

**Missoula County Public Schools  
Strategic Facilities Plan  
Friday, December 6, 2013  
South Avenue Business Building – Board Room  
Steering Committee Review of Subcommittee Work**

**Committee Members Present:** Heather Davis Schmidt, Jason Decunzo, Nick Salmon, Burley McWilliams, Alex Apostle, Art Sikkink, Trevor Laboski, Karen Allen, Matt Clausen, Drake Lemm, Geoff Badenoch, Dave Sell, Gary Bakke, Kevin Ritchlin, Andrea Vernon, Jerry Seidensticker, Mark Thane, Melanie Charlson, Rosemary Harrison

**Committee Members Not Present:** Hatton Littman, Austin Parson, Victor Loya, Anne Blanch Adams, Diane Lorenzen, Rosie Buzzas, Pat McHugh, Brian Lofink, Erin Johnson, Joe Knapp, Ted Linford, Josh Rollins, Parker Blennenk, David Burtch, Diane Beck, Michael Tree, Angie Palin, Michele Nokleby, Billy Reamer

**Members of the Public Present:** Jeanne Joscelyn, Ross Best, Josh Slotnick, Jean Zosel, Julie Lennox, Martha Newell, Jeff Kessler

**MINUTES**

**Welcome/Overview of Subcommittee Work** Nick Salmon opened the meeting at 12:10 p.m. We will review where we are and where we've been. All this work began more than 4 years ago with an assessment of every single facility, funded through the state of Montana. Nick did that work in collaboration with Gary Botchek, walking every square foot of every building. That document has continued to be helpful in prioritizing replacement of boilers, roofs, and other things. Two years ago the school district launched, with the involvement of several hundred people, the educational portion of this planning process. The facilities part: we have been in process since the spring. It is an opportunity to make the 21<sup>st</sup> century vision and solidly mid-20<sup>th</sup> century buildings fit as effectively as we can. The steering committee has been meeting since spring. We have had conversations about foundational documents and a tour of all the sites, including undeveloped sites and leased facilities. We have been reviewing demographic work done by McKibben and Associates. We launched the public piece of this with Assess, in October. Explore, the second piece, exploring the world beyond Missoula for inspiration and mentors, was done in November. Then we slowed it down, to give us a chance to catch up and do our work. We will launch the Apply piece the end of January/first few days of February, when we apply what we have learned through Assess and Explore. There are 225 people in the Extended Educational Innovation Teams. Each school has a team. Seeley has 5 or 6 people on their team, while larger schools may have 35 people involved. For sites with no students occupying the building and for undeveloped ground, we brought the set of questions back to the steering committee for observations. We asked the same questions of those groups that we asked of the Expanded Educational Innovation teams: what works, what doesn't, what's missing, and asked them to look at a range of options, 7 for every facility. The options range from Business as usual, where nothing changes including deferred maintenance, all the way to the opposite extreme of Starting over. In between are Out of the box, Light touch, and Renovate/realign.

This past week we asked the steering committee to divide into subcommittees and tackle five different subtopics. First we looked at options for undeveloped facilities: this building,

Duncan Drive, 55<sup>th</sup> Street, and others. We will take 10 minutes for that group to share major observations, then take feedback from the group. The second group looked at grade level configurations—what are the optimal arrangements we should think about district wide? We have been K-5, 6-8, 9-12 for 30 years; is that best for the future? The third group: looking at all the work on the tables behind you, the drafts we have developed internally, we still need a lot of data added and clarifications. We asked the group yesterday whether this presentation of the data makes any sense. Then we will have a break, followed by comments from the group that looked at the daily schedule and annual calendar. The last group looked at school size and location issues, demographic data that WGM shared at the last steering committee, understanding how people are distributed in relation to schools.

All through the process we have culled through the feedback that people have supplied. Currently we have a cumbersome list of 30 possible criteria, and we are in the process of getting down to a manageable list of criteria. That is the list that the Expanded Education Innovation Teams will use to evaluate the options in January. Nick recommends a dozen criteria; ten is better. He has seen as many as 15, and it becomes cumbersome, a lot of information to go through. A consolidated list would be helpful. We will take a half hour to get familiar with them, and we may need a separate steering committee meeting in January to discuss. The group that tackled this range of options felt that more trustee participation would be helpful. Because the trustees are the final decision makers, the more of them who are involved in developing the criteria, the better.

Alex asked about the composition of Expanded Education Innovation Teams. Nick: The steering committee is composed of parents, sometimes students, administrators, trustees, other folks from the community, and citizens. For the Expanded Education Innovation Teams, we did the same thing: every school has a core team of 6 people: a student, a teacher or staff member, an administrator, a parent or grandparent, and a community person. Six people is not enough to have critical mass for the intensity of the decisions that need to be made. So each of those groups expands, to as many as 30 people in some cases, and maintains the diversity of students, teachers, etc. At every session we have also done community listening sessions for people to understand what we are doing and to provide feedback. At the first session we had 50 people. At the second session, we had more than 75. In general, as we become more specific, a lot more people show up. The Expanded Education Innovation Teams give life through words, translation into images and dollars. Several schools had 3 different tables with 7 different ideas. There is a lot of overlap, some mash up of different ideas. Seidensticker asked about transparency and where on the website people can view information. On the website [www.mcpsmt.org](http://www.mcpsmt.org) you can find the Strategic Facilities Plan link, and once you bookmark that, you can find all the documents starting with 4 years ago, including the model of change and everything else. Nick said he pushes that information to Burley and Hatton and Diana frequently.

### **Subcommittee #1 Range of Options for Undeveloped Sites, Administrative & Leased Facilities** (Gary, Karen, Art, Dave, Pat, Mark, Geoff)

