



**Strategic Facilities Committee Meeting #3  
Northern Middle School Cafeteria  
Minutes of May 7, 2019**

Facilitator: David Lever

Committee Members Present: Crystal Boal  
James Browning

Patrick Damon  
Karen DeVore  
Tracie Miller  
Kevin Null  
Carissa Rodeheaver  
Nathan Sorber  
Bill Swift  
Richard Wesolowski  
Duane Yoder

Guests/Speakers: Chuck Trautwein, Resource Teacher  
Joel Gallihue, AICP, consultant to the Facilitator for student enrollments

Dr. Lever called the meeting to order at 4:30 a.m.

**I. Introductions**

---

The Committee members were introduced to the two speakers, Mr. Chuck Trautwein and Mr. Joel Gallihue.

**II. Approval of the Minutes for Meeting No. 2, April 25, 2019**

---

Kevin Null made a motion to approve the minutes and Tracie Miller seconded the motion. The committee unanimously approved the minutes with a yea vote from Crystal Boal, James Browning, Patrick Damon, Karen DeVore, Tracie Miller, Kevin Null, Carissa Rodeheaver, Nathan Sorber, Bill Swift, Richard Wesolowski, and Duane Yoder.

**III. Google Docs**

---

Chuck Trautwein, Resource Teacher for GCPS, provided an overview of Google Docs for the committee. He showed members how to add a document in Google Docs similar to Microsoft Word by selecting Docs and selecting a blank template. He also showed the members how to title the document and how to create a table within the document. He stated there are other similar Microsoft Office applications including Sheets which is similar to Microsoft Excel. He stated that Google Docs provides a great collaboration tool where staff can view and edit the

same document before it is finalized. He demonstrated this by sharing a document with a committee member. He also showed the members how they can view any changes to the document (by the committee members in the shared document) by selecting “Version History”. Dr. Lever stated that the committee will utilize this tool to collaborate on documents during the edit stage. Once the documents are finalized and approved, they will go to the public.

Chuck stated that the committee members may reach out to him at any time if they need assistance with using GoogleDocs. He can be reached at 301-334-8909 or [chuck.trautwein@garrettcountyschools.org](mailto:chuck.trautwein@garrettcountyschools.org)

#### **IV. Proposed Committee Work Plan**

---

Dr. Lever shared an updated schedule of planning events for the committee. He spoke about the summer schedule and confirmed the May 23, 2019 meeting would be held via teleconference call from 1:00 – 2:30 p.m. Committee members will receive the call in information and any documents in advance of the meeting. The following teleconference meetings in June, July and August would be scheduled via a doodle poll with the best date and time. He reminded the members that the two planning objective workshops are scheduled for June 18<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> at Garrett College.

#### **V. Research Subcommittees: Topics and Membership**

---

Dr. Lever discussed the research topics and the composition of the subcommittees. The draft proposed research topics included:

- Grade Configurations
- Online Distance Learning
- Alternative Education (Disruptive Behaviors)
- Redistricting
- Single High School
- Career Technical Education (CTE): Standalone versus Comprehensive High School Setting

Dr. Lever stated that since redistricting is likely to be included among the planning options the committee will discuss, there was no need for a separate research committee on this subject. The committee requested that another research topic be added to include community based schools. This topic would stress the importance of rural schools to the community.

Committee members reiterated that the CTE: standalone vs comprehensive high school is a critical discussion for the committee. They stated technical skills are necessary for the students and should be incorporated in the curriculum due to their importance to the community and to local employers. This topic would be included with the single high school research topic.

The members also discussed the importance of online and satellite courses for the high school students to ensure students are offered more courses. However, it was also felt that this did not warrant a separate subcommittee effort at this time, but that the topic would be covered as the research proceeds on the other topics. It was agreed that this topic should be discussed with Garrett College, but that it also raises issues of equity in the access students have to information technology systems.

One committee member inquired about the student to teacher ratio at elementary schools which she wanted to ensure would be looked at by the committee. Dr. Lever stated that this topic would be incorporated in the equity discussions which would be part of the June 18<sup>th</sup> Planning Objectives Workshop.

After further discussion, the research topics included the following topics and composition of the committee members.

