



**Strategic Facilities Committee Meeting #7
Garrett College
Garrett Information Enterprise Center, Room 109
687 Mosser Road
McHenry, MD 21541**

Minutes of June 20, 2019 Meeting #7 Meeting / Workshop

Facilitator: David Lever

Committee Members Present: Jim Browning
Patrick Damon
Karen DeVore
Tracie Miller
Kevin Null
Carissa Rodeheaver
Bill Swift
Duane Yoder

Dr. Lever called the meeting to order at 8:04 a.m.

I. Introductions

Dr. David Lever, Facilitator, welcomed the committee members.

II. Approval of the Minutes for Meeting No. 5, June 6, 2019

Kevin Null made a motion to accept the minutes and Patrick Damon seconded the motion. The committee unanimously approved the minutes with a yea vote from Jim Browning, Patrick Damon, Karen DeVore, Tracie Miller, Kevin Null, Carissa Rodeheaver, Bill Swift, and Duane Yoder.

III. Planning Options

a. Review of Adequacy Matrix from Planning Objectives workshop

Dr. Lever discussed the Adequacy Matrix that was developed by the committee at the workshop of June 18. The matrix was analyzed by school and by category. He added the values developed by the committee and assigned to the various facility elements on June 18.

Dr. Lever added values to the colored fields, based on the combined adequacy color code and the urgency ranking. For example, if the regular classroom at Accident Elementary rates 5 in terms of educational urgency and is color coded as green (which means that the facility has the educational feature in reasonably good condition and gets 1

Following discussion to correct some of the values from the previous workshop, Dr. Lever showed the results, analyzed by category of educational facility and by school. (The notes below reflect the findings before the corrections were entered into the matrix.)

Dr. Lever also outlined three goals distilled from the discussions:

- A. Address the largest number of the most critical facility deficiencies
- B. Improve the learning environment for the largest number of students
- C. Correct inequities in the quality of facilities

Facility Categories. Dr. Lever stated the largest number of most critical facility deficiencies need to be looked at (Goal A). Those categories with most total points include: Security, Administration, Physical Education, Health Suite, and Science.

Categories with incidence in 5 or more schools were Security, Before and After School, Community Space, Science, and Day Care. Categories with the largest number of red points included Security, Science, Administration, Before and After School, and Community Space. (However, the discussion to correct point allocations recognized that Administration had received an excessive number of points due to its overlap with Security).

In analyzing the critical facility deficiencies, Security and Science had the highest number of total points; occurred in the largest number of schools; and accumulated the largest number of red points. Before and After School programs and Community Space were deficient in five or more schools and accumulated a large number of red points.

Dr. Lever stated that based on the analysis of this data, one policy option would be to target capital funds towards Security as a first priority. Possible other solutions are relocating administrative areas in schools to the entrances to govern visitors. Another consideration is expanding Before and After School programs and Community Space facilities.

School Deficiencies. The second portion of the report looks at improving the learning environment for the largest number of students (Goal B). Dr. Lever shared a report looking at each school, their full time enrollments (FTE), number of red deficiencies, sum of red deficiencies and deficiency points/FTE (a measure of the intensity of the deficiencies as experienced by the students). Analysis of this report shows that Crellin Elementary and Swan Meadow Schools show an exceptionally high level of deficiency points per student. Southern Middle School and Broad Ford Elementary have over 1,000 students between them with a high level of deficiency points per student. Other schools have a higher deficiency point/student score, however, they have fewer impacted students. The policy implication would be to target the critical deficiencies in a few schools that would benefit a large number of students.

Equity. The next report that Dr. Lever shared was called 'Correct Inequities in the Quality of Facilities' (Goal C). This report looked at each of the schools, separating the northern schools from the southern schools. It looked at the educational deficiencies of the schools (number of red items and sum of red counts) and deferred maintenance, looking at total deferred maintenance (without major renovations), cost per square foot, full time enrollments (FTEs), and cost per FTE (again, a measure of intensity). An analysis of this report stated that schools in the south have a larger number of critical educational deficiencies (65 versus 22 in the north). The total sums (points) related to these critical deficiencies is greater as well (1,017 in the south versus 354 in the north). The south also has a larger deferred maintenance backlog, and the deficiencies are more intensive and affect more students. The policy implications would suggest that the SFC committee should recommend that a larger proportion of funds be directed to the southern schools and at the most critical facility conditions.

Committee members wanted to ensure that the classrooms which were not showing up as green on many schools on the chart would be addressed in the process. Another committee member wanted confirmation that deferred maintenance work would not address or change the red ratings. This was confirmed by staff members.

Dr. Lever asked the members to review the matrix, in particular the architectural categories highlighted in yellow (Technology and CTE). The committee members discussed these and other items and followed up with several modifications to the report on each of the facilities. Revisions were made to the report based on discussions of mandates, equity, consistency, and usage of the architectural spaces. Changes included coding, rankings, and names.