Gary Bakke and Karen Allen presented. Gary explained that members of this subcommittee were charged with looking at options for properties that are undeveloped or leased. They had a lot of very good quality discussion about what the properties currently are and what they could potentially become. Criteria they looked at: the value for school use, school expansion, cost of ownership, maintenance, liability cost, the monetary values today and in the future, resale values, market value. What is the zoning in each parcel: restrictions and encumbrances? What is the desire of our citizens toward these properties? There is intrinsic value to some and not to others. What objections might citizens have if they were used by the district or sold to someone else? They reviewed several parcels. 1-the 55<sup>th</sup> Street and Whitaker parcel: the district currently owns about 20 acres of undeveloped land. This parcel has access issues: there is a dirt/gravel

road that gets to it; it does not have utilities. We could potentially use it as agricultural land, for vocational-agriculture. Maybe it has some value for a trade in the future to offset the cost of another school in a different area. 2-Casa Loma, across the street from the Business Building: an old building with prime property around it. Currently used as good dry storage. Are we utilizing it to the maximum? What could it be in the future? A store or a retail market run by students with participation by the business community? Could it be a developed parking lot? Look at what other changes are possible in this area. 3-Duncan Drive: the PEAS Farm and soccer field. We discussed what it is today and what could happen to it in the future. We did talk about that a lot. 4-the River Bowl, a small parcel along the river below the Missoulian. We are utilizing part of the city's land and part of our land. What value is there? It is a practice field for Hellgate HS. It is a good value to utilize parcels we have. 5-the Vo-Ag farm south of Big Sky HS: cows, pigs, hay; the land is being utilized. Potential for farms or outside school activity. It is a large parcel, about 20 acres, with some great potential. 6-soccer field in the Rattlesnake: we have some liability and issues there. It is prime property in the middle of the Rattlesnake Valley. Maintenance is involved, and some liability issues, but it is being used. We looked at some buildings: 1-the current Administration Building: it is an old building. What is the value of the building vs. the maintenance? What would our future costs be to keep it up as an administration building? It has an old heating system, old electrical, and potential for a lot of costs in the future. A prime piece of property in middle of an older neighborhood. Condo? Other uses? 2-the Business Building: depending what happens next door (at Missoula College) in the future, it could become a totally different scenario for this building. It is not as old as some buildings; it has good potential, good return on investment. We could turn it into a lot of different things. There is potential to have a study that could look at different uses. Karen spoke about other buildings the subcommittee discussed: 3-Missoula College: we are not exactly sure how it will play out over time, but there is an agreement between UM and MCPS that when UM no longer needs it, that property will revert to us for a dollar. We talked about a study about how to best use this whole environment, Missoula College plus the Business Building, and maybe Sentinel. We keep thinking about Sentinel as a great high school—but might this complex become something else? Some middle schools talked about possibly co-locating with a high school. Could we have a grades 7-12 property? 4-Mount Jumbo: we rent it to social work group and store things in it. We talked about Mount Jumbo coming back into being a school. We talked about how to get to Rattlesnake: some kids ride a bus—the East Missoula kids—so if we were to open Mount Jumbo those kids don't have to be on the bus as much, but it creates a segregated environment that doesn't make sense. 5-Prescott: we talked about how it might be used otherwise. Right now it is rented to Missoula International School (MIS). As we understand, they are quite interested in a long term lease or a purchase. The WGM work noted there is not a lot of MCPS feed into that school. Nick commented that there is a very small number of kids who live in close proximity that don't also overlap with Rattlesnake School. Karen: we talked about what uses the community might be okay with. 6-Whittier: just like Willard and the original Paxson (Administration Building is older). Whittier has 2 uses currently: Head Start and movies in the summer for the neighborhood. If someone was intentional about movies in the neighborhood, that could get done; and we might want to change Head Start. It might be a reasonable property to sell: thinking about city parks—would it be a property the city might want to make into a park? We don't really see that we need to keep it; if the team decided it was a good idea to sell, we would be supportive. 7-Linda Vista: a 5 acre piece that has no access, sandwiched between city-owned and county-owned land. Currently part of it is a park. The part the school district owns is at the crest of a hill, unbuildable. We have maintenance costs annually. It could be used to trade for something that would benefit us in the future. Why do we have it? It costs us money; we can't use it; it might be good trading stock. Karen: the innovation team from Cold Springs has thought about a school in the Maloney Ranch area of Linda Vista as making more sense, looking at the demographics and the circles of

attendance; the idea that we keep Chief Charlo but move Cold Springs to the Maloney Ranch/Linda Vista area. We thought about a trade; and as that area is developed, is there a covenant in the development arrangements in which they have given the city some land for a park, and that is where we could trade? Top of Whitaker: does anyone want it? Nick: he does not know that this subcommittee expressed any urgency in moving any of that undeveloped land immediately. However with some buildings there were concerns if you have a dollar lease and you are carrying a lot of liability, is it perhaps better to unwind that relationship? Karen noted the maintenance and issues related to buildings. Gary reiterated that they are a subcommittee, they just make recommendations; they did a little study, discussed past, potential and future. We understand there is a lot of good work being done at the PEAS Farm that benefits the school district and the schools: the vegetables, education of students in summer, field trips. It was recommended by our committee that at this time the district not sell the property to the city—just a recommendation—with the caveat that we discuss with Garden City Harvest and see what their growth needs are the future, to make things better for them. The lease we have is very minimal: we could potentially do something on that, or trade with another parcel that would benefit everyone. We could discuss with them on a one on one basis. But at this time we recommend no sale. Karen: we don't have a market study for any piece of property that we have. Before we can even entertain discussion of selling, we would need a market study to start. If we have a reason why we are saying we wouldn't sell it, we don't know what we would sell it for. Question: would an appraisal count as market research? Gary: yes, and no. We don't really have it on the market. We have had an offer from the city. It has a good asset value; he understands there was an appraisal done a year ago. It gives some values; but is there any urgency in getting rid of it at this time? Karen: Susan Hay Patrick's editorial in the paper today talked about people coming together to find ways of making decisions where nobody gets everything but everyone gets something—this is a thing like that. There are a lot of people who have interests, and we need to think about those interests. If we ever get to that point, it needs to be a community discussion. Nick: there was expressed several times during the week that there was a desire to have a high level of collaboration that is not currently happening out on the Vo-Ag farm, and it could be with the heavy equipment part of Missoula College, with the farm to fork program, or with Garden City Harvest. What is the educational driver, and how could we ramp that up? They also had discussions of the central kitchen being part of that. Karen talked about how we can find both/and in anything instead of either/or. There was a question about public participation in the subcommittees before they made recommendations. Nick: members of the public were part of the subcommittees, but they were not a forum like this. Ross Best stated that violates the public meeting law. Nick said that they have made no recommendations at this time. Ross said that it was said several times there is a recommendation not to sell; he stated that is violating the public participation law. Nick replied that he understands that is Ross's opinion. The work of subcommittees in all cases is to develop and explore a range of options. Karen said she apologizes if they used an inappropriate word. Our role was to put everything we could think of up on a sheet of paper. Ross commented that coming up with a range of options is an action; he said it disregards the citizens' right to participate in the process. Geoff: the range of options suggested by the subcommittees as he understands it are not final. Additional information and recommendations and the ranges could be expanded at the larger committee level if there are other ideas. He sees a recommendation to not do something as basically keeping the status quo; it is not a recommendation to do something. Geoff remarked that he has a deep respect for Ross's appreciation for public process, and what he is saying is consistent with that. Geoff adds that the subcommittees have begun a discussion, not ended it, not put a boundary around them. It is a way to begin discussions. He added that having ideas up on a wall helps him, and helps the public, to consider options. Geoff said his point is that the work as the subcommittees is not the final work; it is not exhaustive; we can add to it; the public will be invited to add to it. He sees this work as a

