A special meeting of the Board of Education of the Oak Park and River Forest High School was held on June 26, 2018, in Room 293W of the high school.

Call to Order
President Moore called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. A roll call indicated the following Board of Education members were present: Fred Arkin, Matt Baron, Jennifer Cassell (attended telephonically at 8:30 p.m.), Thomas F. Cofsky, Craig Iseli, Dr. Jackie Moore, and Sara Dixon Spivy. Also, Dr. Joylynn Pruitt-Adams, Superintendent, and Gail Kalmerton, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board of Education and FOIA Officer attended.

Also present were Greg Johnson, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction; Tod Altenburg, Chief School Business Officer, Karin Sullivan, Director of Community Relations and Communications; and Michael Carioscio, Chief Information Officer.

Visitors

Public Comments
Lisa Pearah stated that she was speaking on behalf of people who felt the swimming requirements were outdated. She thanked the IMAGINE Team for its considerable time and effort. The concepts include meeting the needs of the 3300 students. The IMAGINE athletic proposals are noted as being adaptable; they are nice to know not need to have. The new pool does not meet the needs of the school. She asked to have the swimming options updated and allow a test-out option because already half of the students know how to swim and not have to take swimming would allow them to take other electives. At a time when people are selling their homes, we respectfully ask the Board to direct the architects to develop concepts that renovate rather than demolish. A 25 X 40-yard pool is rightsizing, and they believe it is the school’s path to success and would rally around it.

Michael Nevins read the following comments: “The following is public comment concerning the Special Board Meeting (agenda item concerning the IMAGINE Facility Concepts. I attended the entire IMAGINE Community Meeting entitled “refined Concepts” at OPRFHS on May 19, 2018. While public feedback was solicited during the breakout presentation sessions, I was not able to provide informed feedback due to the lack of a) project scope of work, b) project budget, and c) preliminary cost estimates of the three refined concepts.

“In response, Mark Joliceur of Perkins+Will informed me that District 200 had not provided project budget. Also, Mike Poirier, IMAGINE Team Co-chair, responded
that preliminary cost estimates are not typically provided at this point in a facility planning project. I responded that the proposals were presented as ‘refined concepts’ and that ICI has been under contract since 2017 to provide project cost estimates. I also explained that I have been an architect for over 35 years and currently teach urban planning at IIT, DePaul and previously at the Dept. of Urban Planning and Policy graduate program at UIC. As per my experience, it is conventional practice to begin any facility planning project with the scope of work, project budget and provide preliminary cost estimates during the preliminary planning phase.

“Since both Mike Poirier and Mark Jolicoeur disagreed with me, I asked how a community resident can provide informed feedback on the three proposed facility plans without benefit of the scope of work, budget or preliminary costs. The only response was again the refrain ‘that’s not how they do things,’ which I found unacceptable and alarming given my professional expertise in this areas.

“I also found the demolition and replacement of the south end of the existing high school facilities in all three proposals misplaced and misrepresented. The Fieldhouse is of historic significance, and one of the most unique and architecturally significant Fieldhouses in the entire state. Simply stating that the facility is aging and inefficient with replacement as the only option, based on unsubstantiated ‘research’, is of insufficient merit and lacks the necessary due diligence to investigate renovation options.

“Lastly, I found the entire Community Meeting and IMAGINE presentations to be based primarily on volunteer members bereft of any professional expertise in facility planning. Presenting proposals without a basis of project scope of work, budget and preliminary cost estimates is evidence of a process being driven by volunteers lacking the professional expertise for this type of project. If the Board members had questions, he offered to talk with them.”

Kevin Peppard noted that each of IMAGINE proposals involves completely rebuilding the Fieldhouse and gyms. How will PE and sports be handled during that period? What will they do with the locker rooms? The debt limit is the EAV times 6.9% which is $155 million. The retirement of the Madison TIF may add $7 to $8 million, which could add 1% to the tax base.

