

Approved February 27, 2017

**2016 Survey Sub-Committee
Meeting Minutes January
31, 2017
3:00p.m.
Harvey Education Center**

Present: Josh Galloway, Matt Hall, Patrick Meyers, Sandy Smalley, Sally Trout,

Also Present: Superintendent Ron Drzewicki, Bernie Porn (EpicMRA), Steve Merriman, Kurt Creamer

Discussion

The members of the committee each gave their general impression of the draft of the survey. Most felt that there was plenty of good points covered but understood that there was fair amount of cutting down the number of questions would be needed as well as cleaning up the language in many of the configuration options.

Some of the key issues discussed during the open discussion –

Introduction questions – It was asked by Patrick Meyers if we really needed all the questions at the beginning of the survey on past voting patterns. After an explanation from Bernie Porn, it was decided by the group to eliminate one of the questions but keep the remaining to gather key information on voting patterns by the survey respondents.

Demographic questions – Sandy Smalley asked about eliminating some of the demographic questions at the end. Bernie Porn walked through the importance of these questions to better understand the results and develop useful crosstabs to evaluate the results. The group decided to replace one of the demographic questions to inquire about how long respondents lived in the community.

Messaging questions – We had lengthy discussions on limiting the number of messaging questions. It was decided to see how long the survey was when redrafted but it was the groups opinion to remove those questions in favor of focusing more on the configuration options that the larger study committee group needed information on to formulate whatever proposal they may or may not want to put before voters.

Cost options – It was decided by the group to add back in from the original draft the scaled back option battery of questions (so called scaffolding questions) near the end of the survey to get a better understanding on how much the respondents might be willing to support in a proposal.

Configuration questions – The group discussed at length the configuration options to present in the survey. It was decided that overall the group felt it was important to determine; 1) how do the respondents feel about the concept of moving the 5th grade to the middle school, 2) how do respondents feel about the concept of having to move classes back to HEC, 3) the respondents' general impressions of 4-5 configuration changes that included moving two full grade levels (or expanding all the schools). It was discussed and decided by the group to pull issues 1 & 2 out as stand-alone questions because they are key in whatever the overall committee may decide to do.

The meeting concluded with Bernie Porn agreeing to go back and update the draft with the suggested revisions and that we would meet again to review the new draft in the next two weeks.

Meeting adjourned- 5:15

Approved February 27, 2017

**2016 Survey Sub-Committee
Meeting Minutes
February 9, 2017
5:00p.m.
Harvey Education Center**

Present: Josh Galloway, Matt Hall, Patrick Meyers, Sandy Smalley, Sally Trout,

Also Present: Superintendent Ron Drzewicki, Bernie Porn (EpicMRA), Steve Merriman

Discussion

The group made general comments on the revisions made to the survey and the next steps in finalizing the draft. It was decided by the group to focus the first part of the discussion on the structure of the survey.

It was also discussed that any decision to add questions would require the group to decide other questions to remove.

Structure - This portion of the discussion focused on the best ways to get feedback on the configuration options that were most supported by the overall study group.

5th grade to middle school-it was decided to make this a stand-alone question section to determine the general impression and objections/support of moving the 5th graders to the middle school. It was decided by the committee to move this before the configuration options and ask it as a cold question (little details) as well as a pro and con question to see if some understanding of the issues moved the respondents thinking on the option.

Moving grades to the HEC – it was decided by the group that this is a key factor in any proposal put forward by the overall committee. To help understand this issue, like the previous 5th questions, we would separate this from the other configuration questions and have this be a stand-alone question focused on the idea of the respondents' desire to reopen HEC as a grade school again, regardless of what grades that would be moved there.

Configurations – The group walked through several of the configuration options and decided we would only test options that included moving two full grade levels as directed by the overall study committee. The group felt testing moving just 1 grade would take too much of the survey time and would not allow us to get the needed information on the more heavily supported proposals of moving two full grade levels somewhere. The group came up with a group of 4-5 options to include in the survey including using HEC,

moving 5th grade students to the middle school, building a new school, or just expanding all three of the current schools (this does not move two grades but is designed to result in a similar increase in overall classrooms and capacity).

After reviewing other portion of the survey the group again felt it was important to remove most of the messaging questions in favor of focusing on the configuration options including the use of HEC.