way to begin. He does not see it as limiting the public participation or limiting their ability to add to the list to be discussed. He would expect that any public process would include the invitation to the public to ask “is our list exhaustive,” and if there are other points to be included, please add them to the list. His understanding is that this is exactly how this process is working. He is comfortable with the public involvement and the subcommittee’s work as beginning to list options. Nick asked if there is any more discussion on this group; there was none.

### **Subcommittee #2 Grade Level Configuration** (Diane, Jerry, Ann, Karen)

Nick: the Education Innovation Teams looked at the full spectrum of birth to death, including K-5, special education, Head Start leasing space, loose association with Missoula College. In the past there used to be K-8 schools, then there was one high school, then more. We asked this group to look at that.

Karen: we had a lot of discussion about different grade configurations. Two questions we addressed were the validity of K-8-ness, and that in an ideal world we would like to think we could have different configurations in different parts of the city. We ran with that, then realized that each change we make has consequences. There is some research that says K-8 can be a positive, and some that says 6-8 can be a positive. Ninth grade is a very important transition, and we want to focus on making sure we are doing it well. We have learned from the Health Science Academy that we can really improve students’ experience by focusing on the transition. We would not encourage us to consider changing our grade configuration in any way in the near future—5, 10, or 15 years. It is working. We have pockets in the community where strange things happen: e.g. Cold Springs splitting which middle school they will go to. If we improve the Cold Springs split, we will probably create another kind of problem. The learning of kids is our focus. We would encourage keeping the grade configuration we currently have. Nick: the groups in October generated a dozen different ways of looking at the configuration: a megacampus, a 9<sup>th</sup> grade center, etc. The work of the subcommittee was to probe the list. A 9<sup>th</sup> grade center would be very expensive to run and begins to undermine some of the things that happen, e.g. at Big Sky where a student enters in grade 9 and is part of the academy for 4 years. Karen: we don’t want to limit opportunities. Nick: if we went to a dozen K-8s you would end up with one or two classes per grade level; all the collaboration would evaporate. When you have small middle schools, grades 6-8, with only 150 students each, you end up with traveling music teachers, etc. and rather than paying them to form relationships in those critical years, you are paying them to drive across town. Adjusting to new ways of configurations would not produce benefits. Karen: based on our study we see the value of the current configuration in our community for continuity. We do not mean status quo...if we had a way to make it happen within this construct but over here to the side, that might be possible. Nick noted that this does not preclude a middle school located at a high school site or an elementary located at a high school site. Even within this organization, there are a lot of different ways it could come together. Karen: in a lot of areas the feeder schools are K-8—e.g. Hellgate Elementary has K-2, 3-5 and 6-8. The configuration of 6-8 at Hellgate Elementary is like the configuration of 6-8 at Meadow Hill. K-8 in the feeder districts is not like the old fashioned K-8—that was a big “aha.” Andrea asked about the K-6 conversation. Karen: they talked about that—it is one of those where you have to decide where your “and” is; we didn’t find compelling reason. Nick: just like the discussion of focus on transition to grade 9, the transition to grade 6 is important. You would shorten the potential of building a relationship with students. Lolo has a grade 5-8 middle school for the reason of wanting a longer time to build relationships. Nick: the “aha” for this group was that truly the way to make a vibrant K-8 in our community would mean K-8s of 1500 students—5 or 6 K-8s. That would radically undermine the neighborhood school concept, and none of the buildings is large enough. Alex: was anything discussed regarding the value our community places on the community of neighborhood schools? Karen: our sense from the feedback of the teams we have been part of is that the community values the neighborhood schools especially

at the K-5 level. We wanted to preserve the possibility as much as possible for the K-5s to be actually in the neighborhoods for kids to come to. Lowell kids go to CS Porter and, in their language, “come back” to Hellgate—we just have to help the community understand that. Karen: we did talk about the growth that is going to happen around Franklin and Hawthorne, and that needs to be addressed; the traffic pattern about Reserve and CS Porter—it is not an issue of grade level configuration, but it got talked to. Nick: 90 percent of elementary students attend a school in their neighborhood. Jumbo kids are bused and there is leveling. At the middle school years, 80 percent are attending a school that they are tracked to; for high school, 70 percent are. Thirty percent are choosing. Even outlying students are making different choices: e.g. students from Clinton wanting to go to Big Sky, not Hellgate. Nick reminded the committee of the discussion about effective school size: 450 is an effective size for the elementary due to teams working with students. When you begin to hit 500, like at Lewis & Clark and soon Rattlesnake, it becomes less effective to work with students. At middle schools we are heading toward an imbalance: we will end up with 750 at Washington and 550 at the others: how do we address that? It needs to be looked at. Similarly at the high school level, 1200 students is about the low end of an effective school. But above 2000 you exceed a manageable level. Alex: a big piece of the 21<sup>st</sup> century education model is bringing teachers together for collaboration. So collaboration and teaming is embedded in the 21<sup>st</sup> century educational model that almost 200 people worked on. What we are talking about is developing facilities and infrastructure that support the 21<sup>st</sup> century model of education. Nick: that model is built on solid educational research that teachers collaborating and working together is effective for student learning.

### **Subcommittee #3 Review of Expanded Education Innovation Teams Range of Options** (Melanie, Matt, Jason, Joe, Trevor)

This subcommittee looked at whether the information makes sense the way it is presented, so when we roll it out to you and to the community as a whole, they understand. All the formulas on those sheets have been generated using assumptions about the costs of buildings, because they are applied to very irregular buildings. We are asking for feedback on how we present that information so it makes sense.