Peter Ryan supported the IMAGINE Workgroup and its progress to improve student outcomes in all concepts. From north to south and from bottom to top, he hoped that much of what IMAGINE was proposing could be accomplished.

Kitty Conklin attended last week’s meeting and spoke about Policy 6:40, which addresses curriculum review. She also stated that another community group is moving to identify efficiency in all taxing bodies. As the result of the concurrent timing of the IMAGINE work and efficiency task force, she asked the Board to review Policy 4.10, Fiscal and Business Management, which states “The Superintendent shall ensure the efficient and cost-effective operation of the District’s business management using computers, computer software, data management, communication systems, and electronic networks, including electronic mail, the Internet, and security systems. The policy does not address but suggested efficiency. Will OPRFHS have the flexibility to adapt to situations as efficiencies are adopted?
The Village of Oak Park is discussing solar projects, and they showed up in the IMAGINE plans too. The school should be focused on providing quality education. She thanked them for all of the work they had accomplished.

**IMAGINE**

Lynn Kamenitsa and Mike Poirier are co-chairs of IMAGINE and had asked for a dialogue with the Board of Education, the IMAGINE Workgroup, and the architects.

The community-led Imagine Team has been working since August 2017 to assess facilities need at Oak Park and River Forest High School, and to develop a long-range facilities master plan that will meet those needs now and in the future. The Orange and Blue concept diagrams are the results of Imagine’s work to date and will form the basis of the next stage of our process: consolidating those concepts, along with Board feedback, into a comprehensive, long-term facilities master plan for OPRF.

In the packet was a document that was a companion to the Orange and Blue concepts. It included the following:

I. Challenges and Opportunities Imagine identified during the research phase
II. Explanations of major facilities components presented in the Orange and Blue concepts, including their connection to the identified challenges and opportunities
III. Imagine’s prioritization process
IV. Imagine’s use of feedback

The Board of Education was being asked for its feedback, not a ranking, at this point.

I. The Challenges and Opportunities Imagine Identified

The research undertaken by Imagine identified many specific facilities needs and some opportunities. This information was shared with the public as part of the Imagine’s February Community Conversation. The dozens of specific needs and opportunities identified fall into six general thematic categories:

A. Student learning spaces need to be reorganized, reconfigured and, in some cases, renovated and upgraded to meet current, changing, and future educational needs.
B. Inefficiency is prevalent as the result of decades of piecemeal problem-solving and assignment of spaces.
C. Connection and community could be better fostered through several facilities changes that would help create a more welcoming school.
D. Equity, along several dimensions, could be better fostered through facilities changes.
E. Configuration and capacity in several areas of the OPRF campus leave student, enrollment, and curricular needs unmet.
F. Condition of facilities in certain areas of the aging building negatively impacts students and staff, despite decades of good maintenance.

II. Major Components in Blue & Orange Concepts: The brief introduction to each major concept component includes its connection to the thematic categories discussed above.
A. The Student Commons is a driving idea contained in both concepts. It would create spaces in the center of the building where students could collaborate, study, socialize, and access essential services. The Commons would also bolster campus safety and security by creating a defined area for these student activities and public access. That area could be closed off from the rest of the building and, thus, more manageably secured by staff.

Creating spaces for students: In listening sessions, students consistently expressed a desire to spend more hours in the building and to have more spaces where they could collaborate, study, and socialize during school and, particularly, before and after school. The current campus layout makes it difficult to provide spaces for this without disrupting classes (during school) and giving students access to the entire building (outside of school hours), making it challenging and costly to provide appropriate safety and security staffing. The Commons would create spaces for such activities in a central core of the building. Research tells us that student achievement improves with the number of hours students spend on campus. The Commons would create spaces in which students can safely spend those hours.

A hub for student services: All services frequently used by students would be arrayed along the Commons, so students could access those during lunch or outside of school hours without getting a special pass. For example, students would not need a pass to spend part of a lunch period in the Tutoring Center or Library, seek out their counselor or social worker, get IT help, or visit the nurse.

