



Facilities and Bond Planning Advisory Committee

April 18, 2019

5:30 – 9:00 p.m.

**Blanton Elementary School, Library
5408 Westminster Drive, Austin, TX 78723**

MEETING MINUTES

IN ATTENDANCE:

Committee Members: Michael Bocanegra, Raul Calderon, Cherylann Campbell, Alejandro Delgado, Gabriel Estrada, Dusty Harshman, Jennifer Littlefield, Cynthia McCollum, Kelly Mikelson, Rick Potter, Emily Sawyer, Barbara Spears Corbett, Alison Takata, Valerie Tyler

AISD Trustees: Geronimo Rodriguez, Cindy Anderson, Arati Singh

Staff: Paul Cruz, Beth Wilson, Melissa Laursen, Matias Segura, Lydia Venegas, Celso Baez, Reyne Telles, Christian Casarez Clarke, Michelle Cavazos, Ali Ghilarducci, Laura DeGrush, Leal Anderson, John Green-Otero

Consultants: Mark Rahe, Gabby Bermea

Visitors: None

1. Call to order and overview of meeting goals (5:30 PM)

Tri-chair Cherylann Campbell called the meeting to order at 5:30 PM and reviewed the meeting goals. Blanton Assistant Principal Daniela Ruiz provided highlights of the school including its recent academic achievements, and special programs.

2. Public comment

No public comment.

3. Approval of minutes

The February 28 and March 28 minutes were approved as presented.

4. Discuss committee operations, future meeting dates and agenda items

Future meetings:

- May 1 - FABPAC meeting (extended meeting from 6-9 PM)
- June 3 – Board work session
- June 6 – FABPAC meeting (extended meeting from either 5:30-9 or 6-9 PM)

Rather than scheduling an extra meeting on May 8, members decided to extend the meeting time for May 1 and June 6.

5. Subcommittee and work group report outs

- Community Engagement Subcommittee – Summary of community survey results to be discussed with agenda item #6
- TUP Subcommittee – None.
- Permanent Capacity Work Group – None.
- Portable Management and Reduction Strategy Work Group – None.
- Master Plan subcommittees – None.

6. Update on FMP 2019, including, but not limited to: survey results; and plan development timeline

Survey results

Gabby Bermea (Stantec) presented a summary of the community survey results. There were over 4,000 survey participants that provided feedback in the areas of:

- athletics and fitness;
- Career and Technical Education and career connected learning;
- fine arts and creative learning; and
- portables

About 44% of respondents identified themselves as current AISD parents, and 15% as community members, and each vertical team was represented. The survey summary will be posted on the FMP 2019 website.

Plan development timeline

Melissa Laursen, Planning Manager, reviewed the current timeline for the FMP update.

- April 25 - FABPAC receives preliminary master plan draft
- April 30 - Combined subcommittee meeting
- May 1 – FABPAC meeting to discuss preliminary master plan draft
- May 3 - Deadline for FABPAC to send comments on preliminary master plan draft (for consideration for the draft that will be presented at the June 3 Board Work Session)
- May 7 – Fine Arts subcommittee meeting
- May 8 – Athletics subcommittee meeting
- May 9 – CTE subcommittee meeting
- June 3 - Board work session on draft master plan
- June 6 – FABPAC meeting to discuss board feedback, portables, and permanent capacity
- July and August – TBD
- September – FABPAC meeting to review updated draft master plan (with any modifications that occur over the summer months)

7. Discuss and provide feedback on the Board-driven reinvention process, including, but not limited to: guiding principles; case study methodology; planning regions; and next steps

Trustee Cindy Anderson read a statement from the Board officers regarding the reinvention process, and expectations from FABPAC. Ali Ghilarducci, DCCE, explained the Thought Exchange software that will be used to collect feedback on the guiding principles, case study methodology and planning regions. Participants are able to share their thoughts on open-ended questions and star (rate) the thoughts of others. Thought Exchange will remain open to the FABPAC for a few days, and all feedback will be shared with the Board of Trustees.

Matias Segura, Operations Officer, presented information on the guiding principles, case study methodology and planning regions.

Guiding principles

The guiding principles that were presented to the Board on April 15 were presented:

- Ensure equitable access to programmatic opportunities that engage and inspire all students.
- Put more students in reimagined, 21st-century learning environments that engage and inspire.
- Maintain neighborhood schools.
- Reduce financial obligations not directed toward student learning and support.
- Optimize facility use to benefit students, families, and communities.

Case study methodology

A case study is defined as “A research method performed before implementing a large-scale investigation. It involves an in-depth, detailed examination of the methodology. The basic function is to help identify questions and select types of measurement prior to the scenario development.” A case study will be performed by the district prior to running scenarios for each identified planning region.

Planning regions

A planning region is a geographic area defined by a group of attendance areas. Each scenario will be tied to a planning region. The purpose of the planning regions is to establish targets for multiple schools (not just one school) and develop strategies to achieve those targets within each region. The planning regions, as presented to the Board, were developed using the following objectives:

- Not confined by traditional thoroughfares.
- Do not have to align to feeder patterns or vertical teams.
 - Consider east to west alignment.
- Balanced across the district.
 - 10-14 elementary schools per region.



Questions and comments for all items discussed:

- What specific plans does AISD have in place to address bringing back students who have been lured away by charter schools?
- How is AISD working with schools most impacted by a loss of students to charter schools to address the reasons why they left in the first place? Who is capturing this data? Who is responsible for addressing this issue?
- Why aren't socio-economic factors included in the KPI's?
- At what point during the process will the district try to predict human behavioral responses to change? Will more people leave the district with the proposed changes? Can we gather qualitative data in a focus group to try to estimate reactions?
- What is the purpose of the planning regions?
- Regarding the planning regions – concern about the wide-range of student enrollment and utilization between the regions and the lack of socio-economic diversity between the regions. Asked that the regions be re-evaluated with these considerations.
- If there is a school that is performing well, and it is at 100% utilization, what could a strategy be for that school?
- Is the district considering alternative transportation options – and re-thinking holistically how transportation is provided?
- What were the major factors that were considered when developing the planning regions?
- Did the guiding principles influence the development of the planning regions?
- How will the guiding principles be used in the evaluation of the case study?
- Concerned about the principle to “maintain neighborhood schools” – if outcomes could result in school closures. If the intent is to maintain school assignments, then this principle needs to be reflective of that.
- Has the district thought about regional assignments – not just one individual school assignment?
- What is a reasonable distance for a school assignment?
- When you talk about “neighborhood” – you need to talk about “community”.
- Are there discussions around changing the transfer policy as part of this process?

For the remainder of the meeting, members worked through the Thought Exchange tool.

8. Adjourn (8:55 PM)