Trevor: the important thing about this is that there are 7 options. Each Education Innovation Team was given task of going from doing absolutely nothing to this building, to starting over completely, as well as all the in-between options. This was the first time anyone looked at these together. We looked to see if anything looked strange: re-siting a building, graphic representation. We looked at the Google walking index and whether that is a useful thing. We looked at Casa Loma and other places where no group was looking. We looked at lots of options. We tried to clean up each page, looking at what Nick needs to change before we move on. Jason: in order to comprehend any of the information, how do we make it easy for observers to look at it? Putting down options where there were not options. It was really interesting to see where the overlap was. As Nick mentioned, this site was talked about by the Washington innovation team. We tried to find some commonalities. Nick: Lowell and Rattlesnake said they want to be K-8, Chief Charlo also. We asked does that mean that option is gone? If the guiding principles say the existing structure will be maintained, then we respect the ideas they came up with; honor the work done and leave it in place. Jason: some big things that came out were that it allows us for the first time to see basic infrastructure outlines, what actually exists. Then you can start to talk about the kinds of things that are not common: grounds that are city and county, e.g. having that baseline of information allows us to get into a level of discussion about what is unique about each building, about the students, trying to figure out how to collaborate. We talked about connections between the options. We can start to talk about the connection between Washington and Sentinel, or Cold Springs and Meadow Hill. At some point we need to create structure, framework for those groups to sit down together to find commonalities. Trevor: we talked about the next step, Education Innovation Teams. The Ag

Triangle south of Big Sky is a separate page from the Ag Center. It is very interesting to see overlaps. Nick: the school district has had high level of collaboration with the city, especially Parks and Recreation, about collaboration after hours. The idea is that we could kick off the next session with a gallery walk where everyone could see the work of the others. [Melanie Charlson arrived.] Nick suggested that during the break, committee members look at the drafts on the tables.

Gary had a question about open meeting laws in Montana: some of us are just citizens with no financial tie to the school district—are we not just citizens? With regard to open meeting, Gary noted that anyone who wanted to sign up for a committee could volunteer. He is just a citizen, not part of the system. Geoff commented that the more we involve the public, the better. His involvement is that we have gone back and been self critical, and we have changed our schedule because we were disappointed not to have as many people as we would like. He is a citizen taking time off from work to be here, but not everyone can do that. We work at finding a time and place that people can come and meaningfully digest what is happening and give us their opinions and views. It is hard to do, and hard to do well. We can graciously accept Ross's observations; Geoff noted that part of him agrees. He added that his opinion is that we are not breaking any laws, but that we need to continually do better with involving the public. Alex stated that he respects Ross's positions. We slowed the process down because we didn't want to rush through this process that is so important. We want to be thorough, inclusive, and collaborative. In the final analysis whatever the decision is we want to be together as a community. This is wide open and will continue to be wide open. We will take the time necessary, a year, 9 months, 2 years, to involve people. And that once we come to closure on a bond issue at some point in time that people will say they had an opportunity and joined in, and that we came up with a plan and they support it. We know that not everyone will support it. But we want everyone to have the opportunity to participate. There is time for dialogue and conversation on all of this. We will stumble along the way; we will admit when we stumble and do something different to correct it. We want people to be involved. Transparency is absolutely necessary. There are no hidden agendas here. This is the first time the school district has joined hands with the community to develop a comprehensive facilities plan. We have our instructional program in place; we have an idea where the school district should go academically and instructionally. We are trying to develop a comprehensive facilities/instructional plan so when our students graduate and go on they will be competitive. If people have questions, we invite them to ask the questions, and if we are doing something wrong, we will correct it.

The committee recessed at 1:30 p.m. and reconvened at 1:45 p.m.

#### **Subcommittee #4 Daily Schedule & Annual Calendar** (Heather, Andrea, Burley)

Nick's charge: how could the daily schedule and annual calendar positively impact teaching and learning, the community, the use of the facilities? Andrea explained that they also kept in mind the input from the innovation teams; bringing knowledge from that process was important to them. Heather has put together a graphic spread sheet that gets into the details of these changes; some of the options we are looking at are pretty big changes. For the daily schedule, we looked at the option of expanding the teaching day. Some kids could start as early as 7 a.m., and others go as late as 4:30-5 in the afternoon, with students and families having some flexibility in choosing what works for them. The school day would be broken up differently: instead of 45 minute periods, we could look at longer instructional periods in the day, broken up with shorter periods for kids to have intervention or student club meetings. It would be a block of time in the morning, a 30 minute period, and a longer block in the afternoon with lunch between. The morning block could be music, sports activities, world languages—things that require daily skill. The middle block is a longer block; it would be intensified units of inquiry, team-taught. It would add a lot of flexibility to the curriculum and enhance the opportunity to add i3 throughout

the year, bringing community partnerships into the school environment. Having longer periods provides a lot more openness to elements of 21<sup>st</sup> century education. The latter part of the day is broken up into electives, extracurricular sports, and music. We looked at this from a K-12 level; we saw value especially at the middle school and high school level, but also at the elementary level. Nick tried to rough out the timing. There is also value in common planning times for teachers. Transportation for students: if a student starts the day at Sentinel, they would have time to get to another school for something there. Half an hour would get you across town. Other than those set points, it would be fluid in the rest of the day so teachers can do what they need to do. Common planning time would not be 3 times a day: intervention time, planning time, other. A lot of this is already happening: there are classes at 7 a.m. at some schools, and a lot is happening afterward. All those after school programs could be very deliberate partners with the community. Schools that do that type of thing find valuable partners in success instead of unrelated things in the hours after school. Alex asked about the potential impact of digital learning and how it could alter the school day; e.g. the Digital Academy, different lengths of day for different days of the week for a high school student. Andrea said they looked at that; part of the value of the longer block schedule is more time for the Digital Academy. Alex added that it could also help with internships and externships. Nick: We would have school from 7-5, but be deliberate about when it is important to have things happening in precise amounts of time. A student could come 7-12 and then go work. The student who wants to pick up additional credits, before and after school, could graduate early or get deeper into work. Those students whose brain is not on until 9 a.m. could start their day at 9. Nick: the main facility impact would be teaming space, collaborative space. It is not a way to get more kids into the building. The intent was to give teachers, students, and staff the most flexible way to do their jobs. Alex: a loose organization of how to learn, a variety of choices. Karen: if we said all our sites will have this schedule, the flexibility is there because you can move the pieces around. Heather: certain pieces need to be consistent throughout the system. Example: the school day broken out into different colors: 100 minutes in the morning, 100 minutes in the late afternoon; those are the flexible times. Advisory/transportation are 30 minutes each side of that, with a focused learning bloc in the middle. Essentially the focused learning block is 4 ½ hours of instruction with a 45 minute lunch in there sometime. Nick noted that there was a piece on NPR about the duration of school lunch: some schools have only 15 or 20 minutes. Lolo has ten minutes. Nick suggested we think differently about lunch, not standing in line, it becomes a humane, social connection to them.