Containing public access: The facilities most frequently accessed by visitors would also be located along the Commons and near the main entrance of the building. This would ensure that people participating in an IEP meeting with Special Education staff, meeting with the Principal, attending an arts performance, or going to a Board of Education meeting would not have access to the entire building during their visit.

Note: In addition to the central Commons near the main entrance, both concepts also propose Commons spaces in the south end of the building that would similarly provide spaces for students outside of school hours and contain visitors to athletic events and black box theatre performances. The creation of Student Commons spaces would help foster connection and community, reduce inefficiency, address some configuration and capacity challenges, and foster equity.

B. Library and Tutoring Center would be moved toward the center of the building -- off of the Commons -- for ease of access, before, during, and after school. Both would be redesigned to accommodate group and collaborative work as well as silent individual work. In listening sessions, students routinely mentioned these two spaces as the ones that worked best for them at OPRF, but complained that they close too early, require a pass to access at lunch, and lack collaboration spaces. Moving both to the Commons area would make them accessible during lunch periods and enable them to remain open longer without the additional security personnel that would be required in their current locations. Imagine believes that a new Library and Tutoring
Center would foster community and connection by helping students to feel more welcome in their school, help redress some equity issues (e.g., inequitable access at home to resources like quiet study areas and printers), improve student learning spaces, and remedy inefficient use of current spaces.

C. Cafeteria and Food Service facilities would get significant renovation to upgrade equipment, improve service and efficiency, and create a more welcoming space. In listening sessions and survey responses, students indicated that the cafeterias were a particular source of stress, anxiety, and discomfort, and that they wanted more options like the one provided by the balcony in the current Student Center. Imagine proposes making the cafeteria a more welcoming space using techniques we saw at other schools, including breaking large areas into smaller sections that could still be easily monitored, allowing some overflow to spill into the Commons, creating more spaces like the current balcony, and improving the efficiency of the serving area to reduce time spent in lines. The Commons could further reduce pressure on food service lines if students could creating collaborative spaces throughout the academic area of the building is a key component of improving student-centered learning spaces. Both concepts include small group break-out spaces, create large spaces for collaboration among classes, and make classrooms more collaborative through updating infrastructure, instructional technology, and furniture. Classroom reorganization would address issues related to student learning spaces, existing inefficiency, and configuration and capacity.

D. Special Education Facilities shortcomings would be addressed by expansion and renovation of the TEAM spaces, improving meeting spaces for professionals and families, and ensuring that diverse facilities needs of various Special Education programs are adequately met and located throughout the building. Meeting spaces that serve frequent visitors, like conference rooms for IEP meetings, would be located near an entrance and within an easily secured area of the building. Improvements to Special Education facilities would address issues related to student learning spaces, equity, inefficiency, condition of facilities, configuration and capacity, and connection and community.

E. Performing Arts Facilities for the music and theatre programs would be updated and expanded to accommodate program growth and safety considerations. The current band, orchestra, and choir rooms are worn out, inaccessible, and undersized. New music facilities would be located together in a new area that increases classroom sizes, provides sufficient practice and collaboration spaces, creates adequate storage, and improves efficiency. Renovated and expanded theatre facilities would include a relocated black box theatre (with modern safety features), an expanded stagecraft area, and improvements to dressing rooms. Improvements to performing arts facilities would address issues of student learning spaces, configuration and capacity, and inefficiency. Imagine also believes that these would foster connection and community since students who participated in arts programs reported that these programs served as safe spaces for them within OPRF.