<b>Research Topic</b>	<b>Sub Committee Members</b>
Grade Configurations	Karen DeVore, Carissa Rodeheaver
Alternative Education	Crystal Boal, Tracie Miller, Jennifer Paugh, William Smith
Single High School and CTE: Standalone vs. Comprehensive High School Setting	Patrick Damon, Kevin Null, Richard Wesolowski
Community Schools	Nathan Sorber, Duane Yoder, Jim Browning

The subcommittees’ findings will be data based and research driven. The subcommittees will report back to the committee their findings.

## **VI. Reports**

---

Dr. Lever shared several reports with the committee members:

**a. Report to Board of Education (draft)**

This report will be given to the Board to provide them an update on the progress of the Strategic Facilities Committee Work. He stated this is a sample format for his monthly reports to the Board.

**b. School Tours: Observations**

This report provides Dr. Lever’s facility notes regarding tours of each of the schools. He stated this is not the same as a Facility Condition Assessment report, which would involve a team of architects and engineers and would require testing building components and systems. It is more of a direct observation, review and gauge of the buildings after walking through the facilities and speaking with the building administrators. This report may be looked at a later point and a teacher or staff member may come in to speak to the committee regarding their facilities as well.

**c. Capital Projects List**

The report provides a list of capital projects for each school. Dr. Lever stated the projects were derived from discussions with educational and administrative staff when he toured each of the buildings and spoke with members of the facilities department, joined to the deferred maintenance list that Mr. Swift developed in February 2018. This list was developed using inputs from school custodians, the central office maintenance team, and other managers in the Facilities department. Items on the report are not shown in priority order and the list is not intended to take the place of a Facilities Condition Assessment (FCA). The list of deferred maintenance items and their costs will need to be updated.

**d. Educational Facilities Summary (Revised)**

This report provides several facts about the schools including the age, date when renovated, square footages, state rated capacity, etc. This report was shared at the April 25<sup>th</sup> workshop but was revised to include Yough Glades School.

**e. FY 2018 Unrestricted Per Square Foot Expense Analysis**

Based on the requests at the April workshop to see fixed annual charges for each of the schools, this report was provided to the committee. This report provides the expenses (direct and indirect) for each of the facilities including Hickory, Dennett Road and Central Office.

## **VII. Enrollment Projections**

---

Joel Gallihue, facility planner, spoke to the committee regarding how the State calculates enrollment projections for each school system. He stated that the State provides the enrollment projections each year to each county superintendent. The projections are system wide (not school specific) and are based on historic trends and population projections including projected births. This is a standard methodology, called the cohort survival method.

He stated that the State looks at trends of students as they move through the school system. This methodology is based on the historical data for each school system and the number of children enrolled in public schools by grade. For these projections, historical school enrollment data and trends are analyzed. Development trends are included in the historical data. Judgment is involved in developing the projections, for example in determining whether a jump in enrollment is due to a one-time event or represents the beginning of a trend.

Grade to Grade Cohort Survival Ratios are district level enrollment projections which are set based on statistical estimates. A cohort survival ratio is the proportion of students enrolled in one grade in a specific school year (e.g., 4<sup>th</sup> grade for the 2016-17 school year) relative to the number of students enrolled in the next grade level and school year (e.g., 5<sup>th</sup> grade in the 2017-18 school year). Cohort Survival ratios have been a very effective method of estimating projections for subsequent school years and have been very close to the actual enrollment counts. Mr. Gallihue stated that any demographer is trying to be accurate but that the projections cannot be exact.

The cohort survival rates get adjusted based on the development model. i.e. if a new subdivision or new housing is available, student enrollment growth would be reflected in the projections. If housing starts are declining, the opposite trends would be considered. The projections also account for changes in educational policy, for example full day kindergarten in 2007. Also if a daycare is added to a school, the Pre-kindergarten enrollment could be increased.

He stated that if a business with a large workforce (i.e. Verso/Luke paper mill) is closing, this could adversely affect the enrollment projections.

He stated that Garrett County has a small population and is homogenous, which means it has little variation in its populations. Larger populations elsewhere in the state are more heterogeneous due to higher costs of living, the number of people migrating in and out, changes in housing, etc.

## **VIII. Adjournment**

---

Patrick Damon made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Richard Wesolowski seconded the motion. The committee unanimously approved the adjournment of the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5:38 p.m. It was followed by a tour of Northern Middle School and then by Community Listening Session No. 1 in the school gymnasium.