The annual calendar: there are families who have lots of different options for expanding learning, maybe international travel, and other families who don't have that—those students come back after a long summer break significantly below where they left off in the spring, and spend significant time on catch up. We looked at an annual school calendar with less of that time off. We have many partners that provide learning opportunities in the summer; this would be a more intentional way of including that. The 52 week year can be 8 six week blocks of time, with four weeks where all schools are closed: this is due to the math, but also to allow time for building maintenance projects. It fits nicely with the IB program: there are 6 week units of inquiry as part of that program. By 6 weeks we mean 30 instructional days—holidays affect the week number. Within that, families would choose for their students to participate 6 out of those 8 sessions, as a minimum. But they could choose up to 8—if they want a Digital Academy course, or a UM course. In IB, session 1 is focused on who we are, where we are in place and time; there are 6 throughout the course of the year. At the middle school and high school levels, we could do it where we focus on one interdisciplinary contact area. Hellgate and Big Sky have social studies combined with English language/arts—so you could take a 12 week chunk of time and really delve deeply into those content areas in ways you can't if you have 50 minute chunks of time. You could do problem-solving in several hours at a time—e.g. auto class. Nick: part of this idea is that families and students and staff could make different choices at different times.

You make a commitment to 6—if you have done 4 and there is a major crisis in your family, you can step out for a 6 week session. It would provide enough continuity for teachers, students and families. This is one idea from many different options. Nick: one option is to go to year round schools and create constant six week rotating sessions of off and on to double the capacity of buildings. What if you had only 6 week sessions and 2-3 week breaks throughout the year? That seemed more rigid, and it forced everyone to make vacation plans in those breaks. How do we create the greatest flexibility for families and for staff? Staff could take a UM course. Nick: students could take more courses in a day and in a year. A staff member could earn more by choosing to teach more. If you want 12 weeks off, you take 2 consecutive segments off. We are trying to break out of old ways we have always done things. Alex: regardless of whether we do anything with the school day or the school year, as you weigh different models of instruction, consider if you move too far to the right or the left, you have to take professional development. It changes the teaching/learning environment. It would all have to be taken into account. Professional development and transition time would be important. Heather: we need more time. We need staff to be here more. Currently we have the equivalent of 1347 hours per year through the collective bargaining agreement. What she really thinks we need to get to is about 1500 hours of teacher time, an increase of 153 hours, an 11 percent increase over the year. We couldn't jump to that right away, but it is attainable incrementally over time, working it out incrementally. Nick: we can talk to the legislature, governor, OPI, and say teachers are professionals and need to be compensated as such. Karen: time for participating in activities, extracurriculars, or interventions needs to be available for every child. Data says that if participating in extracurricular events is optional, we have kids who opt out. Mark: 1496 hours of teacher time is currently in the collective bargaining agreement: it includes their lunch hour and prep time. Heather: lunch is really the difference. Karen: yesterday a teacher commented that we spend a lot to try to make it so people can opt into things; the teacher said they really want her to decide something and then get us all to that spot. Tight: we are all going to be able to do inquiry. Loose: there are loose ways to get there. Nick: units of inquiry are not unique to the IB program. Giving them strong identifiable themes. Andrea said she has a 6<sup>th</sup> grade son who gets bored, and this kind of model would speak to him: movement, lots of activity, fluidity between community and the school. Seidensticker: we have to look at what will work best for our kids. Andrea recalled Nick's comment how about 45 minute periods were put into place in 1908 because of the factory schedule kids would have to get used to. Now in the professional world we don't have bells ringing all day; we work in teams. We did talk about the impact of these programs on the summer camp programs. This really opens the door to the academic enrichment programs. College students staff those programs—how do we get them involved? What are the facility impacts? Nick brought up HVAC – a lot of schools that have this type of program are in the south, in buildings that are conditioned to allow more vibrant activity in them even in July and August. How do we condition the air and make these buildings occupiable in July and August? In the both/and world we say what buildings could we do that in? Or people said they could be outdoors. And it could transition. Alex: we say we want our staff to be more creative and innovative. How does that happen when we confine our teachers the way we do in blocks of time? And we want our students to be creative. Allowing our teachers to have flexibility to think, create, collaborate, go out into the community and explore ways in which to enrich their programs—the schedule does not allow that to happen. Exploring different ways to allow cooperation and collaboration, e.g. Ewan McIntosh, notosh.com. Nick explained that organizations like 3M and Google want 20 percent of time to be flexible and creative; Ewan said that 100 percent of your time should be creative. Jason: it has been interesting being the parent of kids out of primary and secondary and now in college: if we don't discuss it, think about it, put the options on the table, it will never happen. His kids constantly talk about if they only had 1 ½ hours in a class they could really get it done. The fact that it is on the table, regardless of how it ends up, that is how things are done in companies like Google and Nokia, and societies like

Sweden—the happiest countries and businesses in the world. It is fascinating; these ideas must not be the easiest road for you but they end up being the best. One of his kids went through a ton of medical stuff—if she had had the ability to have any kind of flexibility, if her school had empowered her to make any kinds of decisions, it would have been very helpful. Nick reflected on meetings with the Lowell community, and the reflection that their kids would not even be in the building when the plan is implemented. If it takes 2 years to ask for the bond levy, a year to develop it, then it will be fall of 2018 before the first implementations are done; it could be longer. For all of us, this is about another generation. It may impact some of those who are in early grades now. But like the decisions made in 1953 and in 1908 in this community, these decisions will endure. Karen: you have talked about how we need to have things happening all the way along or people will forget. What can we do that makes the kids' experience more meaningful, that empowers them? We can't say nothing will happen until the fall of 2018. What is the understory, the thing that keeps going? Nick: high schools talked about the importance of pilot projects; concurrent deep PLC work all along; and immediate examples that take i3 kind of thinking and make subtle facility changes. Karen: right now the sale of i3 for high school kids is an easy sell. What about that for a 3<sup>rd</sup> grader? It is a mindset change for a lot of people. Alex: we can't forget that this is all taking place to support a 21<sup>st</sup> century world. We need to develop a plan that is fluid, that can take advantage of opportunity, and that can adjust to challenges and change over the next 15 years. We have never had a plan, and unless we develop one that we can adjust, we will end up in the same place. We are looking toward developing projects that exemplify a 21<sup>st</sup> century learning environment. It must be part of a plan. Geoff: if you want to go to the moon, you don't aim the rocket where the moon is today; you aim it where the moon will be when you get there. Alex: the last few days in the newspaper, talking about where American education ranks, there is something wrong. We are talking about the right things. The discussions we are having and will continue to have must deal with the fact that our kids are not doing as well as other kids around the world are. The model has been around so long that it does not inspire kids. We have been doing the same thing for so long, we have not changed, and the world has changed. We have to move the agenda. Do we have all the answers? No. But we can always go back to what we have been doing. He hopes we don't. If we do something and it does not work, then go to plan B and then to plan C.