F. Physical Education and Athletics Facilities would be newly constructed in their current location with minimal expansion of the school’s footprint. This new south end would replace several problem facilities, accommodate existing needs, create flexibility for future needs, and make more efficient
use of the landlocked site. The construction would happen over several years in carefully planned stages to minimize programming disturbances. Imagine’s research concurred with previous facilities assessments in determining that some of the worst facilities conditions in the school are the two swimming pools and the several boys’ locker rooms. However, there are many other problem areas to be addressed in the Physical Education areas as well, including overcrowding, inefficiency, and safety. The current buildings that comprise the school’s south end involve dozens of structurally interdependent spaces that make a piecemeal approach to remedying problems inefficient and more expensive. Building new would enable the most efficient and flexible use of available space to meet current and future needs, reduce the costs of maintaining a 90-year-old structure, and create much more flexible spaces to respond to future demands. Rebuilding Physical Education and Athletics facilities would improve student learning spaces, decrease inefficiency, improve the condition of facilities, remedy configuration and capacity issues, foster connection, and community, and address several equity concerns.

G. Family and Consumer Sciences (FACS) facilities would be consolidated and relocated to the first floor in both concepts. The current facilities are not properly equipped to meet the needs of today’s students nor those of the future. Consolidation to a first-floor location, near the main kitchen and cafeteria, would provide a gateway for new instructional opportunities aligned with the school’s career and technical education initiatives. Renovation and relocation of the FACS facilities would improve student learning facilities, address configuration and capacity issues, reduce inefficiency, and improve the condition of the facilities.

H. D200 and Building Administration Offices would be positioned near the main entrance to the school to control public access and maintain secure zones within the building (see Student Commons section above).

I. Student Services would be brought to the center of the building in both concepts to increase student access to these resources before, during, and after school (see Student Commons section above).

III. Imagine’s Prioritization Process
The Imagine Team’s process for prioritizing facilities challenges and solutions has followed a similar pattern at each stage of our work: thorough research by sub-teams, identification of issues to be addressed, discussion of those issues with the broader team, building consensus within the team about issue importance, and gathering feedback about our consensus from facilities users and community members.

This is an iterative, discursive process with consensus as for the goal. Group members respectfully challenge the conclusions and arguments of others at every stage. Ongoing interaction with facilities users and community members pushes us to further refine our concepts. At times, the Imagine group has also used formal exercises to prioritize needs and the approaches to meeting those needs. This group work helps ensure that no sub-group or individual dominates or steers the prioritization process.

The prioritization process has not been driven by formal metrics, but by consensus around multiple dimensions, including, but not limited to: - Safety, health, and security of users - Systems/facilities on the verge of failure - Equity and accessibility
- Percentage of students impacted - Facilitating student learning and achievement - Creating welcoming and inclusive facilities

Individual Imagine members may give different weight to different dimensions, but one the advantage of a large group using a discursive, consensus-focused approach is that such disparities are balanced out as the process moves forward. Additional considerations include: - Efficiency (for students, faculty, and staff) - Return on investment - Capacity for multiple uses and flexibility - Life expectancy - Balancing academic, social, emotional, and physical impact of facilities - Avoiding Band-Aids, inefficient short-term fixes, and the fallacy of sunk costs

Throughout the process to date, Imagine group members have had to train ourselves not to prioritize based on project costs for several reasons: 1) we do not know costs at this stage; 2) individuals’ speculation about what items are more or less expensive is often wrong; 3) we do not want to settle for short-term, cheaper solutions that ignore longer-term, more comprehensive ones.

IV. Imagine's Use of Feedback
During this work, the Imagine Team conducted five Community Engagement Sessions, once each during November, February, and April, and twice in May. Each of these sessions were structured to maximize the opportunity for questions and comments from the public during the meetings. Many of the questions were answered on the spot, and every reasonable effort was made to capture comments and suggestions from these meetings. Also, questions and feedback were solicited and received for each of these meetings via feedback forms submitted on paper, via Chromebooks at the event, or online after the event.

