

**August 26, 2013 Regular Board Meeting**  
**7:00 pm – Board Room**  
**131 W. Nittany Avenue**  
**State College, PA 16801**

**I. CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Penni Fishbaine, board president, called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. She welcomed and thanked all in attendance and those viewing from home. Ms. Fishbaine announced the Board had an executive session August 12 on legal and personnel matters and also held a Board Retreat on August 25, 2013. This meeting will be adjourned to an executive session on legal and personnel matters. With the agenda before them, she asked board members if anyone had any changes; there were no changes.

A copy of all materials distributed to board members for discussion and/or action is included with the official minutes, unless otherwise indicated.

Board members present: Amber Concepcion, Penni Fishbaine, David Hutchinson, Jim Leous, Ann McGlaughlin, Jim Pawelczyk, Gowen Roper, Dorothea Stahl, Laurel Zydney (arrived 7:06 p.m.)

Board members absent:

Board Secretary: Mary Jenn Dorman

Solicitor: Scott Etter

Superintendent: Robert O'Donnell

District Personnel: Randy Brown, Scott DeShong, Linda Eggebeen, Sandy Emerich, Michael Hardy, Amy Lawrence, Tod McPherson, Julie Miller, Jason Perrin, Ed Poprik, Wilda Stanfield, Donna Watson

Guests: John Beddia, Scott Fozard, David Gamsen, Julie Gittings, Mark Higgins, David Hunter, Rebecca Misangyi, Jeff Straub, Michael Vind, Amy Yurko

**II. COMMUNICATIONS**

Dr. O'Donnell noted that tomorrow was the first day of school and that the kindergarten class would be the graduating class of 2026. His youngest child is part of this crew coming through.

He noted the district had a Safety and Security audit and changes suggested would be operational for the first day of school. Even though the first day of classes is tomorrow, many fall activities and extra-curriculars have already begun.

Memorial Field bleachers will be ready for the September 6 football game. The home side is already complete and the facility will be able to be used this fall for the various sports teams.

**III. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Ms. Fishbaine noted that each individual would be limited to comments of five (5) minutes as time permits for items on this agenda or related to Board business. The following audience member addressed the board:

--James Graef spoke on Concept D for the high school noting that this was the best option. Many students would be frustrated with the bridge and he feels that the high school on one side of the street is the best option.

**IV. ROUTINE APPROVALS**

A motion to approve the listing of Routine Approvals as presented.

-August 12, 2013 Board Meeting Minutes and August 15, 2013 Communications Subcommittee Notes

-Overnight/Out-of-State Student Travel

-Nonresident Student Waived Tuition for 2013-14 school year per Policy 202

-Nonresident Tuition-Paying Student for 2013-14 school year

-Annual re-approval of Technical Assistant Program in the CTC Program for the 2013-2014 school year as presented.

-School district and contracted bus drivers for 2013-2014 school year

-Annual listing of regular bus routes/schedules for 2013-2014 - listing of schedules can be viewed on the district [website](#)

- Change Order #3 for Memorial Field Project in an amount not to exceed \$37,000 to Mid-State Construction, Inc.
- Change Order #1 for Radio Park Asbestos Project in an amount not to exceed \$1,700.78 to Penn Installations
- Human Resource Recommendations (please refer to attachment IV-H)

Ms. McGlaughlin moved and Dr. Pawelczyk seconded to approve the Routine Approvals as presented. There was no discussion. All board members present voted aye on a roll call vote.

#### **V. STUDENT REQUESTS to ATTEND CPI for 2013-2014 SCHOOL YEAR**

A motion to approve the student requests to attend CPI for programs not offered at the district CTC Program for 2013-2014 school year. Ms. Stahl moved and Dr. Roper seconded to approve the motion. There was no discussion. All board members present voted aye on a roll call vote.

