Committee Timeline**

Chairperson Waltz further presented a proposed timeline for completion of the committee's duties. This includes the current meeting, April 18th for consideration of the scope of work at the high school, middle school and Steele Elementary School. On April 25th discussion will center on work at Alaiedon and North Aurelius Elementary Schools. The scope of work for the May 10th meeting will be centered on Harvey Education Center, as well as a financial update on changes to the school bond outlook.

Further meetings as needed are proposed for the weeks of May 15, May 22 and May 29. A recommendation from the School Study Committee is expected to occur at the June 12<sup>th</sup> board meeting. The school district has a date with Treasury on June 28<sup>th</sup> for a Preliminary Bond Qualification conference.

A committee member supported moving forward with a possible November 7, 2017 ballot unless something unforeseen happens. This was unanimously approved.

### **Proposed Scope of Work**

The committee reviewed draft drawings and cost estimates for three buildings. Mike Kounelis and Steve Merriman provided the overview to the committee.

#### **High School**

The proposed scope of work is the same as what was proposed in the May 2016 bond proposal. The scope of work could include a secure entrance, additional space for STEM and a multi-purpose room, HVAC improvements, technology & infrastructure improvements, and additional technology equipment. The proposed scope of work would include asbestos abatement work that was not included in the last bond proposal.

Estimated cost of \$15.7 million.

***Committee member questions:***

What is the new square footage added to the high school? *Performing Arts approximately 3,000 square feet, multi-purpose room approximately 4,000 square feet, robotics approximately 4,000 square feet, woodshop approximately 3,000 square feet, and two science rooms approximately 1,500 square feet each.*

Can the committee be provided with the approximate cost for items such as additions, technology, safety, facility audit items? *Yes, this can be provided.*

*Currently, the school district is focusing on district-wide HVAC work using sinking funds. The scope of work for HVAC could reduce the work needed with a future bond proposal.*

Steve Merriman provided an overview of past discussions with school staff and administration regarding scope of work at the high school. Steve explained that GMB spent approximately 8 months interviewing teaching staff and learned what the school needed educationally and where things should really be for learning. Athletics have limited practice space and various teams are practicing in hallways. Athletics asked for additional space (multi-purpose room), wrestling would benefit as well as other sports teams.

Visual arts asked for renovations so that a kiln would not be in a closet and to have space for instruction. This would help the visual arts program that has been a highly recognized program within the state.

Performing arts has difficulties with staging areas, back staging, practice rooms, and a lack of storage area for instruments. Teachers and administration felt performing arts needed additional instruction space. Many wanted additions to the auditorium, but they needed the storage space and work space more.

STEM teachers shared the program does a great job up to sophomore year for course offerings and could use some expansion for getting more students involved from other grade levels. There has been equipment donated to the program and they don't have the space to use it.

FFA teachers asked for space and a new location to help improve their programming. The relational space, in various areas on the school property, can be hard/problematic to move between the current classroom and sugar shack.

***Committee member questions:***

Can the committee be provided with a rough estimate of the costs for the high school?

<i>New signage</i>	<i>\$ 25,000</i>
<i>New drive</i>	<i>\$500,000</i>
<i>Furnishing and equipment</i>	<i>\$160,000</i>
<i>Technology/infrastructure/equipment</i>	<i>\$1.7 m</i>
<i>New construction footage</i>	
<i>(performing arts, multi-purpose room, STEM, 2 science rooms)</i>	<i>\$3.5 m</i>
<i>Remodeling under</i>	<i>\$6.7 m</i>
<i>Partial mechanical upgrades and</i>	

*replacement (160,000 square feet) just under \$3 m*

Where would the remodeling occur in the high school? *Remodeling would include office space, science rooms, visual arts, performing arts, and general interior remodeling (just under 15,000 square feet of remodeling). The remodeling does not include moving walls.*

### Middle School

The proposed scope of work is the same as the May 2016 bond proposal. The May 2016 bond proposal was estimated at under \$8.8 million and now the estimate is \$9.5 M. The scope of work includes, reconstructing the building entrance, utility area, parent drop off/pick up, visitor parking, site signs, and parking rework for a STEM addition. New construction would be just over 4,400 square feet and would include a new secure entrance and 4,000 square feet for STEM and robotics. The approximate cost for this is just under \$1M. Remodeling work is approximately \$4.8 million and would include office and counseling space, large group instruction area converted to science labs, and partial ceiling replacement. Mechanical upgrades would be approximately just over \$900,000. Technology, network infrastructure, and devices just over \$1M. The science rooms really need upgrades. Science labs have difficulties with hot water and lack sufficient lab space. The proposed plan would transform room 22 into a science suite area with collaborative classroom and lab space. Computer labs may not be needed if we had more technology devices in classrooms. The sciences labs were built in 1969 and still have the 1969 furniture, fixtures, and cabinets.

