

Highland School District #203
Board Work Study Meeting
Highland District Office
May 3, 2016

Board Chair Chris Garent convened the Board Work Study Meeting at 7:05 a.m. Others present were Board Members David Barnes, Matt Barker, Lupita Flores, and Nikki Keller; Superintendent Mark Anderson; TIS Principal Kelly Thorson; and Recording Secretary Julie Notman.

TIS Principal Kelly Thorson presented the names of his nominees for Classified Employee of the Year: Yoanna Rivera-Ramos, and Certificated Employee of the Year: Linda Manske. He described the two nominees and his reasons for choosing them.

Kelly left the meeting at 7:10.

Barb Gilbert, Brian Johnson and Don Strother joined the meeting at 7:10 a.m.

Don described the new Sway method of presenting materials, an upgrade from PowerPoint, in preparation for their **Tech Committee Recommendation, Implementation Timeline Proposal, Budget** presentation. Barb ran the program while Don outlined the timeline, purpose, and goals of the Tech Committee from Fall 2015 to the present and through plans for the summer. He detailed the options they discussed regarding implementing tech upgrades into each building, from their initial meeting through individual research, the new phone system installation, the NCCE conference, observation trips to other schools, the new virtual servers that are being and have been installed, and the updating of programs and purchase of devices for staff and students. Brian described the transition of installing new computers to select staff (admin/teachers) and the ‘trickle down’ of better/newer computers replacing older units (for student use).

Don described the procedure for choosing Microsoft for the school tech platform, Brian followed with information on the tech upgrade at MWC that will happen over this summer and then Barb explained the timeline chart which showed the implementation of the tech upgrade (of equipment) from the current school year through 2019-2020. Brian detailed and answered questions about the estimated tech budget which showed costs for getting started with devices plus the projected estimates for upcoming years: long-term maintenance and replacement costs for 2018-2019 through 2022-2023.

Barb explained what they’d learned at NCCE about using a technology instructional coach in year two or three and described how a staff member in that position would be utilized. They opened the floor and answered questions. It was noted that we most likely won’t use the same devices K-12 as the needs vary in each age level. The Tech Committee will give recommendations so the next step is determining which direction to go and implementing that so it will be successful. Mark described the support we have had and will continue to have from Microsoft.

Barb enthusiastically shared her encounter with a vendor at the NCCE conference which led to her receiving a loan of a 'myON' reading program which is a virtual library with a 10K+ book capacity and is highly customizable for a teacher's assignments, tracking the students' reading, and for each student's reading level, comprehension and testing needs. It is loadable onto any device: ereaders, smart phone, etc. and is accessible via the internet. The intent is to get books into the hands of all students with each student having his/her own log-on so they can access myON at home or via school-loaned ereaders. She emphasized the benefit for those students that don't get to attend summer school to have book access. The program costs \$6600 for two buildings (MWC & TIS).

Brian left the meeting at 7:16 a.m.

Employees of the Year: Barb described her nominees for Classified Employee of the Year David Rose and Certificated Employee of the Year Teresa Long. She gave her reasons for choosing these two deserving employees then left the meeting at 7:49 a.m.

Don talked about the HHS and HJH nominees for Certificated Employee of the Year: Marv Stewart, HHS and Gary Packard, HJH and then the Classified Employee of the Year nominees for HHS: Sheri Rossow and HJH Irma Dorantes. He had much to say about their qualities and deservedness for the award.

Don left the meeting at 7:54 a.m.

Mindy Schultz, MWC Principal, joined the meeting at 7:54 a.m. She described her nominees for Certificated Employee of the Year: Colleen Christenson and Classified Employee of the Year: Marcela Castellanos. Mindy described each person's qualities and how they enhance the atmosphere benefitting both staff and students at MWC.

Mindy left the meeting at 7:57 a.m.

After a discussion of the merits of each of the nominees the board made the difficult decision and chose Linda Manske for Certificated Employee of the Year and David Rose as Classified Employee of the Year. It was suggested and agreed that it would be nice for the board to send a congratulations letter to the winners about a week prior to graduation to inform them of the honor so they can plan to attend and be present for the award.

Mark presented the **Healthy Kids-Healthy Schools Grant** which was awarded to HHS, HJH and TIS for \$183,466 and described how the grant money is designated to be used.

HEA/PSE Negotiations Update: Mark informed the board that HEA wants to wait until June to meet, with a second meeting in August. He said they will operate under their existing contract until a new contract is agreed upon. PSE prefers to wait until HEA is settled so there won't be a meeting with that negotiations team until later.

Mark gave the **Legal Update.**

Howard Brooks, Danny Wise, Mark Williams, Carla Borland and Francis Badu entered the meeting at 8:17 a.m.