Committee members wanted to ensure that the building issues will be included in the process. He stated that they will look at these items when the performance issues will be overlaid with the adequacy architectural items at a later point. Dr. Lever referenced the FEA Study completed in 2013, which includes a Facility Condition Assessment (FCA). The assessment includes a Facility Condition Index (FCI) number for each school. The FCI is an industry standard that measures the condition of the buildings, and each building is given a number based on the findings.

Formula for Facility Condition Index % =
$$\frac{\text{Cost to bring every system in the building up to current standards}}{\text{Current Replacement Value}}$$

That % gives you an idea of the condition of the facilities. For example:

10% - pretty good

65% - building is in trouble and should be considered for replacement or major renovation

FEA also looked at educational components of the schools and provide a graphic overlay of the two scores and the results are very revealing. Based on this information, they developed recommendations which included school closings (which he stated thankfully were not made at that time). Dr. Lever stated that the GCPS deferred maintenance list of February 2018 is not based on an FCA, but on the direct input to Mr. Swift's office from educators, administrators, building managers, and his own staff. Dr. Lever didn't think the committee needed to get a new facility condition assessment report, but thinks the committee may be able to get the information needed from the current maintenance staff and reporting.

After the committee made further revisions to the Adequacy matrix, they could see that the grading/ratings are based on educational impact, which includes the impact on the community.

Dr. Lever asked if the Adequacy matrix could possibly be shared with principals to ensure the information is accurate. However, after further discussion and timing concerns, Dr. Lever recommended that the committee accept the ratings they currently have and go back and revise the consequences from this report. That will give a better idea of where we stand. The next task will be to look at the goals followed by building the formulas for facility conditions.

The next step in the process would be to overlay the deferred maintenance needs with the facilities adequacy matrix to get a better picture of what needs to be done for each of the facilities.

b. Planning Goals

Dr. Lever referred the committee to review the planning goals (see above; a fourth goal, "Improve the efficiency of operations," was added at the following SFC meeting).

1. Address the largest number of the most critical facility deficiencies

This process would look at those facilities with the most issues and the projects would be prioritized within the current project.

2. Improve the learning environment for the largest number of students

This process would look at the facilities with the most students and look at the critical issues that need to be addressed.

3. Correct inequities in the quality of the facilities

The committee could look at all facilities across the board and see where inequities are occurring and find out how to correct the inequities. The matrix clearly showed that inequities exist between the southern and northern schools.

Committee members really wanted to see the costs when reviewing the goals. They also wanted to see the budget opportunities, i.e. what are the possibilities for the school system to get funding (i.e. bonds issued by the County and/or State funding opportunities)? There was discussion on the advantages of closing the current Board office in Oakland and possibly relocating it to the Dennett Road facility; this would save an estimated \$500,000 per year in lease payments, which could be used to support bond issuance for capital projects.

Dr. Lever posed the question, What combination of projects will maximize all three goals? One committee member suggested building a new elementary school on the southern end (large enough for all students) and closing the other schools. The students would have a state-of-the-art facility with enhanced programs. This would address the facility issues as well as inequities in education. Other committee members discussed the inequities on the southern end. Dr. Lever stated the committee needs to look at red categories on the chart and inequities in the quality of facilities.

c. Planning Options Narrative

Dr. Lever shared a summary planning options document with the committee. The broad options include maintaining the current educational facilities configuration, with possible redistricting or no districting; changing the current educational facilities configuration, with possible redistricting or no redistricting; and capital improvements, whether widespread improvements, targeted improvements, or major projects.

The narrative also looked at the general pros, cons, and concerns for each of these options. This document will be very beneficial for the committee to consider in making any recommendations to the Board.

After further discussion by the committee, Dr. Lever added listed the planning options for consideration. Those options including adding Head Start at elementary schools on the southern end, closing the Board office, and grade band configurations. Other options included consolidation and system wide redistricting. The discussions were concerned with providing the most efficient utilization of the schools. After the options were drafted, the next steps would be to put costs behind each of the recommendations. Mr. Yoder noted that rather than posing the question in terms of north and south, it would be better to simply focus on questions of adequacy and equity.

d. COMAR 13A.02.09.01 – “Adoption of Procedures to Govern School Closings”

Dr. Lever shared with the committee members a copy of COMAR 13A.02.09.01 which provides the guidelines that a school board must follow when closing a school. Several factors must be considered before closing a school, and the required procedures include public hearing and adequate notice to parents and guardians.

e. Enrollment Projections

Mr. Joel Gallihue sent preliminary enrollment projections. For each of the individual schools, enrollment is projected to be relatively stable and is not likely to alter the analysis of adequacy discussed earlier. Committee members spoke about new economic development possibilities and concerns that the enrollments don't reflect this.

IV. Discussion

Dr. Lever reminded the members that the preliminary committee reports are due on July 15th. Committee members discussed concerns regarding their current research findings. Dr. Lever stated it is still important to share this information to see if the school system is doing what it should in relation to other school systems in the state or elsewhere.

V. Adjournment

Jim Browning made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Bill Swift seconded the motion. The committee unanimously approved the adjournment of the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 12:57 p.m.