

Rockford Public Schools, District 205
Facilities Master Plan 2025 – 2030
Meeting Minutes

Steering Committee
Wednesday, January 17, 2024

Korey White, DLR Group opened the meeting at 5:05 p.m.

DLR Group Members Present:

Korey White, AIA, pK-12 Planning Leader/Senior Associate
Keri Vansant, AIA, Project Manager/Senior Associate

Committee Members Present:

Board:

Paul Carpenter
Tiana McCall

Principals/Teachers:

Adam Cengiz – Principal Special Programs CAPA & Gifted
Dawn Myelle-Watson – Science, Jefferson HS
Joshua Tatman – Science, Auburn HS

Students:

None

External:

Brent Pentenburg – YMCA
Antonio Ramirez – Alignment Rockford

Internal:

Heather Psaltis - ED of Schools, Southeast Quadrant
Jason Pope – Director of Recruitment
Susan Uram – Director of Education Technology
Tessa Huftalin – Director of SPED
Bridget French – ED College and Career Readiness
Dawn Williamson – Director of Athletics, Activities, and Program Development
Melissa Wolf – Director of Fine Arts

Committee Members Absent:

Principals/Teachers:

John Schmelzer – Principal Ellis ES

Students:

Jessica Garcia – Auburn Superintendent Student Advisory Committee
Emmanuel Edwards – Roosevelt

Internal:

Misael Nascimento – ED Bilingual and Multicultural Department

External:

Angela Hite-Carter – Former RPS 205 teacher, principal, administrator
Ron Clewer – Gorman & Company

Administration Present:

Michael Phillips – Chief Operating Officer
Greg Brown, Ed. D – Chief Financial Officer
Scott Jenson – Director of Design and Construction
Ehren Jarrett - Superintendent

Ms. White started the meeting reviewing the Steering Committee Agreements and the agenda.

Steering Committee Agreements

- Stay engaged (Ask and respond to questions, etc.).
- Maintain confidentiality.
- Be mindful of being a dominant voice. We want to hear all voices.
- Share and make space for others to share questions and perspectives.
- One mic, one voice. Refrain from talking over one another or having a side conversation.
- Speak only from the “I” perspective.
- In the event of an absence, we commit to reading the materials from missed meetings and providing written feedback, if and where needed.

Meeting Agenda:

1. 4-2-1 Vision Discussion
2. State of the Schools (data review)
3. Group discussions

Ms. White reminded the group that if they cannot attend a meeting, the information will be shared with them so they can stay up to speed.

Ms. White recapped the phases. Phase 1 and Phase 2 - continuing to understand as much as we can about the current state of the District, utilizing existing documents that have been provided, additional research and information that we are gathering internally and with the District. We have done several workshops with teachers and staff and sent out surveys and started to align that information with conversations with your existing buildings to see how they need to be right-sized, to start conceptualizing what changes might look like once we align and right-size the needs to the exiting building portfolio. We will then figure out what those scenarios might cost and then ultimately recommend it to the School Board. What should we do for these next five years? This is a snapshot of where we are on the schedule. Some things are overlapping as we are having conversations with staff, teachers, and administrators. We are conceptualizing the data we are looking at, as to what some of those changes might look like, whether it be facility conditions, educational suitability, or program space needs.

We used this information to make those guiding principles that we have developed, and that the Cabinet has reviewed, and we have finalized. Those are the framework, or roadmap. The strategies that we develop are meant to align with those goals.

The meeting was turned over to Dr. Jarrett to explain the vision and the 4 to 1 concept. Dr. Jarrett explained that the idea of 4-2-1 is not an official Board policy but was born in his brain of the idea of scarcity in a few areas. Assume we have a total of around \$180 million to spend on this. We know that there are going to be limited resources and tough decisions. Where I initially started thinking about the idea of 4-2-1 came from the idea that we have four high schools. I think this would apply to other levels as well, but let's start with the high schools and athletics. For example, about 15 years ago we were having a tough time having enough girls to have a girls' golf team at any of our high schools, so we ended up canceling girls' golf every year. What the athletic department did at that time was to pivot to have one district-wide girls' golf team. Now ideally, we would like to have four girls golf teams that are competing for a state championship, but when faced with limited student interest and limited coaching talent that was available, we decided to go from 4 to 1, and ultimately had a state champion golfer and a team that won multiple conference and sectional championships. Now the sport of women's golf has grown a bit. Ideally, you want to see that one program eventually becomes two and then go to four. So that was where I originally thought about it, and I thought about how this could apply to fine arts and academic programming.