The Imagine Team documented and gave careful consideration to all of this feedback. They responded to many questions and comments on the Imagine page of the OPRFHS website. The feedback informed our discussions and decisions as they continued with the work. It helped to identify oversights and errors in the work, broaden the thinking about particular components, test assumptions, and conclusions, learn where they needed to sharpen and better support their explanations, and gather information about whether the work was on the right track in the eyes of community members. They did not do a quantitative analysis of the feedback since the small and self-selected sample would not yield results that were accurately representative of the community at large. They occasionally received unsolicited feedback and ideas, which they also evaluated as part of the overall work process.

Also, important and helpful feedback was received from OPRF students, faculty, staff, and members of the Board of Education at every stage or the research, assessment, and conceptualization. The insights from these constituencies continue to be valuable in both defining critical issues and identifying conceptual remedies to address them.

A long-term master plan, once adopted, can function as a roadmap to make sure future projects fit within a larger facility.

First, Mr. Poirier reviewed with the Board of Education the layout of the four floors in the Blue Plan, pointing out the areas discussed above. He noted that the investment in the new facilities would reflect the welcoming and ownership ideals, the
foundation of the common core of the building. In this plan, there will be a build-out space with two-stories toward Scoville Avenue, keeping the outside arched windows. Music will remain where it is, but it will have more efficiencies. The auditorium and Little Theatre will remain. The Black Box Theatre will move to the other music area. Note: the scenes need to be built on the stage and, thus, the stage cannot be used for other activities.

North End of Building
TEAM, the program with students with most profound needs, will remain on the first floor and will have its own entrance. Other special education classrooms will also be on the third floor.

Math and science classes will be relocated to one area. The second floor will have collaborative spaces where entire classes can meet, as well as small spaces for small group work. Classrooms will be renovated for more collaboration, i.e., size, furniture, flexibility, current, and future technology. Most classrooms will be located on the perimeter of the building and will have windows. Skylights and light wells will be added to get as much daylight as possible in the building in the core of the building. The second floor will have office pods, surrounding classrooms, and laboratories.

South End of Building
The rebuilt south end of the building will not touch the parking garage, but bumps-out will be added in the front and in the mall, and the school will gain 4900 additional square footage.

The lower level will have a new competition gym; the court level is in the basement but it is a 2-story structure, so it will not be dark. Visitors will be able to access the bleacher stands from the top. The new aquatics facility, which will include lockers, mechanics and a 25 X 40 yds. pool with a bulkhead and a 6-ft wide divider to gain more flexibility. It will include a changing room, dance gym, and two large classrooms.

The first floor will house a jogging track that can be used for fitness classes. It will also have an additional ingress and egress point. In addition, the first floor will house PE and athletic offices, laundry, coaches’ offices, trainer space, the weight room and a cardio gym.

The new field house goes the entire width of the building and includes 5 courts, a climbing wall, a 200-meter track and pull out stands that will accommodate a full school assembly. It will be dividable by curtains for classrooms and sports. If students are running on the track, three courts can still be used.

The third floor will have more spectator seating and a classroom. The fourth floor has solar panel possibilities.

Questions/comments/responses:
1. What problem is being solved with the centralization process? Student and public access. Students want access to the school after hours before their extracurricular activities start. The more hours in the building, the better the outcomes. Students will have collaboration and socializing spaces. It will be a
welcoming space. Students could spend time in the library. A suggestion was given to change the word “library” because it connotes a certain image and libraries have changed. Breakout rooms could be built so that students could work on projects together.

2. What would the additional staffing needs be with this configuration? While there would be additional costs, staffing costs had not been explored.

3. Where will adaptive PE be located? It will be located on the first floor.

4. Will the facilities meet ADA requirements? Everything built new or reconstructed has to be ADA, and the goal is to be fully compliant. Consideration had been given to moving vertically in the building, and three areas have elevators sized for movement and emergency response. The idea is to improve circulation with additional corridors where possible, i.e., creating connections.

5. How have you addressed structural barriers in the north end of the building? The barriers have been acknowledged, and a deeper dive will be necessary to address them. The two theatres have some accessibility issues. IMAGINE is trying to be sensitive to cost while meeting the accessibility goals.

