

**Minutes of Special Meeting of the Aurora City Schools Board of Education of  
November 19, 2024**

The meeting was held at the Aurora City Schools Conference Center,  
119 West Pioneer Trail, Aurora, Ohio

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 pm.

All Board Members were present.

**Discussion Items:**

**1. ASCD Renewal Levy Schedule**

Mr. Volosin presented the district’s renewal levy schedule:

| Mills/Type          | 2019 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 |
|---------------------|------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 1.5 Mill P.I.       | P    |    |    |    |    | P  |    |    |    |    | X  |    |    |    |
| 5.61 Mill Operating |      | P  |    |    |    |    | X  |    |    |    |    | X  |    |    |
| 7.33 Mill Operating |      |    |    | P  |    |    |    |    | X  |    |    |    |    | X  |

Mr. Volosin recommended that the 5.61 mill operating levy be placed on the May 2025 election ballot. The resolution of necessity to renew the levy would be on the regular December 2024 Board Meeting agenda for approval and the resolution to proceed would be on the regular January 2025 Board Meeting agenda for approval. Mr. Acomb noted that a renewal levy would mean no new taxes for the community.

**2. Bond Issue**

Elissa Katz, Citizens Committee for Quality Schools Co-Chair, reported to the Board regarding the levy campaign. Elissa reported that the 3 top reasons as to why people voted “No” were:

1. Cost and Financial Concerns
2. Perceived Lack of Need and Understanding of Current Conditions
3. Concerns Over Project Scope and Design Choices

Ms. Katz said that recommended next steps if a bond issue was to be placed on the ballot would include:

1. Engage Community from the Start
2. Gather Feedback and Insights to Start to Rebuild Trust
3. Identify and Prioritize Issues and Challenges
4. Emphasize Transparency with Data and Evidence
5. Strengthen School, School Board and City Advocacy and Communication

Mr. Acomb stated that at times the needs of the Schools and the City get confused by the public.

Mrs. Mehallis asked how the reasons for people voting “No” were found out. Ms. Katz said it was through a combination of people communicating with her through emails, conversation, etc.

Mrs. Klich and Mrs. Schneider commented on the importance of communication.

Mr. Roberto presented and discussed the positives and negatives of four options regarding the district’s facilities:

**Option 1: Put a Similar Bond Issue on the Ballot**

Positive

- Addresses aging infrastructure and capacity concerns

- Long-term investment that would not require going back to the voters
- Takes ACSD to the next level with infrastructure matching Academics, Athletics, & Arts

Negative

- It will still be expensive and likely more expensive
- There is no pool, big auditorium, location
- 57% “No” in today’s current economic times is a strong statement
- Could experience a “No” campaign if repeat a similar request
- Very comprehensive but made it complicated as well

**Option 2 - Elementary School**

Positive

- Immediate concerns for Craddock (aging infrastructure) addressed
- K-5 capacity concerns addressed
- Relatively Cheaper
- Potential to add a bus garage or other items like a pool

Negative

- Doesn’t provide a plan for the long run and will cause us to go back to the voters
- No students currently attending our K-12 buildings would attend this school (concerns for parents willing to support)
- Location concerns between High School & Middle School
- Change of location would require the purchase of property and cause the school to be off campus (no available land next to campus)
- The addition of a bus garage or other items like a pool would increase the cost
- Cost of pool has enduring costs in terms of operation and maintenance
- If looked at current location of Craddock, would have no room for parking or playground while constructing new school - not recommended

**Option 3 – Additions to Buildings**

Positive

- It would be relatively cheaper
- There would be room to add if you added a little at each building
- Multiple options ex. We could add to Harmon and move 5th over to Harmon and have four grades at Leighton, Harmon, and AHS

Negative

- Additions would be clunky
- Playground, cafeteria, parking/traffic issues would arise
- Four grades at Leighton & Harmon come with concerns for lunchtime/recess
- Might not have ideal grade configuration/combinations

**Option 4 - Punt and Patch/Ala Cart**

Positive

- This is the cheapest
- Can be done in stages
- Addresses immediate need
- Most Timely
- Could go for a Permanent Improvement (PI) instead of bond issue
- Could fix up the bottom of the CC to use for Board Office Space to create space at Craddock and potentially Leighton (Special Services)

Negative

- Would need to ask for funds to complete ala cart items
- Would need to keep and maintain Craddock
- This will take a while to get caught up in all five buildings
- If this is an option, we will need to get a master list together

Mr. Roberto also discussed the role of TDA regarding the above options. TDA would be needed in each of the first three options. If the district would decide to proceed with Option 4, a \$40,000 payment would be owed to TDA for the work they did on the bond levy.

Mr. Roberto and the Board discussed potential next steps:

- Start engaging community and city now
- Reach other 70% not connected to the school
- Punt and Patch projects with costs (prioritized list)
- Critical to pause, focus on Renewal Levy - first priority**
- More time to examine project and engagement with community/city
- Next possible window with no levies is '26
- Clarification of what's possible on Craddock property (TDA)
- Exploration of property and cost of purchase - Rt 43, Aurora Hudson Rd, Mantua  
Grain per Mr. Sabulsky's suggestion
- Explore communication strategies with community as well - ongoing, subscribe to newsletter or Final Form access

**24-232**

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 pm.

Moved by: Mr. Sabulsky

Seconded by: Mr. Acomb

Roll Call Vote:

Yes: Mr. Acomb, Mrs. Mehallis,

Mr. Sabulsky, Mrs. Schneider,

Mrs. Klich

No: None: motion carried

---

Board President

---

Treasurer