I want to pivot to academic programming and think about this concept. We have just purchased the building next to Jefferson, the RVC building, and we have fourteen career pathways that we offer to our high schools. Here is the challenge posed to our group throughout this process. When we decide about whether we are going to offer programming at all four high schools, two high schools, or one central location. I am not proposing that some schools and students get access and others do not. What I am talking about is, are we going to have some concepts built into this facilities plan where we do some things district-wide to draw in our entire student population, as opposed to trying to replicate everything. So, the criteria I

would ask us to think about as we contemplate the 4-2-1 idea is, first, do we have enough high-quality staffing available to run this program at an A+ level on all four sites?

For example, automotive, are there four absolutely awesome automotive teachers that we could run a program in all four high schools, we have two, or we have one? The second thing I would ask us to consider is facilities. Is the best we can do is to have some converted space in all four of our high schools and have a C+ level or a D- level? Automotive, it is functional, but barely. Are we better off doing that, or are we better off having two sites that are B's, or are we better off having one super innovative place where we can do electric vehicles and all kinds of new innovative things and create one space? And then the problem becomes, how do we transport kids there? How do we use virtual learning? How do we get our students to those places? When I think of the idea of 4-2-1, with our limited resources, are there going to be times when we are better off having one program that serves the whole district and take advantage of the fact that we could draw from eight thousand high school students? Or are there some programs where we are going to need to have them at all four high schools? We do have the talent, we do have the space, and we do have the ability to build that high quality performance facility that would be necessary to do that.

This is not something you do with the English class. We are going to have English class and all our school core curriculum. This may not be something we do with lower level or feeder level courses that lead up to our pathway course. A lot of those can be offered at all four of our sites. But as we start to think about specializing, with really specialized teaching talent and specialized facilities that's expensive, are we going to be better off having some choices that we make in this facilities plan that really take advantage of one centralized location for certain things, pairing up to schools for some things, or having it at all four sites?

There is not one answer, but on a case-by-case basis. I think we have to be careful. Equity does not mean everybody gets a C- facility and a C- teacher because that is the best we can do. I hope equity means that we make decisions with our facilities dollars about whether it is better to have one A+ teacher or one A+ facility to figure out how we give all of our students that experience who want it.

That is what I want to challenge us to really think about. I think that applies to athletics, as I mentioned already. Let's say we decide we want to have one really high-profile indoor track, like we did. I think there was real wisdom to the fact that we have one place all of our schools have an indoor track at one school. Auburn is set up that kids can run an indoor track. I think there was some wisdom in that decision because the cost it would have taken to make all of the fieldhouses bigger would have cost us money in other areas. Yet we can still host an indoor track meet with a full 200-meter track. The other schools have 160-meter tracks.

Let's talk about Fine Arts in all of our schools. We have a base of a theater, or a base of a performance place, but you may have specialty investments that are made in different schools, depending on the needs. Then we could draw students from all over the district to use those facilities for fine arts.

Then finally, for academics. Can we have 14 A+ career pathway spaces and expect our community partners to go to four or five high schools, including Roosevelt? Or are there going to be some programs that are going to be better off in that one space for Career Ed? I think it is going to be different with every decision we make. I am not here to tell you the answer is always one. The answer is not always two, and the answer is not always four. I think as we think about high school, this will apply a lot. But I also think, as we think about middle school and elementary school, and even early childhood, are there district-wide resources where we take advantage of our scale and have one of something? Are there advantages to buying into, and are there advantages to continuing to have one in everything?

So that is the idea of a 4-2-1 concept. Again, kind of guidelines to be intentional about making sure we have the best possible facilities, the best possible instructors, and the best possible programs to maximize student participation and interest. But I think we would say that if this is something where because we are having it in one place, it means we're having to say no to hundreds of students, then we would know that's got to be four, because we have too much student demand to have it in one place. We do not want students sitting out or not being able to take advantage of it. But if we have the right amount of student demand, and the right number of high-quality teachers to do it in one facility, I think that is something we are going to have to consider as well to truly make sure we have some A+ stuff.