#### **VI. TEACHER EVALUATION & DIFFERENTIATED SUPERVISION PLAN**

A motion to approve the Teacher Evaluation & Differentiated Supervision Plan as presented. Mr. Leous moved and Dr. Roper seconded to approve the motion as presented. Board member questioned how this would be implemented. Ms. Bauer responded that the year one model would not change areas that they are working on but will change observations and performance. Tenure teachers have two observations/year and non-tenure teachers have four observations/year. The Plan has options and 85% of the score is the Plan and 15% of the score is the school performance profile. Next year it will ramp up for teacher specific data.

With the motion and second above to approve the motion, all board members present voted aye on a roll call vote.

#### **VII. REJECT BIDS for DEVELOPMENT/FUNDRAISING**

A motion to reject bids received for Development/Fundraising. Ms. Concepcion moved and Ms. McGlaughlin seconded the motion. Board members discussed: some confusion, what was needed that the district did not have to make the selection, the issue warrants more discussion, and vote the motion and then discuss. With the motion and second above to reject bids received for Development/Fundraising, all board members present voted aye on a roll call vote.

Mr. Brown discussed that there are two key elements of development:

- Internal development officer role - donors and friends of the school
- Capital Campaign - advertise to reach widely and usually is outsourced

In reading the RFP, it was more outsource and not dealing with the first part. It is realized that we have names and Dr. O'Donnell noted that we could come back with an update. Board members discussed: Look at lack of understanding the RFP resulted, need to be much more specific for the outsource, develop local resources, what we need for assistance, need to think about a deadline and not let time get away, learned something and keep moving forward, the sooner we move we can get some development going, and others agreed on the sooner the better.

#### **VIII. BID AWARD for BOX TRUCK**

A motion to approve the Box Truck bid award to low bidder Lake Ford in an amount not to exceed \$32,650 as presented. Ms. Stahl moved and Dr. Pawelczyk seconded to approve the motion. There was no discussion. All board members present voted aye on a roll call vote.

#### **IX. BID AWARD for FAIRMOUNT AVE DOOR/WINDOW REPLACEMENT**

A motion to approve the bid award for Fairmount Avenue door and window replacement to low bidder, Haas Building Solutions, in an amount not to exceed \$33,500 as presented. Dr. Pawelczyk moved and Dr. Roper seconded to approve the motion. There was no discussion. All board members present voted aye on a roll call vote.

**X. DISTRICT GOAL CATEGORY: FACILITIES - HIGH SCHOOL PROJECT**

Dr. O'Donnell reviewed the goals for this evening and noted that the Educational Model and the Educational Specifications are related. The Model and Ed Specs relates to the design parameter for the project. Adding anything will change the numbers and likewise with subtracting something, numbers would change. He noted four key dates:

- September 9 - Regular Meeting to downselect to one option
- September 11 - Community Forum, 7:00 p.m., High School South Auditorium
- September 16 - Work Session to discuss the Educational Model and Educational Specifications
- September 23 - Regular Meeting

**Proposed Education Model**

Mr. DeShong provided an overview on what would happen when the students walked in for the first day of class tomorrow:

- Currently the school runs on a department structure
- CTC has classes in both North and South buildings
- Students only see that teacher while in class - each class 47 minutes with 8 periods/day
- Teachers teach five sections/day and see approximately 120 students/day
- Departments meet once a month and cross-curricular happens informally

Mr. DeShong spoke on specifics of work that has been done since he last shared information in June, reviewed the four pillars - common themes, and the guiding principles that started with all students and teachers for input. There are eleven guiding principles and as work continued, six common themes were noted. He shared information gathered from the five school visits with similar demographics and size and by the end of June recommended a 9th grade academy and grades 10-12 have learning communities. They have continued to look at models and student course choice.

The 9th grade academy will focus on the relationship piece, not teams, collaboration time, curricular choice, not taking options off the table, and transition and mentoring. Looking at the 2018 school year - a seminar class needs to be developed, students will see core subject teachers more than once/day (core team of teachers - Math, English, Science, and Social Studies), have same classes in same area, and provided a 9th grade schedule sample.

The upper classmen in five years will be in learning communities - more of an informal place, internships and externships availabilities, electives within the learning community, focus on teachers knowing students, graduation requirements, schedule sample, the CTC programs and learning communities, and measuring progress and academic performance.