Mark Williams described the maintenance shop and its functions including irrigation, welding, and bus repair. He explained that bus parts are not sold in local stores but must be ordered so he keeps a supply on hand so buses can be fixed and returned to service without delay. Bus breakdowns are a daily occurrence. May 12 is the state inspection and he invited the board to attend. The WA State Patrol conducts the inspection on-site and inspects 100% of the fleet (10% at the fall inspection), holding them to a very high standard. He noted that they notice how well the fleet is maintained. They can 'red-tag' a bus putting it out-of-service for any safety infraction. Most of the time Mark can make the repair or modification and have the bus re-inspected while the patrolman/inspector is still on-site and get the bus back in-service immediately. This would not be the case if we contracted with Mobile Fleet since they wouldn't be on-site during the inspection plus they do maintenance but not necessarily the specialty parts of a bus. A bus might be out of service for a few days. We have 13 buses and each one is in the shop every two weeks for inspection and maintenance. Danny described a few examples that have occurred recently with buses which would result in their being out-of-service and unavailable if repairs were done with Mobile Fleet resulting in the district's inability to provide service to the students. Mark W. pointed out the cost savings of his hourly wage vs. that of 'for profit' shops. He also noted that Mobile Fleet doesn't do seat covers and wouldn't be likely to have on hand the parts needed to repair a bus in a timely manner. Some route buses require weekly adjustment to their brakes. Matt acknowledged the importance of the work that is done by the operations staff and explained how the bond failed last year when a bus barn and track upgrade were on it and passed after they were removed.

Nikki inquired about conditions when the buses were maintained in the old bus shop. Mark W. and Danny described how they managed such as rolling under the bus on a [creeper] to get from one side to the other.

Chris repeated the results of last year's failed and successful bond attempts and noted that they want to provide a new maintenance facility. It was noted that the vote could have been swayed by nostalgia for the old Ag building since remodeling it (in the bond language) passed but building a new CTE building didn't.

The funds that are available to build a new maintenance shop were discussed.

Nikki explained the board's concern about community perception with putting up a new maintenance shop before the CTE remodel is finished.

Howard acknowledged that they are willing to work with the board to a solution. He noted that he can do about 70% of his work strictly from his van for the four areas he maintains in the district but three to four storage units will be needed to cover current storage needs. The old bus building could be used if remodeled.

It was noted that the crew also works on the mowers and the food vans, which are old.

Carla asked if the district could find out what other districts paid for using Mobile Fleet and suggested holding a public meeting to present the problem to the community. She noted that she operates on a shoestring to stay within budget.

David mentioned the concern of passing the next bond if they don't accomplish what was detailed with the current bond particularly due to perceptions of failure to fulfil previous bond intentions.

It was noted that the HHS roof repair came in under budget but that MWC estimates are over the initial amounts but those two cancel each other out.

Carla again mentioned a public meeting noting that the money spent on Mobile Fleet for a year cannot be replaced and the public will be upset with that loss.

Matt reiterated that building the maintenance shop before the CTE remodel is a ‘cart before the horse’ situation.

Nikki mentioned that the board thought that since there are so many open buildings in the area that one of those would work out as an off-site, but local, shop. The CTE/Ag shop construction won’t begin until 2017 so everything will remain as is for another year.

Howard noted that the district keeps patching things up and not building quality, from scratch.

Chris noted how government work costs 4x what a private citizen would expect to pay.

Matt encouraged the staff to make do for now until the new building can be built.

It was agreed that everyone wants a maintenance shop on-site that is of adequate size and usability. The goal is to stay in budget, meet the obligations of the bond. It will be difficult in the short term but worthwhile in the long term. The old bus barn should be remodeled with the least expense possible. It will be used as a temporary maintenance shop for all needs until the new maintenance shop is built and then for some storage and maintenance of the smaller rigs (mowers etc., desk repair/welding) after.

There was some further discussion about remodeling the old bus barn to make it serviceable, fencing to cut down on vandalism and long term goals for the district.

Carla left the meeting at 9:20.

Chris acknowledged that the operations crew does good work and thanked them for coming today.

Howard, Danny, and Mark Williams left the meeting at 9:22 a.m.

Mark Anderson gave the **Staffing Update** explaining about the goal of having a K-6 Intervention Specialist rather than one at MWC and one at TIS. Margaret Lane took the open 2nd grade position at MWC which still leaves the Kindergarten and 4th Grade ELA positions unfilled.

The board had further discussion regarding the maintenance shop and it was agreed that a contract with Mobile Fleet was no longer a consideration. They then discussed building a smaller maintenance building that can be added onto as funds become available and for now, putting money into the old bus shop for temporary and long-term use. Francis mentioned that for consideration of the options, he has spoken with Mobile Fleet and they gave assurance of being timely with maintenance but warned that there would be times that a bus could be delayed for a few days due to their schedule. He noted that Mobile Fleet contracts with only the Tribal school (all other districts have on-site maintenance shops). They are creating an estimate for our consideration. Having a bus delayed at Mobile Fleet would require a ‘Plan B’ if we were in a situation of being short of buses. It was asked if we should buy another bus or car. Francis noted that we buy buses when we have the funds for them and expect to be ordering a new one in August. A new 12 passenger van has been ordered and the plan is to have a second one by the end of the year. It was noted that old/retired vehicles should be kept and maintained for back-up and not sold off, but is it cost effective? Chris thinks it is better to make an on-site facility.

