Facilities Master Planning Governance Committee

Five-Year Facilities Maintenance and Capital Plan (5YP)

The following notes are from two brainstorming sessions held by the Facilities Department to inform Saint Paul Public Schools’ “rolling” five-year plan to modernize its facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 1 of 2: April 13, 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of attendees: 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Activity 1: Highest Hopes

- All boilers work all the time!
- Diverse learning environments
- Enjoyment of environment
- Integration
- Quality
- Flexibility to meet needs of multiple programs
- Success
- Welcoming
- Flexible
- Community
- Safety
- Dynamic
- Students

- Respect
- (x2) Great learning environments
- Equitable access for all students
- Outdoor learning
- Learning
- Equitable
- Fun learning
- Enriching
- Stewardship – of money, earth, all folks
- Hub – families, learning enjoyment
- Exceptional
- Inspiring
- Flexibility

### Activity 2: Opportunities and Challenges

#### OPPORTUNITIES

What **opportunities** do you think SPPS Facilities should leverage? What **recommendations for action** do you have?

- Vacant downtown space
- Pre-K/Early Childhood
- Urban school district and the benefits of a diverse community
- Community partners like the 3M partnership

#### CHALLENGES

What do you see as the **biggest challenges** faced by SPPS Facilities? What **recommendations for action** do you have?

- Volume of buildings – consideration of impact and variety
- Placing funds to meet future needs
- Financial constraints (funding great visions)
- Building age
- Mentors
- Career readiness
- Partnering with local colleges
- New superintendent/mayor
- Energy efficiency
- How food service affects student day
- Increase access for families with young children (B-5)
- Identify and ask – what can mentors do for students?
- Dining space
- How can it be a positive experience?
- Open schools to communities – revenue
- Create menu of amenities
- Utilize new leadership
- Create new narrative
- Share strategies with proven outcomes

- Looking at over vs. under capacity buildings
- Public understanding of what “facilities” encompass and in turn, how it impacts students
- Planning in uncertain times
  - Facility person at table for strategic plan
  - Multi-discipline coordination
- Specialized programs in the right place/do buildings support programs?
  - Mental health, cope with change = stress
  - More people to the table
- Learning under construction
  - Communicate phasing and planning
- Diversity in design
  - Engage community AND parents
- Respect for teachers and environment
- Safe walking to school
  - Coordinate with public works
  - Examine best practices
- Building security

### RECOMMENDATIONS FOR OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES

- Play to win (lottery)
- Educating community – using student voice/advocacy
- Efficient use of funds – data driven, replacement vs. repair
- Building community partnerships

### EQUITY IN ENVIRONMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do you see the issue of equity in environments in the conversation?</th>
<th>What recommendations for action do you have?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

• Providing same amenities and facilities across all facilities with district to serve all users across all communities at once.
• Prioritize fairly
• More money
• Physical assessment
• Inequity inventory
• How are the neighbors engaged?
• Concern: big additions focused where “success” already exists

• Voices are important
• Representation is important
• Equity in environments

Session 2 of 2: May 9, 2017
Number of attendees: 38

Activity 1: Middle School Options

Option 1: Build New Middle School in Area A
Option 2: Buy and Repurpose Crosswinds School (Woodbury)
Option 3: Use Existing Schools to Increase Middle School Capacity

OPTION 1: Build New Middle School in Area A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros (as presented to committee):</th>
<th>Cons (as presented to committee):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Equity for Area A families</td>
<td>• 65 million cost to build; leaves less money for other projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consistency for students, e.g. supports existing learning pathways and attendance Areas; supports PreK-8 peer group continuity</td>
<td>• Operational cost of new facility in time of declining funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• State-of-the-art learning facility</td>
<td>• Leaves elementary schools under capacity vs. changing one into a middle school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Periodically adding new buildings, smart portfolio management</td>
<td>• High cost, scheduling complexities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 1: What have we missed for the pros and cons?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros: Suggestions provided by committee</th>
<th>Cons: Suggestions provided by committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Utilize public transportation</td>
<td>• Declining student projection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Design to fit our needs</td>
<td>• Elementary/Middle transition (won’t be able to meet enrollment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build East-side pathways</td>
<td>• Competition from Charters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build for flexibility and multi-function</td>
<td>• Is there available land?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Marketing opportunity – strategy development opportunities</td>
<td>• Will taxpayers support this with declining enrollment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunity to recapture lost students (declined enrollment)</td>
<td>• Public perception</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. What key questions does SPPS need to consider to make the most informed decision?

- What does [student] equity look like in Area A?
- What should programming be at the new middle school?
- Would it have a magnet focus?
- How many students should it serve?

3. Which audiences need to be engaged in the middle school conversation(s)?

- Families that are leaving SPPS after elementary
- Business community
- Residents
- Students (4th/5th grade) (Current Middle School)
- Parent Advisory Councils
- Area A elementary, middle and high school staff and leadership
- Subject Matter Experts – other districts with similar experience