That is a regional draw that is truly maximizing our dollars and then some. I do not think we would necessarily put all those in one place. We would be very strategic about where we would invest, in what parts of the community. Something for all of us to contemplate as we think through this work. This is something we are going to be considering as we make investments throughout our system, to consider having four of something, two of something, of one of something, or applying that to our middle schools and elementary schools.

Ms. White commented that she liked the overview. She said what they are looking for is how the high-level vision, questions and feedback align to the guiding principles. We would love to hear your first impressions.

Board Member Carpenter commented that student interest is important and asked. the District has a sense of need for various things going forward.

Dr. Jarrett responded that was a great point. That would have to be part of the criteria we would establish. We would have to build this out to ensure that we are applying criteria consistently in determining what we could do. Are we better off doing one high quality site with a high-quality faculty or are we better off having multiple mid-level facilities.

Committee Member French commented that because we have been having conversations about this, we have a general sense of what students are interested in if you have specific questions about different pathways. We do have criteria we use to make decisions.

Committee Member Tatman asked what specific programs, other than those we have mentioned, like auto and theater are we looking at?

Dr. Jarrett replied that other programs for the CCR building would be to look at models for college and career readiness centers across the country, and we could offer some early college experiences there as well. One thing we struggle with, we could look at academic

courses that are difficult to offer at all four campuses but could come together in one class. For example, let's say we wanted to offer one high school Mandarin opportunity, but could we offer a full first through fourth grade Mandarin experience? I am not saying we are going to, but that would be an example. So, it could be for traditional world languages or fine arts, or I mentioned Career Ed in my example. Pre-pandemic, we would have been afraid to try this. But now we have technology that would have the potential to allow us to do a blended model. We would either provide the transportation to physically get students there or some blended model where some days they are physically in the one site or some of the time they are virtually in that site.

That is part of what we are thinking. For those courses we have to cut every year because we are fighting to get twenty students so we can run the class, if we put all four high schools together, we could always run it every year. I can tell you my own children have multiple times experienced their science class getting canceled because there were not enough science teachers. Both my daughter and my son missed an opportunity for an advanced placement science class because we did not have a teacher. So, if we have a teacher shortage, if we have a numerical shortage of students, stuff does not run sometime. That could fit, and then obviously the Career Ed which is more facilities dependent.

Committee Member Williamson asked if there were going to be criteria using student surveys, or however you do it, that would have ranges of feedback that would determine if they would be putting something in each building or require two buildings? I guess the second part, and that is for all of you, is there a way to build in flexibility so that if we are at a two-building level now, but then there is a lot more interest that brings us up to four. I do not want to be hamstrung based on where we are now, and where we might go later.

Dr. Jarrett responded with, as an Athletics example, let's say we decide to spend a lot of money and build the area's first natatorium, because we don't have a big swimming pool anywhere. Jefferson is the biggest we have in the area, and we decide we are going to build a 50-meter pool with tons of seating capacity. We decide we are going to have the biggest pool in the area at RPS and all the students are going to use that one pool. Then we find after five years of doing that, after this facilities plan runs its course, we have so much interest in swimming now. We are the swimming pinnacle because we made this coaching and facilities investment. Then that may be something you talk about down the road as an example. So, you can succeed your way into growing, into needing additional facilities as a best-case scenario.

A worst-case scenario, though, would be the risk. Anytime you commit to facilities being in one place, then you do take the risk of having some space limitations. That is what we would have to contemplate. It's one thing too, if you have the facilities equal across the board to easily grow it, it's another thing if you make a huge facility, let's say we spend \$15 million on an auto, like a state-of-the-art electric vehicle, we get a \$10 million donation from the new, whatever company name is that's doing Chrysler. We want EV workers, and we are going to donate \$10 million to one space, and then it becomes such a successful program, that we need to do it in a second space. So, those are the things we think of. But we have to do the best we can to have criteria at the front end to make the best possible decision about student interest, the ability to have a good teacher, and the ability to have a true best-in-class facility.