There was an extended circular discussion about options for remodeling the old bus barn to make it usable in the short-term for bus/vehicle and district maintenance and long-term for just district maintenance (mowers/desks/building storage etc.). Items considered included the position of existing beams, heat retention using a curtain, shelving needs for storage, length of buses and how to accommodate them with an awning or other addition/extension. Mark noted that the board must consider requirements for meeting minimum standards for providing a safe work environment.

It was reviewed that the initial \$150k estimate for a maintenance shop was misleading as it was for only the building and didn't include site or interior work needed to make a serviceable space. Final estimates were much higher (3-4x) as they included all aspects of creating the new shop. It was agreed to look into options utilizing the local drafting business.

Francis spoke of a conversation he had with Pacific Mobile regarding portables and repositioning them. They could potentially be pushed to be available this summer. He noted that state auditors have finished their review and will come back only for the exit interview. He doesn't expect any issues.

Cost Estimate Scenario for Bond CTE Renovation: Francis referred to the chart detailing the estimated costs for each possible size of remodel/new construction of the CTE/Ag shop. The exact plan for the space must be determined. There was much discussion about the different size options and related costs and how that affects the contingency funds. It was noted that the art department teacher supplied definite and detailed plans for how to use the new space but the Ag department teacher was less prepared, also that the space must be large enough to accommodate both departments with individual and shared spaces. Chris suggested bringing in a portable for classrooms next to the upgraded CTE building in lieu of creating classroom space/more square footage in the building. Portables last 15-20 years so this was deemed a poor use of funds.

There was a quick review of the **AE Fee Schedule and CTE Fee Proposal** attachments.

At 10:35 a.m. the board, Mark and Francis went out to the bus barn/future CTE building with Ryan Monson for a walk-through and discussion about remodel options and costs.

Back in at 10:58 a.m. with Ryan Monson. Ryan handed out a rough draft of a floor plan of the CTE space and reminded the board about his idea of adding art to the CTE space to be able to create two classrooms in the old art room. Matt noted that the rough draft looked more like individual spaces and didn't show how common space would be used. Ryan noted that this is a very preliminary draft and that consideration must be taken regarding explosive and sensitive materials such as dust, or glass bits in a kiln and that certain areas must be separated due to risk factors. It was agreed that the spaces must be considered for optimal and maximum use throughout each day. Ryan noted that classrooms and specialty spaces are generally built with program rather than specific staff members in mind. There followed much discussion about the space with ideas and options for best use with references to the school site visits made and how those schools utilize their space. Mark summarized that they need to determine the desired square footage and how best to use it. He'll meet with HHS

Principal Brandon Jensen and future, potential, CTE teacher Gary Packard for more discussion about what classes will be offered.

Ryan explained that the initial design/floor plan is easier to construct with the traditional classrooms in the existing building and tech in the addition.

C: Should put in 2 classrooms but 6000 sf too small. Don't want to start the project and run out of money. The costs are not detailed and don't take into consideration utilizing the existing building.

M: would like to know the needs for the space before making such a big decision.

MA: mtg w/ GP and will have more info after Weds.

C: wants to give them a budget and a wish list and have architect design w/in those limits.

D: asked for 2 estimates: what can be done for \$2.2 mil and for \$1.9 mil

RM: noted that he has already designed the space and creating new plans will take time & \$.

N: pointed out that the roof is done, MWC and tech upgrades are underway: we already know those costs so we should go with \$2.25 million as planned. The roof coming in under budget was nice but the other cost overruns are concerning.

N/M/L/D all agreed on \$2.25 million total project cost.

C: thinks they should plan for lower, leaving more room for contingencies.

Ryan explained the state fee (consulting/architect/oversight) guidelines. After approval he goes to his consultants and will reduce the fee (12.5%) if work is not as intensive as anticipated. Nikki asked how often that has happened: not often. Chris offered him 10%.

Ryan noted that the fees on the roof project were reduced. This was not explained earlier, it was just known that the overall cost came in under budget.

The timeline was explained: 7-8 months in the design phase, then 8-9 months construction.

Construction could possibly start next winter but we need to consider what will be done with the maintenance shop if we have a mid-winter start.

Ryan noted that costs are lower when there is a repetitive design such as 10 classrooms: design one classroom then build 10 of them. Our design needs are not repetitive.

Ryan left the meeting at 11:50 a.m.

The board continued the discussion about the CTE building and agreed they want art in it. They discussed the higher than anticipated estimates for the MWC electrical/tech upgrade, some of which are the design fees. Mark and Francis will continue a discussion with Ryan about fees and what is covered.

Julie left the meeting at 11:55 a.m.

Superintendent Evaluation: board discussed with Mark.

Meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m.

Chair

Secretary