#### **Subcommittee #5 School Size & Location** (Austin, Jason, Rosie, Trevor)

Nick explained that location is mostly driven by data McKibben developed for a graphic study. A few interesting insights that you began to notice in the last session of the steering committee include that some schools are not in optimal locations. Jason: key things that are interesting that we start to absorb was demographic location that McKibben had. It is interesting to see where every child comes from—a huge bird's eye view. These schools were here—it raises the question in some cases why they were built there in the first place, and the question of is it still working. Based on demographics, it is easy to see the relationships, then the discussion of whether it serves the needs of those it serves. It is easily read now that WGM has put the information together. Trevor noted the work that WGM has done about where the kids are projected to live and where the building will occur. The physical circles on the map are not the boundaries of the schools; they are the bike-ability and walkability based on where kids are today and where they are expected to be in the future—the quarter mile and the mile. They talked a lot about transportation and the impact the school district has on transportation; the trail system; Lowell students going to CS Porter; how poorly located Big Sky is in terms of student population and where kids are coming from. Jason: They looked at boundaries: things that are physical impediments, which may affect a decision down the line: the river, Reserve Street, Russell Street. Trevor: the city/county boundaries; safety issues. Hawthorne is in the county, not in the city. The Ag Center is in the county. Big Sky is in the city but surrounded by county; the problem of being on the other side of Reserve. Jason: Are the graphics represented in a way

that people can absorb the information? Those are snapshots in time. In order for them to be foundations, we want to have continuity. Easy to absorb. Trevor brought up the possibility of an intermittent school, used on a temporary basis while a school is being renovated or rebuilt. WGM shows where growth is projected. The majority of our schools are really well placed; changes need to be made on boundaries. They talked about the Mt. Jumbo site: maybe rather than MCPS responding to growth, a school could encourage growth, work into bicycle-pedestrian circles. Jason: the data was so comprehensive, it raised questions about what drove what. There are impressions: one is that the Rattlesnake is a growth area, but it is not; it can't be. Trevor: they looked at adjacent properties: do they need to be purchased to accommodate various school plans? One big thing that we have a need for is the layover of the city parks. We talked about the collaboration of city parks with open space: e.g. Washington and the city park that could be used for P.E. space. The Riverbowl is a great place to have P.E. Jason: that discussion led to the realization of how important it is to have the inclusion between the district, city, county, zoning. It is nice to have consultants who know those things, and it is important for that information to be disseminated to all of us; it helps us to avoid being myopic in our thoughts. Trevor: transportation: we are trying to limit the amount of busing; busing is expensive. The impact Big Sky HS has on Reserve Street due to the majority of kids living north, the massive impact that has. To hear Brent Campbell not wanting to do a traffic study until school is in session—that is the impact we have. Nick: other key insights were that most of our schools are in the right locations but some are obviously not. The CS Porter group has said they don't think they are in a good location; the McKibben data supports that. Affirmation of observations those groups had had. The other piece Nick touched on is what other temporary spaces we have: Mt. Jumbo, Dickinson, Missoula College. It gets more complicated at the middle school years, 500, 600, 700 students. They listed other places that might be short term lease, absolutely temporary, buildings we don't own. In a lot of districts when you have to address renovation or replacement, you end up owning one more building than you really needed. It would be good if there is a way to meet a temporary need where someone else provides that space and then you are done with it. Geoff: from a presentation we just heard, we all know intellectually/intuitively—when he sees transportation and city/county boundary, it occurs to him that every one of our students is a Missoula County resident, and most are city residents. With city parks, he thinks there is an opportunity for the district to reach out and start to think about forming deeper, more substantial relationships with the city and the county. Alone we cannot accomplish nearly as much as we can if we partner with someone or several someones. Collectively putting our assets of resources together, we can make a positive outcome for all the partners. Jason: that is something that came out of our discussions: include as many partners in a win/win. Geoff: it goes back to public participation. At some point before we are too much further along, he suggests a presentation to the City Council and to the county commissioners, explaining what we are discovering in our work, so there is more coverage, more people understanding what is going on, another public forum. Karen: Dickinson and all the kids projected to be coming into that corridor and the possibility that we actually need that as an elementary. Trevor: every possibility we could think of, the bike paths, the California Street Bridge, things that connect kids to a closer site: he thinks that gets brought up on sheets with the Dickinson site. Karen: where are the kids going to be? People have to understand that over a lot of years we see as principals an apartment building go up and think “families!” But there weren't any. Nick: pay attention to when interest rates rise to about 5.5 percent: we will see a rise in enrollment because people won't move out of the city; and for the sale of existing homes, which the realty association tracks on a monthly basis, we can look at trends in the past and how it correlated to enrollment in the schools. Locating schools in the right places and making an investment in the schools represents a significant investment in the community infrastructure and leads to other development we'll need to be prepared for. A decade from now even a small investment made now in the schools might be incentive for people to live near them. Trevor: no

easy formula for these decisions for each of these sites. Big Sky may not be the best site for Big Sky, but is it easy to tear it down and build a new one? There is no growth in Grant Creek, and very little in the Rattlesnake. Jason: the school systems/communities that make decisions on one major piece of information, those schools/communities will be left behind. Our economy and our world don't work that way anymore. For us to have valuable information and move forward, it has to be done so much more quickly than it used to be done. The fact is that thinking has to change for us to be responsible for moving forward for 10, 15, 20 years. We must consider multiple data points. We have to take all the information into consideration and move forward in a way that is not myopic. Gary: did you discuss impacts 21<sup>st</sup> century education would have on size and locations of the schools? Trevor: that came up more in the group where we looked at different options. Not so much with this. It was more about the data. Nick: the old way of thinking is that we have to customize schools to meet a certain height of child: e.g. low counters, low toilets, even though those kids encounter full size stuff in the rest of their lives. What we have said to the future is that this school has to be an elementary unless you want to invest a lot in it. So with any investment you make, consider flexibility to support teaching and learning at any age. It could be an elementary at one time and a middle school at another time. Amongst our most challenging buildings to teach and learn in are those that began as elementaries and were added onto awkwardly. Don't hone in on a very specific way of doing something that never lets a building be used in any other way.