Ms. White commented to add on to that, I think the criteria will also really have to look at the spatial needs. So, if we came to the District tomorrow and said to give us a list of all the programs you have had to cancel for, we could easily start to look at them and sort out what a facility implication or scale of need would be for investment. We would start to think about, these fall into the very flexible, and maybe design a project-based classroom and put it out for high schools and say we know what this is probably going to be in the next two years, but maybe by year five it's transitioned into a new innovative science space. I don't know what the need may be, but I think there's multiple ways to approach that with the criteria perspective, that we can start to gather and make sure that we're designing and putting in place the right criteria to design any future building needs to design a flexible layer so that it can accommodate a number of programs and not limit us just to Mandarin.

Dr. Jarrett commented that another lower level to share, Melissa just presented last night (at Board meeting), we are doing a fifth-grade district-wide band. Would I like to have every one of our elementary schools have its own forty student band? Absolutely, but where we are right now, we have forty for the whole district. But I believe the best way to grow that from forty to eighty to one hundred twenty, to eventually having bands grow, is to have something for our students that they can get excited about district wide. With thousands of students to choose from, we can get forty now and then over time we can grow that scalability in. So, there is a fine arts example and an elementary example that I was really proud of when I heard about it last night. We know this is not ideal yet, but it is better than doing nothing because we can only get four at each elementary school. Having forty from twenty-one elementary schools is something we can be really proud of.

Committee Member French commented, can I also add that we evaluate our pathways every year and we have sort of a rubric to do that. That is student interest, based on student course requests and industry demand for what careers are going to be coming in the next year, five years, ten years. Do we have the teachers to teach it and the facilities for it. Another good example is we have an amazing manufacturing program at Jefferson and a small one at Roosevelt, but we cannot offer all of our kids that opportunity because we are bound by our facilities. If we had something at the Center, we could open it up to the students at Auburn, East and Guilford to have that same opportunity. I do not think we would necessarily shutter Jefferson; we would just have additional facilities for us to do that.

Dr. Jarrett explained that the other opportunity that presents itself, when you do find opportunities to use a central space, if we imagine that there are four or five programs that take up a lot of space, that we move from our four high schools to a central location like the College and Career Center, that space can then be utilized in those existing high schools for different things. Let's say we decide to go with a centralized auto, I'm just throwing that out as an example – I have no opinion on this right now, but I'm saying if we do something like that, there's a big auto bay in the new place so that's what makes me think of it. What could we then do with the Auburn, Guilford, East, Jefferson spaces that they are using for auto in the current schools and what educational use could come of that?

So, it is not just putting stuff in one place, potentially giving you an A+ teacher and an A+ facility, but you could also turn the C+ spaces into something A+ on that campus. When we built our field houses, we took some weaker PE spaces and converted them into some pretty

cool educational spaces during our last ten-year facilities plan. That is an example of something we did differently. I believe we turned a wrestling room at Guilford that we didn't need any more into something else, and there's a few examples like that.

Committee Member Pope commented that he liked the 4-2-1 concept, but it does not always have to be 4-2-1, I think there could be times when its 4 and 1. There could be something at each high school, but then we have a central location, like our collaboration spaces and Cherry Valley; some place where they could come together on a weekly basis, or on this day, this school gets it, and on this day, another school gets it.

Ms. Vansant commented that what is nice too, is you draw interest from students as you implement these, whether it is 4, 2, or 1, it has a trickledown impact. There is more exposure in middle schools and elementary schools. Because we don't know what we don't know. How do we know we are interested in these things? That gives them an opportunity to say, "Hey, that's something that maybe I can check out!" And if it trickles down to the lower levels, that can really build momentum. Then in 10 or 15 years, your plans may look to expand or grow on what you get to do.

She explained what DLR has been doing behind the scenes. Things like taking a look at what the district has already done. We are talking about all the great things the District has already started with the condition assessments, capacity utilization records, enrollment projections, and security audits. We do not need to undo those. We are building upon those and using them. We ask questions where we need to. We say, do we need to dive deeper in some cases? So, during our process, the data we captured was related to educational suitability. That's a sampling of schools within the district at all levels. Walking around, looking at the classrooms and the different learning environments, to understand how the schools are functioning, opportunities and challenges, and then assessing how is it different, also cannibalizing the same assessments that were done in 2020, because the District is doing a lot of work. They have been doing roof replacements, some HVAC, or mechanical improvements. We have also been engaging with community, staff, teachers, etc., at different vision sessions. That is part of the data we're gathering and building on that data. We mention this because facilities matter. As we know, research and improving conditions in educational environments is going to help all of us. We know that there is a connection between the spaces that they learn in and how they can then focus on learning instead of if they are too hot or too cold and being distracted. So how can we get them to reach their full potential by impacting these facilities?