The group discussed the removing the battery of questions toward the middle of the survey that discussed certain aspects of the other parts of the bond proposal. Bernie explained it was important to include these to help the respondents to get a full picture of the other benefits of what the study committee may propose at the conclusion of this process. The group agreed to keep these questions in the survey draft.

Opening questions – We again discussed these opening questions on voting patterns and opinions of the district and after lengthy discussion it was decided to trim out a couple questions from this section to help get down to the needed IS-minute survey length.

It was decided to have Bernie update the draft and then hold an optional meeting for any of the full study committee members to offer their feedback on the survey draft.

Meeting adjourned 6:35

Approved March 28,2017

**2016 School Study Committee Optional
Survey Review Meeting Minutes February
16, 2017
5:30p.m.
Harvey Education Center**

Present:

Chris Waltz, Amy MeVaugh, Jerry Shafer, Mitch Perrault, Ted Moore, Tim Williams, Russ Whipple, Josh Galloway, Matt Hall, Patrick Meyers, Sandy Smalley, Sally Trout,

Also Present: Superintendent Ron Drzewicki, Michael Kelly

Discussion

Chris Waltz kicked off the group discussion allowing the survey sub-committee to share some overall thoughts on the process to date. She then asked each of the attendees to share a few minutes of their thoughts and comments on the survey. These comments would be used to determine additional changes to the draft before sending it to the field.

Amy MeVaugh (and others) had issues with the questions 19 & 20 and it was agreed the S'h grade info was included in error and would be corrected.

Russ Whipple had several concerns including the length, what he felt was too many voting pattern and previous proposal questions, and felt the survey missed the mark on the overall desire to learn more about what the public wants in configuration options.

Mitch Perrault felt that there was too much focus was on the two grade moves and not enough on one grade moves, or moving no grades.

Michael Kelly was also allowed to make comments during the meeting and felt that there were inaccuracies in the descriptions and financial numbers used in the survey. It was explained that this is the standard practice when discussing bond rates and costs to taxpayers. He raised the issue of vote margin from last proposal and was assured that the error would be corrected.

The Survey Sub-committee decided to hold an additional sub-committee meeting to discuss the feedback and process for finalizing the survey.

Meeting adjourned 6:35

Approved March 28,2017

**2016 Survey Sub-Committee
Meeting Minutes February
27,2017
7:00p.m.
Harvey Education Center**

Present: Josh Galloway, Matt Hall, Patrick Meyers, Sandy Smalley, Salley Trout,

Also Present: Superintendent Ron Drzewicki, Bernie Porn (EpicMRA), Steve Merriman

Discussion

Approve the minutes from Jan. 31 and Feb 09 of2017-Both approved 5-0

Open discussions on comments and changes from the optional Survey Review Committee meeting on Feb 16-

Configuration options - The group took the feedback from the meeting and reworked the first group of the questions to most accurately represent each option.

Including costs-Porn shared the importance of including the costs when possible otherwise you often get skewed results or inaccurate information from voters. The group also felt it was important to be honest with the voters and include them when possible. It was also decided by the group to include the costs in the manner most likely to be reported in the media and during the discussions at forums and meetings.

Including additional options -There is just not enough space in the survey to add in more options without taking out others. The options we are including the committee tried to reword where needed to better focus on the core issues in each.

Removing voting pattern and demographic questions –The group discussed changes to these questions, but at the advice of Porn, it was decided they were important to keep in order to get crosstabs that will give the committee a better understanding of the responses.

Capacity question –The question of capacity was raised in the meeting and the group agreed to adjust the figures to more accurately represent the current capacity issues.

School "designed" for issue-The group decided to adjust the question to better reflect the feedback from the meeting.

Fix 5th grade references in questions 19 & 20-The group agreed the adjustment needed to be made.

Questions on overall layout and individual questions – Raised via written document- Each issue was addressed and discussed by the group and changes were made to survey to address as many of the issues as possible. (Whipple)

Question 27 issue – Raised via email by one member and the issue was resolved. (Mumby)

Question 19 issue – Raised via email on "rotation" question that was addressed by the group. (Duane)

Question 25 issue – Raised via email and the technical questions were addressed by the group. (Beebe)

Approval

Vote to approve the survey with final changes and have it go into the field as soon as Epic/MRA can do so. The vote 5-0 in favor of approving the survey,

Meeting adjourned at 8:00pm