6. What has been the assumption around student population growth? IMAGINE believes the school can accommodate expanded enrollment in this space. The utilization numbers are not maxed out, and each concept shows additional space for additional classrooms if there is an influx of students. Twelve to 15 more classrooms are available. Some teachers have exclusive use of a classroom while others float to different ones. Some classrooms are not adjacent to a collaboration room. If a classroom does not have a dedicated teacher, it can be used eight periods per day rather than five periods per day. The idea of introducing faculty offices to offset additional classrooms.

7. How can classrooms be made to fit the needs 10 to 15 years in the future? That is hard to predict. The classrooms are being made as flexible as possible, using movable furniture, large, square classrooms, working collaboratively, having space for team style tables, 1 wall would be for projection with dual projectors, whiteboarding, and retractable wall. Instead of a fixed instructor station, the teacher would have a podium on wheels which can be moved to different parts of the room to see what learning is occurring.

8. Why move and upgrade the Consumer and Family Science space? This area is outdated, too small, and not efficient. If it was going to be redone, it made sense to move it down to the first floor in proximity to Huskie Pups, loading docks, and ventilation will be better too. Culinary Arts students prepare a meal for 200 people, but if the cafeteria is near, it can serve more people. Many students did not know these classes/spaces existed so this might encourage more students to participate.

9. Has the space for physical education and athletic teams increased? The flexibility of the spaces does allow for more turnover and, larger uses. The number of court spaces is the same. The track is bigger than the current one, and space can accommodate a full school assembly. Wrestling will have three practices together.

10. What phasing in occurs? How is that accommodated? This work would be completed in stages, just as it is done in other schools. It will take much-advanced planning. Deeper portions of the building will need to be shored up. Perkins + Will considered the two major phases to be first the Fieldhouse and then the second floor to gain additional space for an additional gym.

11. Is it more expensive to do these projects piecemeal rather than a demolishing the building? Should a total demolition of the Fieldhouse be an option? The Fieldhouse was built for PE only. The utilization of the area east of the Fieldhouse was explored, but from a facility standpoint, it left operational and curriculum holes.
The least expensive way to make these changes would be to do everything at once, but there are lots of unknowns, i.e., a new building may not attach to the old. While painful, other schools felt the reconstruction was worth it.

12. Is there a comparison of costs for tearing down the building or renovating it? More study would need to occur.

13. How will this restructuring impact commute times for students in the building on an average day? Transgender students or students who use wheelchairs will be able to navigate more easily because of the new elevator shafts—one in the north part of the building, another across from the new washrooms, and one in the commons. The redesign tried to reduce as many barriers as possible with straight line corridors. Much of the student conversation was about how the students use the building, the location of their lockers, and what they carry with them to the classrooms.

14. A comment was made that when students go to PE, they first go to their PE locker and then to the gym, sometimes leaving only 20 minutes of instructional time. Teachers in a “neighborhood” will help with instructional time as well.

15. What key assumptions about programs were used when designing the Fieldhouse? The key assumption was flexibility and regulation track. IMAGINE did not want less than what there is now because every space is being used. This configuration allows more space and a dance room with a special floor. The track team has gotten kicked out of practices 25 days because of not enough room. The track was a goal and drive for the 300 students plus student activities.

16. Believing that academics should be a priority, how could the plan be cut back if needed? This will be some long-term facilities plan (LTFP), and not everything will happen at once. Highland Park’s LTFP timeline was 10 to 15 years and included two major summers of construction and after that investment of $3 to $4 million each year. Other things could be phased. This plan is about having enough room for the current programs and doing it more efficiently. Shrinking a new element will not change the cost. Lake Forest had other space and moved all of its non-student facing functions to another building. The IMAGINE group was making no recommendations at this time.