Ms. White explained what they wanted to share with the group is a little bit about that data. They had a set of maps with different data points for the group to look at and discuss in small groups. Think through some of where we are headed next with this, which is the round of prioritization. I will go through at a high level what you will be getting and if there's any general questions, we'll provide some time for you to ask.

The first one you will get is referred to as the requirement index. This is a technical term basically to say facility condition. This is the terminology that aligns with the consultant who did the assessment in 2020. It looks at what the total needs are at the buildings. Not over a thirty-year plan, but just in general, what are the total needs that building may have? It includes different categories such as electrical systems, equipment and furnishings, exterior enclosures,

fire protection, each HVAC systems, interior construction and conveyance plumbing system, side special construction, special construction structures, systems. What you will see is the percentage. The lower the percentage in this case, the better the condition is or the less work that each building needs. We have also broken this down and looked at it in the quadrant that your district uses, just to give you a general idea across the different regions of how this is starting to break out. You will see the different categories for work, early childhood, elementary, middle and high, then color coded by the region.

The second map that you will receive is related to capacity and utilization. This is based on the number and size of classrooms that a school has, its functional capacity, and then its utilization brings in the factor of enrollment. So, for instance, if a school has a functional capacity of three hundred, and this year it has one hundred students, it is going to be considered underutilized. If next year it goes to four hundred students, and total capacity stays the same, it will then be considered overutilized. This study was done in 2020 and Rockford schools has identified between 85 and 95 to be the ideal utilization percentage. We have a map that will show you the breakdown by utilization rate. We have two different maps here that sort of overlap. There are a few nuances here when we are talking about capacity and utilization. Your district has some locations with portables, so we have gone ahead and identified those. If it has a red ring around the outside of the dot, it has portables. The second thing to note is that while it may, at face value, appears to have a value statement on it that appears to be good, overutilized or underutilized, it's a little more nuanced than that because there are some schools where student needs are underutilized. But that is not necessarily the case, because the classrooms or open space has been transitioned to better support students with needs, they have at that location.

In conversations with the district, we have overlaid the utilization of the buildings, same numbers you saw on previous map, with the intent of that designation through the Illinois school report card, identifying the schools that are in the bottom performance of the state of Illinois. That is just to show you where there are some underutilized sites that are serving a population of students that may have more needs. We are providing more support in those spaces and that is why you are seeing some underutilized use there. Again, we have broken this do. by the cohorts and the region so you can take a look at where there might be some peaks in some of the utilization. This shows that in our upper schools, some middle and high northeast and northwest are showing some over utilization, as well as the high school in the southeast which would be Jefferson. And then underutilized seeing more of that at the early childhood and elementary.

This is not that atypical, I would say, because of the way you also need to think about how students' transition or do not transition throughout the day. Early childhood and elementary school students stay in their classrooms, whereas in middle and high, we start to see some transition between spaces. Those were utilized in some cases, because people were moving about the building and used it to access it.

The next sheet is around enrollment trends. We have received updated numbers based on student enrollment for this year and updated projections going through '28, '29. What you are seeing here is a breakdown of whether or not there is a gain or loss. You are seeing a breakdown across quadrants.

The next one is data we collected throughout. Kari mentioned we did a sampling of schools. We do not have numbers for every single school in your district. But on this one, it was more of a high-level understanding of the educational suitability which looks at instructional spaces and how well they are supporting teaching and learning. Not necessarily the maintenance issues, per say, but is it right-sized for the furniture and the types of activities that are occurring in there. I see some smiling; we have had a lot of comments about that. Then, what is the security and do the students feel safe? Not necessarily like a security assessment like from a fencing perspective, but more about visibility and logical safety aspects, and then public and support spaces. This would be any of your spaces that could be accessed by the public or used to support general academic needs throughout the day, like gymnasiums, community rooms, if there are those, and a cafeteria as well. So, does it meet the needs of the students, as far as learning needs or playgrounds? We put this on a scale of zero to four. Zero means it was not there, so it could not be accessed. If it is a four, it means it is functioning excellently, typically what we see in a new building. We will be providing a full detailed report for you.