4. Are there particular questions we should ask certain audiences?

- No responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 2: Buy and Repurpose Crosswinds School (Woodbury)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pros (as presented to committee):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low cost to acquire building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Eliminates need to build new middle school; ensures flexibility in existing secondary facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Newer building (2001) meets FMP principals, standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Location conducive to outdoor learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Move-in ready</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential for attracting new students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 1: What have we missed for the pros and cons?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros: Suggestions provided by committee</th>
<th>Cons: Suggestions provided by committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Single resource for special needs</td>
<td>• Additional costs for athletics, and programs beyond current program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The program is a fully sufficient educational experience for very nearly every possible student</td>
<td>• Annual operating costs for an additional facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Off-campus” environmental learning center for</td>
<td>• Though close, it’s not a neighborhood school – it will be a commuter school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
all grades – extension (think Belwin)
• Magnets do attract certain families
• Gives Battle Creek Elementary more STEAM pathway options and to continue to pick up enrollment, especially out of district
• Crosswinds is in the “shadow” of 3M which provides opportunities for STEAM program funding
• With new superintendent, might be nice timing to redraw boundaries
• Costs to operate
• Distance may be deterrent – students won’t make friends within own community
• Impact to inter-community relations with Woodbury (jumping over boarder)
  - What other inefficiencies come with being outside Saint Paul?
• Redrawing boundaries could scare families away

2: What key questions does SPPS need to consider to make the most informed decision?
• Does this support long-term demographic projections?
• Does this reconcile financial differences with other options?
• Is SPPS fully committed to making it successful (e.g. marketing the program to families)?
• Is SPPS wiling to change programming?
• Is there any flexibility in changing arts/science/integration program down the road? Will this hamstring the district?

3: Which audiences need to be engaged in the middle school conversation(s)?
• Area A families and other affected Areas
• New residents and new families
• Young families
• Taxpayers
• Families with students in STEAM programs
• Montessori families who would go to Parkway but don’t due to perception that Montessori program is diluted by its co-located community program
• Woodbury Public Schools and families

4: Are there particular questions we should ask certain audiences?
• Area A families: Is this a suitable path for your children?
• If the community program is removed from Parkway, are families more likely to enroll students there?

Option 3: Use Existing Schools to Increase Middle School Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros (as presented to committee):</th>
<th>Cons (as presented to committee):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Repurpose and invest funds in existing facility</td>
<td>• May require school(s) be converted to serve middle school students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not adding overall square footage to district facilities portfolio</td>
<td>- May impact learning pathways and attendance Area boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Disruptive to students and families</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 1: What have we missed for the pros and cons?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros: Suggestions provided by committee</th>
<th>Cons: Suggestions provided by committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunity to address equity issues of Area A – no middle school articulation is present</td>
<td>• Might need to add square footage to existing buildings to accommodate extra students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not adding another property to maintain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Equivalent improvements made to many existing buildings (rather than 1 new)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improving existing buildings could attract students and families, and inspire them to stay in the district</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What key questions does SPPS need to consider to make the most informed decision?

- If we could talk about re-aligning, should the conversations be focused on programming drive next steps? (Yes - Start with programming to best serve students and families; and work backwards into facility needs).
- What programming will best serve students and families in affected Area A?
- What facilities do we need to accomplish this?
- What are our facility options?

Group note above: Status quo does not meet our needs. Any facility changes will require re-alignment.

- Should SPPS convert Hazel Park to a 6-8 Middle School?
  - Will impact Area A Elementary buildings
  - Will impact IB program, PreK-5 students
  - Need to explore cost impacts of using existing building
- Is a comprehensive middle school program that critical for Area A?
  - Do students tend to go to magnets instead? (by choice or necessity?)
- Should SPPS consider expanding a K-5 to a K-8 building?
- What are the impacts on existing magnets – Farnsworth, Phalen Lake, French Immersion?
- What are the impacts of Charter schools in Area A?

3. Which audiences need to be engaged in the middle school conversation(s)?

- No responses

4. Are there particular questions we should ask certain audiences?

- No responses
Activity 2: 5-Year Plan Validation

1. Referring back to the criteria for prioritization handout, what ways do you see the criteria impacting the next 5YP?
   - Are there buildings that are not worth renovating – too costly?
   - Need to address accessibility barriers in old buildings – ADA compliance
   - Air quality for staff – especially in summer
   - Bringing buildings up to existing building codes – fire and safety
   - Major projects are more in West part of district – more subjective – criteria; more objective criteria is more city-wide
   - Criteria validate and guide adjustments to initial FMP
     - Obtain feedback on the effectiveness of the criteria as we move forward
   - Are criteria flexible enough to adapt to unforeseen and changing factors?
   - Do the criteria keep up with social and economic fluxes?
   - Are criteria still relevant post-SSSC?
   - Revisit our growth assumptions to ensure our priority is aligned with reality today
   - Define – safety and security
   - Pink document provided is an internal tool and not something readily understandable without familiarity of each school

2. What do you see as positive and negative implications to how the criteria is being applied in the next 5YP?
   - Priorities will change
   - District will need to remain flexible
   - Public will need to be well-informed and given opportunities to be engaged in process
   - Are our data reliable that drive the prioritization?

3. Given everything you’ve heard, what does the BOE need to consider as they adopt this next 5YP?
   - Should any of the additional criteria be given higher priority and vice versa?
   - Student equity and how existing criteria support the prioritization of projects
   - Consistency, fairness and opportunities across the city
   - Hardest work first – not low hanging fruit
   - Maintain long-term vision – very helpful
   - Consider fluidity, flexibility
   - Have responsiveness in design
   - Fast track early learning
• Visit sites – “live there”
  - What are the site constraints?
  - What are the unique features?
• Will there be a new strategic plan with new Superintendent?
• Think “Real Estate”, not Facilities; leverage existing
• Demographic projections – more detail; housing/neighborhoods – cycles
• Get more granular with “building condition”

###