17. One member stated that it would nice for OPRFHS to be able to host athletic tournaments.

Ms. Kamenitsa highlighted the features in the orange concept. Safety and security are the fundamental concepts of this plan. From discussions with the staff, this plan is much more manageable for the Safety and Support Team. The biggest difference between this plan and the blue plan is that performing arts rooms are housed at the west end of PE. Again, as in the blue plan, the special education offices and the TEAM program (with its private entrance) are in the same location but expanded. On the second floor, one story builds up; the tutoring center stays within the existing part of the building. The library is more centrally located. There is no build-out for the new library over the cafeteria.

Performing arts abuts the fields which makes it easier for the Marching Band to access and the loading of instruments, competitions, etc. The Black Box is relatively close to the main stage auditorium. The current west gym is still a gym and is flexible space for expanding the south cafeteria; it is an area not settled until the design phase.
The classroom reorganization includes big shared offices for math, science, history, etc. on each floor.

The Huskie Pups and Family and Consumer Science classrooms are on the east end.

The big floor competition gym and pool are now on the ground floor, pushing other functions to the lower level, i.e., changing rooms, wrestling, weight, and adaptive gym. The hope is to capture some daylight for those. The orange plan is four stories, while the blue plan is three stories. The changing areas are larger than the current ones, and the adaptive gym and weight rooms are smaller.

The orange plan includes a green roof with skylights and solar panels.

Questions/Responses and Comments:
1. Could the black box theater and the library be relocated because of the noise level they may encounter with the represented location? The big advantage with this location is not having to build a new structure to accommodate it.
2. Will a zoning ordinance be needed because of the height? If so, when will that happen? Zoning will be investigated with the Village after a master plan has been developed. The Village must approve any expansion of the building.
3. The orange plan has more green space with more roofs, and there is the potential for putting solar panels on the existing roof. The outdoor terrace spaces could be outdoor educational spaces or green roofs.
4. While moving the Huskie pups would result in better security and a new entry, getting a permit for space may be difficult.
5. Was there an investigation in the blue plan to get the SPED offices into the commons? The team looked at several locations, and the major domino pieces are the upfront pieces. Faculty and staff must access other parts of the building frequently, and they did not like moving to the south end of the building.
6. Was using part of the alley explored? The team looked at getting the necessary programs in the same footprint. Expanding the building further south towards the parking garage would be trickier. The closer one is to that existing structure, more has to be done to make sure that structure is not undermined. In the orange plan, there is no bump out to the west and some egress because the building is going up. Many factions want to face Scoville, SPED offices, TEAM, the administration, Huskie Pups, etc. The auditorium is a large constraint. There are always bigger unknowns when one goes down a level. There are pros and cons to putting a pool in the lower level having to do with the structure, leakage, etc. However, it would be shored up appropriately.
7. Was any consideration given to building a self-contained athletic building somewhere else and swapping fields and then demolishing the south end and putting a field there? Through the internal study process, the PE and athletics group, the reality of the west fields is that they are tightly planned. Removing it does not provide viable space. Efficiency would be lost by putting it somewhere else on site.

Dr. Moore stated that Little Theatre and Auditorium were strong static elements because they are heavily utilized, purposefully built, and doing their jobs well. It would be very costly to move them to another area.

Mr. Cofsky liked the theme of the commons area and the leveraged area above the cafeteria as it is a prime real estate in the blue option, taking advantage of space in an
area that would be common space. The faculty collaboration rooms would be an enhancement from a PD standpoint which means gains for staff and students.

Mr. Arkin was impressed with the commons area. He encouraged looking at other schools, as it had made a profound difference on the climate of those buildings. He also believed that security was a major issue. Securing the parts of the building where the public is allowed is critical. The idea of removing the field house and rebuilding it was a big concept to overcome. Finally, he noted that the way some of the classrooms are utilized today wasted three periods of the day.