Board members discussed: how to look at getting from here to opening in five years, specific 9th grade piece, could be put in place before the new facility, how a new facility would help, better for more interaction and collaboration, model should see its full potential, how Learning Enrichment would be affected, seems like each student could experience LE and that does not happen now, exciting stuff and new opportunities all over, flexibility with freedom to choose, is four learning communities enough, not being rigid with set number of students, ways to provide and encourage leadership opportunities, students getting guidance without even knowing, the number of teachers, students and sections, likes the idea of common space, meeting all students' needs, how is this different than back in 2007/08, built around pillars and guiding principles and what is agreed upon for teaching, learning, and expansive program opportunities, like the theme of choice, and the ultimate goal is to get our students college and career ready.

Board members had a break 8:55 to 9:05 p.m.

### **Proposed Educational Specifications**

Amy Yurko reviewed a planning diagram, explained that the building design is for flexibility but needs to fit and align for day one and be able to change over time. She pointed out common areas, the main entry, circulation and traffic flows, taking the 2007 Ed Specs and updating them, worked with teachers for feedback, and Delta will be part of this but has not been included yet.

Board members discussed: Learning suite and shared space, number of students, and square foot per student has gone up. Mr. Poprik explained three factors: 1) classroom utilization, 2) grossing factor - amount of space beyond the classroom, and 3) spaces that are non-classroom spaces.

Board commented on: Difference in length of hallways, natural daylight, the higher the utilization rate the less sq. ft. needed, utilization rate involves teachers and students - not just one or the other, do we need two main offices/network closets/advising areas/etc., more sq. ft. in Concept B than Concept D, and spaces shown can provide a lot of flexibility. Dr. O'Donnell noted that going forward, Crabtree Rohrbaugh Associates will pick up the work that Ms. Yurko has done and he thanked her for coming back East to work with us on this project.

### **Updated Project Calendars: Referendum Options**

John Beddia summarized the key differences from the five documents that were provided for comparing scheduling issues related to the High School Concepts and the referendum timing. February Referendum Timeframe:

- Bidding earlier in the Spring - an advantage for competition
- Gaining several month of construction prior to students attending
- Have a good 9 to 10 months in prior to winter
- Provides an earlier completion date for both Concepts

May Referendum Timeframe:

- Does not incur the cost of a special election
- This has already been previously publicized

Mr. Beddia spoke on Concept B vs. Concept D in the February and May Scenarios looking at the start, middle, and end of the project and where it puts you at the end, and the calendar year not matching up with the school years.

Board members discussed: The February Referendum date being attractive but only 176 days, could numbers be ready by then, do not need full schematic design to answer the question, Mike Paston says you need a dollar figure, floor plans, hugely important is a WOW factor- what it will look like, Board has been using May, when would the Board need to vote on a referendum date, need to decide if we need to change, Delta needs to be determined, could happen on the north side, do we have the ability to do this in February, want to be successful, prioritize where kids live everyday, and thinking about May and the community thinks it is May. We should not be too hasty since this is a project to last 50 years or more, and there is a year difference between B and D for completion. Ms. Fishbaine asked that board members think about the February vs. May Referendum and deciding on B or D concept for the next meeting.

### **Project Funding**

#### **Survey Discussion**

David Hunter, a resident statistician, spoke to the Board for further understanding of the community feedback for questions 7 and 11 on the survey relating to the project cost. He noted that SSRS did a nice job, reviewed their methodology, and stressed we want to use the medians, not the means. The mean is useless and impossible to calculate while the median is more helpful and he explained two reasons why. He showed graphs and various plots representing the responses of each questions providing a visual for a better understanding.

Board members discussed: The idea of a snapshot of a point of time, you can change what will happen, appreciates the fact he thinks the survey was well done, the referendum question will be in the amount of millions of dollars, what is at stake are the students' future, what other information gathering can be done, a way to keep people engaged, exit polling in November a possibility, and should talk with Mike Paston about this.

Ms. Stahl left the meeting at 11:00 p.m.