### **Review of Final Guiding Principles**

Nick: at the end of every session, we will look at the guiding principles. He will hand out the 30 to look at. Not all are clearly defined. There will need to be a meeting of the whole or a subcommittee to work on those. There was an observation yesterday that recruiting 3 or 4 trustees into that so they understand them will be important, so they don't unravel them. At least get you familiar with them. Nick asked the committee members to take 5 or 10 minutes and read through them quietly, then reflect. Bakke asked about the site plans being available. They will be available in a couple of weeks, after corrections; all online. Nick explained how we normally use guiding principles. We asked the Education Innovation Teams what works, what could be better, and what's missing. The second review is then to use these guiding principles and say when looking at option C and this particular guiding principle, is it highly effective, moderately effective, or not effective. You end up with a matrix of the guiding principles and the red-yellow-green traffic signal. Inevitably there will be some that are just a sea of red, and others that are a mix of yellow and green. All will have a red dot or a few; the key is not to get caught up in the groupthink and ignore a red dot, but look and see whether it is a fundamental flaw or whether it can be addressed, so the red becomes yellow and the option is even better. You can see why 30 would be cumbersome. When you read through them, he is sure you saw some that sound similar, or like an important guiding principle that does not really have facility impact, rather an education principle. That is the task of working with these, is to get a dozen or so on equal footing with each other so they can be an effective tool for culling the herd. We have 224 options on the table now—too many to hand over to the trustees. They need to get culled down to a reasonable level that leaves you as steering committee and the trustees also with a lot of flexibility. Jason: all 30 of these actually seem quite germane. They are the result of discussion; but as you mentioned our task right now in the process is to deal with physical plants, buildings, how do we take those and not lose the input, how do we redirect that? Nick: go through it with the filter of which fall into T&L and subtle facility impacts, and then say this dozen are really important, but we will put them in a different category, yet they will still be part of the work of this group. The school district thinks about it and says they are doing that over here. Karen: it is valuable: it is not just one of the pack over there, it has come up in this venue as well. Nick: those who were part of the 21<sup>st</sup> century education process will see some things they were already aware of—different processes coming to similar conclusions about where we are

headed affirm the points. Gary: 1—there has been such talk about the change in families—is there a difference in preschool learning of children because of the change in families? Nick: absolutely, there is a change in students' readiness to learn based on many different factors. Karen: the problems have always been there somewhere, but the more diverse your community becomes, the more we have it here. Nick: diversity comes in many different forms including readiness for schools. Gary: the universities have faced more nontraditional students than in the past; maybe we have more nontraditional kindergartners than before. Jason: the ability to be flexible with people over 18; how do they continue their education? Educators seem to think that is of the utmost importance; he had not realized it was even possible. How do we make sure we are embracing the diversity? Nick: in conversations about the 6 week segments: when he was a child, you moved in the summer and were ready to go—it happens much more frequently now that people move in the middle of the year and need to be placed. Victor has 40% midyear transiency; DeSmet also has a high level. That pattern tells us if we do things the way we always have, you would have a rough time until the next semester and then be ready to go. Discussion of intervention as also enrichment and extension. Jason: the ability to adapt fairly quickly in an educated way—a responsive way rather than a reactive way. Nick: we cannot boil it all down to one single guiding principle. You need enough different ways to think about the options to help to filter them and make choices. Nick: could we use a few minutes to talk about how best to convene and discuss that list and get it down to a reasonable list? Gary had asked when we could get all this information out electronically. That is the intent: to get it out electronically in a dynamic way. Someone could click survey, click, learn about the guiding principles, click on “I want to learn more about Franklin,” then have the option to provide comment. Same questions: what works? what doesn't? what's missing? and to apply the guiding principles as well. That's why if we are going to get this out, sometimes it would be good to have the guiding principles out with it. He recognizes it is December 6 and we have 2 weeks left of school then a 2-week break. Jason: if they could get the information into the hands of educators and parents, that gives them 2 weeks to look at it and review things. Nick: one suggestion was to get it out with the holiday concerts next week...but that is too soon. The Expanded Education Teams could be meeting with people in the first 3 weeks of January. Nick's goal would be that all this material is corrected and ready before the holidays. It's rollout with people talking intensely. Karen suggested sending the list of 30 out electronically—she would highlight in red what she thinks should come off, yellow as maybes, greens as important. Suggestions: Maybe Survey Monkey or Google docs. Nick: the only disadvantage is the importance of gaining involvement of trustees, the personal discussion. Karen suggested the communication committee could meet with the trustees. Rosemary suggested an intermediate list—Jason agreed—pare it down some then meet with Trustees. Geoff agreed with the electronic submission to the steering committee with a deadline and the ability to comment. Jason: in a Word doc we could highlight and add. Don't do the track change thing on the Word doc. Just highlight. Karen: we have to decide if we want to wordsmith or just look at big ideas. She prefers to wait until the end to wordsmith. Nick: the first pass is to look at the big ideas. Alex: in terms of facilities and instruction, or all together? Nick: if you are okay with it, he will give it 3 categories: facilities, T&L, and general community goals, and allow you to comment, including that you think it is in the wrong category. It might quickly show us how many are really facility related. Nick will make those category revisions, get it to Hatton and Burley to post, and get it to everyone with a deadline, maybe next Friday. He will get it out on Monday morning and give you till Friday. Next thing: is there a desire on your part to convene before we roll out the Apply phase the last week of January? You may be tapped to go to outreach meetings in the schools to connect with the Expanded Education and Innovation Teams the first 3 weeks of January. The idea is more participation up front, more understanding at the building level. Jason: another meeting sounds good; the better educated we are the more effective we can be at the community listening sessions. Alex asked whether anyone on the steering committee has

comments or ideas. Nick: was there anything that led you in new ways today? Kevin: flexibility and adaptability: he thinks we need to talk more and more about that.