Ms. Spivy concurred with Mr. Cofsky and Mr. Arkin. Her focus was the mental health and well-being of the students. Clustering classrooms, decreasing stress, and increasing instructional time was very important. She appreciated the work that had been accomplished. She questioned how the athletic facility models originated and why IMAGINE did not opt for demolition.

Dr. Moore appreciated the straight corridors for ease of access and safety issues. About the Fieldhouse, her reaction was different. She looked at this as a PE need in the same way as core classes. The data shows that students who participate in extracurriculars are better students than those who do not participate. These improvements are to address the needs of students now and in the future. The Fieldhouse is not necessarily of historical value. The track is a non-cut sport and many students who do not participate because the track is so congested. It is one of our most diverse sports and in the same way in which the discussions about classrooms is occurring, having activities working concurrently is the most effective use of space. If the Board of Education and the community had the current schedule of athletics, performing arts, bands, etc. so that they would be able to see how this design would eliminate some of the issues would be helpful.

Mr. Iseli felt that moving the services of Special Education into the commons area would be a Priority, which is in the orange plan. He agreed with Dr. Moore on the athletic facilities, but he had to be sure that they were challenging themselves on choices and tradeoffs on the needs, because of unlimited resources.

Mr. Baron thanked the IMAGINE group for their engagement. He liked the untapped real estate in the area above the cafeteria. The common space theme was a huge part of the experience. He felt the mind, body, and spirit was very important and the pools were an urgency. He understood that an undergrown pool would have the biggest risk. He wanted to know more about the cost. He was very impressed with this effort.

Ms. Cassell was most excited about the common space. She has heard consistently about the students’ desire to collaborate and to have a welcoming environment for students to make them feel like they belong and have the benefit of safety and security. The focus on giving additional space to the arts and being centrally located is critical as there is a demand for services in those areas and for students who enjoy it or make a career of it. These plans reflect the demands of the school. The shared offices for the departments will be important for faculty collaboration and the students and wait time, in general, knowing where they can find their teachers in a division. CCB recommended having the Welcome Center more inviting for students.
and visitors with a focus on safety. She noted that the size of the adaptive gym is very important to some of the neediest students.

The next step will be to take this feedback and the best and then distill that into one concept. Then the Board of Education will be presented with cost information at executing the first phase of the work and the cost tradeoff information regarding the decision important to the Board of Education could be done as well. The community is welcome to these meetings, and another community engagement session will be scheduled to share the progress made over the summer.

At the next meeting in August, a review of the single concepts and incorporation of the best elements would occur. Cost information could be presented as well. The next meeting will be about confirming priorities. One member wanted to understand the duration of time it would take to do these elements. IMAGINE did not want to recommend executing a plan that would destroy a student’s career. It could be that the sensible and sensitive way to do that would be to execute some things over a couple of years and then pause.

Mr. Iseli felt it would be difficult to cost this out because there may be 20 to 30 individual projects within each option and each needs a priority and a rough cost before they can be prioritized. Perkins + Will stated that the intent is to have a menu of components and which are dependent upon something else that must be completed. Many schools live through this process. Construction managers do a tremendous amount of work during the summer and then phase in the larger components over a multiyear time.

Mr. Baron stated that the public needs to know not only the entry point but the exit point. Perkins + Will stated that any cost calculated after five years would be less tangible. ICI has put together long-term programs, mechanical upgrades, roofing, etc., and those programs are annually approved by the Board of Education. One can look at the current costs and escalate them. Other conditions would also influence the cost.

Dr. Moore stated that the costs could be fluid and cautioned that communication should be a range depending on the timeframe and factors beyond the District’s control. Numbers will be escalated as time goes on.

Board members were asked to send any further questions to Ms. Kalmerton. They were thanked for this time.

Adjournment

At 10:00 p.m., on Tuesday, June 26, 2018, Mr. Iseli moved to adjourn the Special Board Meeting; seconded by Mr. Arkin. A voice vote resulted in all ayes. Motion carried.

Dr. Jackie Moore
President

Jennifer Cassell
Secretary