**School Capital Improvement Planning Task Force**

**Notes from January 21, 2014 Meeting**

**Metro Offices in Portland**

Members Present: Joe Rodriguez, Scott Rose, David Krumbein, Geoffrey Hunnicutt, David McKay, Edward Wolf, Matt Donahue, Jeana Woolley, Don Grotting, Craig Roberts, Cheri Rhinhart

Members Absent: Carol Samuels

Guests: Ruth Scott, Morgan Allen, Dennis Whitehouse, Ben Sawsburt (Metro), Clint Chiavarin (Metro)

Matt Donahue presented the slide show developed by Carol Samuels on GO bonding.

Ruth Scott: the language in SB 540 about “the evolving methods of education” came from the OEIB and came out of the movement towards and integrated P-20 system—primarily the possibility of putting pre-k programs into public school buildings. Community colleges did not want to be included in the task force.

Dave Krumbein: evolving methods of education also means technology—connectivity, online classes, etc.

Joe Rodriguez: the task force report is due in October, but the funding goes through the biennium. Is there work that will need to continue after the report is done? The key is to make what the task force does as flexible as possible.

Scott Rose: Equity is an important consideration.

Ted Wolf: we should look at the governor’s ideas about capital. The TF can learn from what the governor’s office has already done.

Ruth Scott: standards can help assure that facilities are high quality and prevent incentives from leading to unintended consequences.

Scott Rose: standards can be used as a guide or a hammer. They need to be designed carefully so they serve as guides.

Joe Rodriguez gave a demo of the School Atlas system. It is a GIS-based mapping and data system.

Scott Rose: we need to make sure that the “need” data for school districts are accurate if the state is going to make funding decisions based on the data.

David McKay: How is the capacity of a building determined?

Joe Rodriguez: there is no common method of determining the capacity of a building. If we are going to use a capacity measure, we will need to define it in a common way.

David McKay: CTE programs have different space needs than strictly academic programs.

Joe Rodriguez: capacity and enrollment growth are key issues for school district planning.

Craig Roberts: We also need to think about rapid response in the case of emergencies.

Joe Rodriguez: School Atlas is a tool that we can use with the data. Gathering the data is a different matter. Data from a lot of different sources can be loaded into Atlas.

Don Grotting: We shouldn’t let the task force get bogged down too much on specifics. We need to stay at a more conceptual level for the issues at hand.

Ruth Scott: She has some slides on the conditions and needs rating system.

Key questions are:

1. What factors do we want to consider in evaluating facilities and needs, and how do you weight the various factors to arrive at a measure or score?
2. What facility characteristics affect student learning?
3. What data do we need?
4. How will we use the data to evaluate need and determine funding assistance?

Ruth Scott: there are concerns about the accuracy of the DOGAMI data.

Joe Rodriguez: There is a big need for technical assistance in school districts.

Jeana: It is not the task force’s job to get caught up in the data. It’s too early to make any hard decisions about the data.

Matt Donahue: The database is one of many things the task force needs to cover.

Dave Krumbein: Who are the key audiences to the database? Is it primarily for running a state program for funding facilities, or is it broader than that?

Brian Reeder: The technical data issues are not that great. The challenge is to design a funding program and the criteria that drive it, that is, what would go into a needs index?

Scott Rose gave a presentation on standards (PowerPoint). Key points:

1. You need to know what you are collecting the data for.
2. The standards should be “timeless”, meaning they should be general enough that they don’t become quickly outdated.
3. If the state is at least partly providing funding for facilities, the question comes up of how much say the state should have in the building standards.
4. The degree to which districts adhere to the standards in their proposals can serve as criteria to prioritize projects for state funding.
5. Need to think about how the state can hold districts accountable for what they do with the money—doing what they said they would do.
6. When the district does a project that includes some state money, the state should capture some basic data about what the district did.
7. Key question: does the state need design standards, and if so, what “flavor” are they—how detailed and complex?
8. Facility data gets outdated very quickly. The more detailed your assessment of a building’s condition is, the better able you are to project the future condition because you can project the expected remaining life of individual components (roof, HVAC, etc.)
9. Need to consider how you update the data. Do it regularly (e.t., annually), or just when something changes? If you are going to use it to evaluate needs, then having it current is important. Maybe we require districts to update it as part of an application for state funds.
10. Need to have criteria for determining when the state needs to say “you need to replace that building instead of putting more money into renovating it”.

Scott Rose: We need an assessment standard to distribute state funds—an objective measure of need. Rather than asking questions like “what conditions is the roof in?”, you need to ask objective questions like “when was the roof installed?. Does the roof have any leaks? Are there any raised seems?” Etc.

Only collect the data you need. The funding plan should drive what data you need to collect. Collect what you need to make decisions about funding.

Question: do we initially focus on helping districts catch up with deferred maintenance (e.g., bringing all facilities up to a minimum standard), even if that means the distribution of funds might appear inequitable? What is our definition of equitable?

Scott Rose: The work of the task force has the potential to be transformational because it can dramatically change the way we look at capital planning, so ODE probably needs to develop some expertise in capital planning.

Washington requires districts to update their data every 6 years. The state pays for that work. The work is done by professionals, with a percentage of the districts doing the work each year. Districts are also required to do annual updates of any major changes.

Scott rose: Washington has a method of monitoring the condition of buildings so that they can assess whether ongoing maintenance is adequate. The purpose is to prevent districts from skimping on maintenance in order to get state renovation funding. Another method is to require a certain level of maintenance spending in order to qualify for state funding.

Jeana Woolley: it’s important that while we are providing catch-up on deferred maintenance that we also make money available for new construction.

Scott Rose: it will be important to give districts some technical assistance for what goo planning is and to do basic assessments—a checklist of what needs to be done, when, and how often.

Scott Rose: To keep the cost of data collection down, it makes sense to only collected detailed data from districts when they ask for state funding.

Joe Rodriquez: Don’t take on the whole database question now. We need a framework for a funding system first.

Jeana Woolley: We need to transform our thinking; we can’t get bogged down in the data details.

Dave Krumbein: How does capital sup[port student achievement? How do we convince the legislature that it does?

Scott rose: There are a lot of studies that show that good facilities improve student achievement.

Geoff Hunnicutt: How does the community nature of schools, particularly in low-income areas, affect how we look at this?

Scott rose: The space needs may differ for schools that have a lot of community activities.

Matt Donahue: (slide show) Can the state expect districts to do certain things (e.g., approve a construction excise tax) before they qualify for the state matching funds?

Jeana Woolley: Where are we on the state debt limit? Is there a way to coordinate with the QZAB program to make it more attractive? Create partner pools? We need to think about data needs in short-run and long-run terms.