But for the purposes of today, we just wanted to share a little bit around this. We do not have a map, because as I mentioned, we did not survey all of the schools in your district. Over here you can see which areas we actually walked the schools. In some there were two, in some there was one, and in some there were zero. That was for the elementary schools. We only did one early childhood and middle school and then all the high schools.

The last map we have for you is the National Neighborhood Equity Index. This is something your administration shared with us and that has already been shared with your community. This is an index that was developed by UCLA Center for Healthier Children, Families and Communities. It looks at categories across social indicators, educational indicators, and wealth indicators. This is not related to the school buildings themselves, but the census tracts that exist in their district. There is a correlation between the location of your school and the census tract right here. We have broken this down into quintiles, so you can see the gradient here. The higher the percentage, the more vulnerable it is in one or more of those domains. This helps give us context to what the neighborhoods and the students and communities in those specific schools might have challenges with, where the school district and the facilities might be able to enhance the students' variances that positive change.

It is a lot of information. You can dive in a little bit deeper, asking questions, but we wanted to share with you what we do with this information.

Committee Member Psaltis commented that there are a couple of schools in particular where the numbers have shifted pretty drastically in the last couple of years.

Ms. White said they would give out sticky notes and feel free to note those on there.

Ms. White explained what they did with all of the information. There are a few layers to this, on the right-hand side are all the data points related to the maps and information that we will give you. On top of that is all the input, and the program needs, and the vision that gets layered on top to understand where the mix of that is. We know we cannot just use one piece; we cannot just look at the facility condition and say, okay, here's where we're going to invest. We know we have to consider the capacity utilization and the vision we just talked about, related to the programs being academics, athletics, and arts that you are providing in each location, but also

the vision for the future. You do not want to make recommendations that are going to work for today but have not taken into account what needs to happen five years from now.

All of that together feeds into the next step, which will be the different scenarios. We typically look at three different options. If you start with too many, it can be decision paralysis. We start to look at what the different situations are, and if we prioritize things, what does that mean? What does that start to look like across three different options? So, in future meetings we will be bringing you some of that for you to provide constructive feedback and guidance on something we may not be seeing. That ultimately feeds into the recommendations to formulate what goes to the Board.

Committee Member Psaltis commented that she would guess that just for COVID that there is going to be a little surge in population coming up.

Mr. Brown and Mr. Phillips commented that actually was not true. If you look at what our demographers created, our annual enrollment projections are actually down based nationwide on birth rates.

Committee Member Ramirez asked if we were looking at the numbers of incoming immigrants.

Mr. Phillips said they were actually looking into that too.

Committee Member Myelle-Watson wondered if Jefferson's demographic data is accurate since we have a bilingual program that pulls from everywhere. It may not reflect accurately.

Ms. White commented that was a good question and to make note of those things on the sticky notes that will be provided.

Mr. Phillips commented that just as an example of immigrants coming into the area, our English learners have grown by 1,332 students from the 2018/2019 school year to this school year and we are projecting that number to grow.

Ms. White asked the committee to break out into pairs, review the data, and write down their thoughts and ideas so the DLR group can start to prioritize.

Feedback from the committee members included:

Requirements and Utilization

Committee Member Uram asked if we were going to invest in Roosevelt or not, and also the Marshalls' Esser HVAC does not seem to be factored into this as far as requirements.

Committee Member Pope said that the thing that stuck out to their group the most, was that if you overlay the maps, the northwest quadrant of Rockford seems to be the greatest at risk. That seems to be an area we really need to focus our attention on. I know that at the last meeting we talked about having a regional facility, a multipurpose facility that we could use for bilingual, student support and some of those things. That might be an area that we focus on for that strategy.

Committee Member Psaltis talked about how some schools have programs that students from all over the district are dropped into. Can we look at freed up spaces for those programs and also mentioned the portables and how they have become permanent fixtures.

