Committee: Facilities
Date and Time: July 15, 2025
Location: Virtual via Zoom
In attendance: B. Wild, E. Dudnik, B. Steinbach, E. Rosenberg, P. Hoyt, S. Dice, M. Messinger, K. Speth, K. Callam, S. Beardsley

Observations from community survey (about school closure/consolidation criteria):

- Discussion of survey satisfaction rate
- Highlights and trends/concerns

Discussion topics, including:

- How to show that equity and finance do not need to be opposed
- How categories/criteria should be listed/presented
- Which metrics would be used to measure whether a certain group is "more heavily impacted"
    - Agreed upon solution: A student is added to the count as impacted if they qualify for any of the categories included in the table. A student can only be counted once.
- How the subcategories within the various categories will be weighted
    - Further action needed
    - Agreed upon solution: Each criteria receives a normalized value that reflects the schools data on the criteria when compared to other data points. This is a value between 1 and 5. Normalized values are averaged to create the category value. Essentially, this system has the criteria contributing evenly to the category score.
- Whether to modify a description under capital expenses
    - Agreed upon solution: Keep descriptor as is
- Student locations — geographical home school v. magnet programming
    - Agreed upon solution: Students are reflected in their attendance boundary using Foster boundaries (where they live) and rolled into attendance boundary school except for King Arts - King Arts students are reflected at King Arts.