### **Financial Analysis**

Mr. Brown noted a review of financial records for 2012-2013 thus far results in an estimated deficit of \$2.6 million. Many variables contributed to this result. In order to assist board members in planning for the high school project, not only five-year projections have been updated, but also two financing scenarios and recognition of the K-8 needs. The capital reserve fund balance has been designated for the K-8 facility needs so far. The five-year projections have also been updated to ten years to 2024 with the best estimate for the district's financial outlook. He spoke on the capital reserve fund, debt service, increase of real estate taxes to fund the high school project, and four scenarios were shown for the impact on the general fund and the capital fund for funding projects of \$104 and \$114 million. Michael Vind noted that a three-prong approach was taken with borrowing in 2014 and then again in 2015 and 2016. He spoke on call dates and current debt that would not be refunded in the future.

Board members discussed: Nice summary, increasing amount of district contribution, referendum success, full mill effort can still do elementary, elementary project in next 5 - 7 years, looking at each with wrapping around debt, any increase in investments/interest, making a decision on Concept and budget at September 9 meeting, where you think we should be for total project cost, and need to accept a certain amount. Ms. Fishbaine asked board members if each was comfortable making a decision on the concept, date of referendum, and budget related issues at the September 9 meeting or if more time was needed. Most were in agreement they were comfortable to do so and spoke on phasing the project - South side then the North side, what you get for additional cost, what explains the difference from \$104 to \$114 million, Crabtree Rohrbaugh numbers are \$109 to \$115 million, no way to drive down \$165.00/sq ft, will be based on what Ed specs are, comfortable setting project cost but not with all the decisions, need to have answers on what will happen to the North side, minimal referendum and relying on District contribution, what are we doing to future boards, decision making depends on projections, Mr. Brown should continue to refine, PlanCon is delayed another year, and nothing is happening anytime soon. There will be a motion on the September 9 agenda for action.

### **Evaluation Matrix Discussion**

Ms. Fishbaine asked board members if they brought their evaluation matrix and comparisons for Concepts B and D and asked if anyone needed further information to analyze the final two concepts, and if anyone wanted to share their thinking to date regarding the components of the evaluation matrix.

Board members commented: Concept B needed no discussion for a bridge/walkway due to knowing it is an enclosed hallway integrated into the buildings, basically program based on D, the two bus drop-offs, B is spread out and D is compact, degrees of renovation in each but B has more square footage than D, demolition is included, Delta is included, and the North side is keeping both gyms and pool area. Ms. Fishbaine asked board members to complete and bring their sheets to the September 9 meeting to explain what you have and how you did it.

### **Draft RFP for Construction Management Services for Pre-referendum Estimate**

Mr. Poprik presented a draft RFP for high school construction cost estimating for board members to consider the content of the document and discuss the timing of the services. Some things to think about are when the board wants the number and how they would like to do the process.

Board members provided suggestions for paragraph three, noted that the CAC recommends this, and confirmed that this is a professional service that we can choose and no bidding is necessary.

Dr. Pawelczyk moved and Ms. Concepcion seconded to move this item to action. All board members present voted aye with a voice vote. (Ms. Stahl had left the meeting.) The motion passed. Dr. Pawelczyk moved and Ms. Concepcion seconded to approve the draft RFP with the recommended changes. All board members present voted aye with a voice vote. (Ms. Stahl had left the meeting.) The motion passed. Mr. Poprik will bring the process back to the Board.

**XI. REPORTS**

Ms. Fishbaine asked if all board members would be in agreement to postpone the reports to a future board meeting. All were in agreement.

**XII. FUTURE AGENDA PLANNING**

Ms. Fishbaine asked board members to review the Future Agenda Planning items and if anyone thinks or has something that needs to be added, please contact her and Dr. O'Donnell, same for any changes.

**XIII. ADJOURNMENT**

Dr. Pawelczyk moved and Dr. Roper seconded to adjourn the meeting. All board members present voted aye with a voice vote. (Ms. Stahl had left the meeting.) The motion passed and Ms. Fishbaine adjourned the meeting at 12:02 a.m. to an executive session on legal and personnel matters.

Submitted by,

Mary Jenn Dorman  
Board Secretary