Capacity and Utilization

Board Member Carpenter asked what percentage of students in all the high school are going to those schools because of special programs.

Committee Member Pentenburg commented that looking at all the data overall just prompted a lot more questions than formulating opinions about it while we can identify there are concentrated pockets of certain needs. But I think some of the questions are where are our current facility gaps? I think some of that is related to either overutilization or underutilization. Like Bridget's comment about the manufacturing program at Jefferson, are there other areas that we are seeing essentially that our facilities are not meeting the demand. Which led to where is the interest greater than the supply and where is the supply greater than the demand. How do our facilities accommodate and what does it look like?

Committee Member Uram asked what the tipping point as to how long do you support a portable as to an extension of the building. Auburn has had their module for a very long time.

Mr. Jenson explained that the way you look at a modular is that it is only supposed to be a temporary structure. Many city buildings and municipalities consider you should only be dealing with two years or in that range when you have a modular building. It is supplementary and you need to come up with other items. Any place you are dealing with a modular building, you may as well throw them out and do a building addition or reassign other programs or items. You should only use a modular as a temporary means and normal, from every organization is usually considered the max, but it goes on and on and on.

Committee Member Uram asked if this five-year plan included that as a goal.

Mr. Phillips responded that one of our goals was to address the schools that have the modulares and remove them and to look at the additions and what needs to happen there. They are definitely well past as Scott said. Typically, a modular classroom is supposed to be five years at the most. If you think about our community colleges, they were all modulares with this five-year horizon that lasted twenty to twenty-five years.

Ms. Vanzant commented that your district is not an outlier with having 20-year-old modules.

Mr. Phillips commented on the question Board Member Carpenter had asked, that this will be something coming to Board as part of our annual report. The question was how many students are coming to Auburn. I cannot break it out for CAPA and Gifted, but we have 617 students that actually go to Auburn, so it is about a 34% transfer in rate. We could dive further down into that as to how many are CAPA and how many are gifted, but that's information we are working in parallel with the Master Plan.

Board Member Carpenter asked if some of the CAPA and gifted are from the neighborhood.

Mr. Phillips replied that of the 1,815 students that are attending Auburn, there are 1,198 that reside within the boundaries of Auburn.

Projected Enrollment

Committee Member French said that all high schools are projecting a loss in enrollment, but all middle schools are projecting an increase in enrollment, but that really does not match up with where the kids go.

Ms. White commented that she was not sure if the group had discussions with the demographers or not, but in previous discussions DLR has had with demographers is that you can only project so far out before you are just getting into a guessing game. So, her assumption is that there is a bubble moving through the district. You are seeing it reflected in the middle school here, but if you were to go out another five years, you would probably see that same bubble transitioning to the high schools.

Committee Member Psaltis commented that when looking at the overlaps with the 4-2-1, not sure who will be coming up with the plan, but when looking at where we look at our most intense schools, that there is transportation included, because Stenstrom is a long way.

Neighborhood Equity Index

No input

Ms. White asked if the group was going to prioritize on what was discussed today, is there anything that stood out? Any aha thoughts?

Committee Member Myelle-Watson said the thought that is rolling around in my head is, if the space was repurposed, depending on how things shake out with the 4-2-1, or if Roosevelt moves, then that opens up a nice northwest spot for some other things. I guess in my mind, coming up with a couple plans that shift this stuff around, that's a lot of moving pieces, but that's kind of what we need to do. If this happens, then what moves here, what can we do for these other schools? Then which one is the best one, the A+ in facilities.

Ms. White asked if there was anything else the committee wanted them to take a look at. They are not capturing any new data, but is there something to look at with what they have already gathered?

Committee Member Psaltis commented that they have a couple of special programs that need to roll up. Steam was created several years ago to roll up to high school academies, but there is no middle school. So that is something that can be expanded and an opportunity to grow.

Ms. White said she would collect the questions. There are two community workshops tomorrow evening at Patriots Gateway and Northwest Community Center happening simultaneously. We will give them a high-level overview and ask for their input.

The meeting ended at 6:29 p.m.

Next Steering Committee meeting is Wednesday, February 21, 2024, at 5:00 p.m. in the Administration Building, Room 208.