### **Public Comment**

Ross Best spoke. He is not a parent. He is here largely because he read the last sentence on the agenda: all subcommittee meetings are open to the public, but there will only be official public comment at the end of this one. . . . Montana has a public participation law. Those of you who serve on subcommittees and committees are serving in an official capacity, and the public participation law is intended to protect the rights of those who are not in an official capacity. It requires that the agenda for any meeting must allow public comment. Ross expressed his concern that your subcommittees are not complying with that requirement of opportunity for general public comment. It says the agency may not take action on any matter discussed unless specific notice of that item has been placed on the agenda. He is concerned that the subcommittees are doing the business assigned to them and bypassing the public comment period. Ross stated that he frankly finds it shocking that you would have public comment on a day different from the meeting. The public participation law requires that you establish procedures to encourage public participation. He urged the committee to give some thought to what it means to encourage public comment. Advising and offering recommendations is official business and not exempt from the public participation law. Informality does not exempt you from the requirements either. It is official action: whether you consider it to be an official recommendation or a final recommendation, the public has an interest in being able to comment on it. He recognized that a lot of meetings have no public that shows up to comment. That is fine; often it means that the public is okay with what you are doing. The Survey Monkey appears to be a public meeting individually surveying members of the committee; that is a different kind of impropriety. People who are not on the committee have a right to submit comments. You cannot have your deliberations going on outside of publicly noticed meetings. You need to have your legal advisors explain to you what the requirements are of publicly noticed meetings. We have been here for over 3 hours. You have the duty to encourage public participation; you promise a commitment to transparency, but you send an unmistakable message to the public when you put public comment at the end and not on each item. Ross stated that you are just going through the motions and do not care about public comment. Recommendations were made on deliberations in meetings earlier in the week and now we can talk about them; that flies in the face of public comment. Prescott school: Jeanne Joscelyn and he have supported Prescott in the past. He spoke about the financial analysis of the implications of leasing the Prescott School building to MIS. When students go to MIS instead of attending public schools, there is a loss of state funding to the school district. A booming school like MIS has taken money away from the district and has also taken students away in a way that some of us find unconscionable. He asked the committee to take a comprehensive look at the leasing arrangement and at what a potential sale might mean for the school district.

Jeanne Jocelyn spoke. She stated that she waited 3 hours at the last school board meeting for public comment, and today is a repeat at 3 and a half hours. She said that Ross and she are the only ones from the public attending the meeting who don't have vested interests in our properties except for our interests that benefit the public. She said that other members of the public who are present are from MIS: they want Prescott School. Their enrollment has grown from 33 students originally to now 161 at the last check. This is an increase of 112 students. You may say they came from out of our school district, but MIS admits most come from our district. Jeanne said she stood on the corner of Van Buren and Elm and has seen 50 cars come in every morning into MIS; another 25 come down Van Buren from the Rattlesnake. So a third of their students are coming from the Rattlesnake. This was a concern in 2004 when this lease was approved. Drake Lemm and Rosemary Harrison are on this committee—Jeanne said Rosemary voted for the closure in 2004 and that Drake Lemm has advocated for the lease

of Prescott. So Jeanne is not sure this committee is as well founded as it needs to be in relation to our schools. Jeanne grew up in Missoula and has seen the changes that have come with the middle schools. She talks to others she grew up with in the public schools in the 60s and 70s, and almost every single one would like to go back to a K-8 system. The K-8 issue, small schools issue, middle schools issue, too much to address. A Hellgate High School student came to the podium at the Board meeting; he said he was representing Hellgate. In her comments about neighborhood schools like Prescott, Dickinson, and Jefferson, she feels she is speaking up for the neighborhoods.

Josh Slotnick spoke. He works with Garden City Harvest and on the UM Environmental Studies faculty. He thanked Gary and Karen: great report, it was obvious how thoughtful you had been compiling all that criteria and information. He also expressed thanks to the school district. The school district, the university and Garden City Harvest partnered to create the PEAS Farm. Tens of thousands of pounds of food for the Food Bank, field trips, far beyond what the typical school district would do. This project has received tremendously broad support. More than 900 people came to their event in August; 500 came to their event in October when it was cold. Projects that people have to pay for have sold out year after year. Josh has been invited to universities all over, even Thailand, to speak about it. Thanks for the work you have done with us. You said you think one on one conversations with Garden City Harvest should happen next; he appreciates that. He wants to expand that to folks from the city and from Environmental Studies. He noted that Nick said maybe we could trade 16 acres—the PEAS Farm is 13 acres—that we could swap that for 60 acres at the Vo-Ag Center and meet the needs of more people; but our farm exists and is successful because it works within biophysical parameters. It creates context for teenagers, for kids from Youth Court, for university students who are there as part of class, who ride their bikes do the work. It is very public, right there in the center of things; people drive by and walk by regularly. It is successful because people know what it is, where it is, and they can get there by bus. Biophysical: we have great soil and great water; we have built up the soil over time, invested hundreds of thousands of dollars. We are rooted culturally, embedded in the culture of the town; we are also rooted biophysically. Josh looks forward to one on one conversations including the city and university. Nick clarified that the team representing Vo-Ag had an idea of a high level of collaboration, with biodiesel and a deeper partnership. Slotnick: we have worked closely with them.

Julie Lennox said she is here as the parent of 2 kids who have come through MCPS schools and now are semi-launched, and as a citizen of Missoula and as a taxpayer and an educator. She is excited about this process you are doing; it has a lot of inclusivity. She is excited by the vision that you are working with, by throwing ideas on the table. As a representative of MIS, she is interested in the process. They have been in the Prescott building for 10 years now. They are in their own process of trying to figure out where they would like to be for the long term. Julie said they have taken really good care of it. There are issues: there is a lot of deferred maintenance. She is interested in the process and watching it.

### **Closing Thoughts & Reflections**

Nick said he appreciates the time everyone has invested. He will send updates on Monday; items will be distributed. He will schedule meetings and let people know when they are scheduled for. The Education Innovation Teams will do outreach in January; at the end of January/early February is the next phase of meetings. Karen: we try to avoid Fridays and Mondays because of issues around getting substitutes. Nick: Seeley Lake folks asked not to have to travel twice; he will try to provide a meaningful experience for them. As we have been doing, we will be getting notes integrated into the long document and reposting it; it is our opportunity to dig in and try to understand more. All the raw data from McKibben and WGM maps have all been posted now so people can understand what it looks like. As soon as these maps can be corrected and shared, he will post them.

The meeting adjourned at 3:51 p.m.

As recording secretary for this meeting, I certify these minutes to be a true and correct copy of what was taken at the meeting. \_\_\_\_\_

Elizabeth Serviss, Minutes Recorder

\_\_\_\_\_  
Alex P. Apostle, Superintendent

DRAFT