### ***Committee member questions:***

The survey supported major renovation/expansion at other buildings. The support for the middle school improvements were not as high. A committee member worries about finding balance on the final proposal. It is good to have improvements to parking and traffic, but we also need 21<sup>st</sup> century classrooms. The member thinks the community will support work at the middle school and an \$80 million dollar bond with the correct education.

A member commented that the last bond failed, according to the survey, primarily because people were not supportive of a 4/5<sup>th</sup> grade building. The recent survey may not have touched on some of the side issues like classroom space but more on the larger items like over-crowding. The member feels the community will easily support the side issues. The member does not feel that the last bond failed by a lot. Considering survey results, the member does not feel we need to drop the programming features for a future bond proposal.

A committee member shared that they feel we need to do a better job educating the community. The member said that the roughly \$25 million dollars between the high school and middle school were not a focus on the survey. We need to look at what we cannot live without as we develop the scope of the bond proposal.

A committee member shared the results of the survey and said the majority would support improvements up to a substantial amount. The member feels we are still in support of improvements at all schools.

A committee member urged the group to not talk about priorities and focus on discussions of the proposed scope and costs. Then the group can debate the priorities once we have a total cost.

### Steele Elementary

This building has changes from the last bond proposal. The last proposal was \$15.4M and it would have been a K – 3 building. The proposed scope of work for a future bond would be a 1<sup>st</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> grade building with an estimated cost of \$21.8M. The proposed scope of work would include new parent drop off, a bus loop and staff parking. It would demolish the old building, build new and relocate the playground with new equipment. New construction would include 37,000 square foot general classroom space, 3,400 square foot of administration space, 1,980 square foot art room, 1,980 square foot music room, a new gym (larger than the existing gym), PE storage, and restrooms (13,500 square feet). The new gym would be approximately 90x100. Additionally, there would be storage, restrooms, and mechanical fixes of just over 10,000 square feet. Remodeling would include a secure entrance and asbestos abatement (\$1.5M). Furnishing and equipment would cost approximately \$265,000 and technology and devices are estimated at \$450,000.

Steve Merriman explained the programming portion. The May 2016 bond proposal was a four section building for K-3<sup>rd</sup> grades. A proposal for the new bond would be a four section 1<sup>st</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> grade building. This would keep the 1998 portion of the building (the café, kitchen). There would be eight teaching stations for 1<sup>st</sup> – 2<sup>nd</sup> grade and twelve teaching stations for 3<sup>rd</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> grade.

### ***Committee member questions:***

What is the estimated cost to demolish the old building and prepare the site? *Approximately \$275,000 for the demolition and \$250, 000 for site work.*

How many teaching stations does Steele currently have? *Three teaching stations per grade with K – 5<sup>th</sup> grade.*

Superintendent Ronald Drzewicki explained that the district currently has 9 sections at each grade level and with current enrollment the district could support 10 sections per grade. We should really consider having enough classrooms district-wide to support 10 sections for grades K-5.

A committee member commented that most would agree it is desirable to lower class size and add an additional section. Can we afford to add another teacher at each grade level? Can we afford to pay for the staffing and benefits? *At this time, we are not prepared to open an additional section at each grade level. However, if we build the space for a 10<sup>th</sup> section it would be best to have it at Steele and plan for the other elementary schools to be 3 section schools. Steele could serve as a 4 section building because it is in-town.*

Is having 10 sections based on Mason kids or on adding School of Choice students? *Having 10 sections is based on number of students actually enrolled in Mason. Next year, the district is planning on 10 sections of 1<sup>st</sup> grade.*

A committee member commented that if the group is really thinking about the future we should probably not cut back the number of teaching stations.

Is the district prepared to take care of the maintenance costs with the new technology? What is the life cycle on the technology? *We would probably need to have some addition staffing in the technology area because of the additional devices and equipment. The district would be able to support the additional costs at this time.*

What is the vision with the technology – is it only infrastructure or is it devices for students? *Technology could include classroom enhancements, overheads, sound systems, projectors, state of the art teaching equipment, additional devices for students but not a one to one. It would be good to have each classroom have a set of devices that students could use but that the students would not carry from room to room.*

A committee member commented that we have only discussed the middle school, high school and one elementary building and we are already looking at high costs and we still have 3 more schools to discuss.

Why can't the old part of Steele be used? *It would be cost prohibitive. The amount to renovate Steele to be up to code is approaching the amount it would cost to demolish and rebuild.*

A committee member commented that moving kindergarteners out of Steele does not really gain a lot of classrooms so additional teaching space would be needed at Steele. Additionally, because the lower levels of Steele have moisture and are wet frequently, the classrooms are simply not adequate.

Would Steele require new land? *No it does not.*

### **Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

### **Next Meetings**

- April 25, 2017 from 5:00 – 9:00 p.m.
- May 10, 2017 from 5:00 – 9:00 p.m.