Grinnell-Newburg Community School District Regular Board Meeting

The Grinnell-Newburg Board of Education met on April 26, 2017, at 6:00 p.m. at the Grinnell-Newburg Community High School in the Boardroom, 1333 Sunset Street, Grinnell, Iowa 50112.

Members Present: Barbara Brown, Meg Jones Bair, Helen Redmond, Dustin Smith, Jeff Smith, and Stephen Sieck.

Members Absent: Jonathan Nance

Also in attendance at the table: Superintendent Dr. Janet Stutz and HR/Payroll Assistant Judy Smith.

Administrators Present: Shawn Edelen

D. Smith read the District's Mission and Vision Statements.

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

President Brown called the regular meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. HR/Payroll Assistant Smith called the roll. Six members were in attendance.

2. Fiduciary

No questions.

3. Approval of Consent Agenda

Motion by Jones Bair, seconded Sieck by to approve the consent agenda.

A. Approve/Amend Agenda

- **B. Minutes:** 2/22/17 Facility Minutes
- C. Claims and Accounts
- D. Personnel:
 - 1. Resignations:
 - 2. Offerings:
 - 3. Transfers:
 - 4. Upgrades:
 - **5. Open Enrollment In (2016-17):** Keegan Rilatos: 4th grade from Lynnville-Sully; Trinity Rilatos: 7th grade from Lynnville-Sully

6. Open Enrollment In (2017-18): Avery Behounek: Kindergarten from South Tama

Motion to approve the consent agenda carried 6-0.

4. Communication from the Public None

5. Communications and Reports

A. Board None

B. Superintendent

a. Recognitions

Superintendent Stutz recognized student Julia Chamberland and staff member Abby Allen. Of Chamberland, Stuz noted the work she had done organizing an effort to plant a series of trees across the high school campus. Of Allen, Stutz noted Allen was nominated by the 6th grade teacher team, for her constant support of our middle school students.

- b. Literacy Goal Planning for the 2017-18 School Year
 Stutz detailed the meetings she has held with literacy teachers K-8, and the process for which they are working through to determine proficiency and gaps, as well as planning for a new curriculum implementation. She explained this will provide consistency. Jones Bair asked about a timeline. Stutz explained we will do a pilot in the 17-18 year, and resources will not be purchased until the 18-19 year.
- c. Focus for 2017-18

Stutz discussed the plans the administrative team has for the 17-18 school year. She stated the administrative team has made goals that they would like to reach in three years, and have worked backward to plan out what needs to be done in the next year in order to reach those goals. She detailed plans for professional development, culture climate, continued building collaborative teams, continued work on curriculum alignment, facility plans, Vanguard training cycle 2, NGSS, and our literacy pilot.

- d. SIAC Committee Stutz stated she would like to have a SIAC Committee Meeting soon.
- e. Tentative Agreement Stutz stated she hoped to have a tentative agreement with the union very soon.

6. Old Business

A. Discussion of site visits

Stutz noted both visits were good, and there was quite a bit of discussion about each site. She stated both sites had good things she saw, but she stated she believed relationship with the architect firm was the most important to her. She believed both firms could do what we wanted and needed, but she felt the relationship with CMBA is what she was looking for in an architect.

D. Smith noted that BLDD's site had innovative spaces that he was looking for. He felt like CMBA's site had a lot of similarities to what we have now, but that CMBA would be able to help pass a bond. He stated he would be happy with both.

Redmond discussed the architectural design and details that she felt BLDD was missing that CMBA had, including natural lighting, creative spaces, furniture conducive to spaces, electrical outlets available so students could plug their laptops in collaborative spaces. She believed CMBA planned the details where it was clear that with BLDD several design elements and architectural needs were an afterthought rather than an essential part of the planning process. She also said CMBA had the energy needed to get a bond passed.

Stutz stated there are 33 design principals and she was using those principles, looking at material, sustainability, furniture selection, stairs construction, orientation, storage etc., and she stated CMBA had a lot of those components. She said she was hoping to see more collaborative spaces at CMBA's site but she was told the district didn't really want those spaces, but she also noted that collaboration spaces really began to be implemented after the building was build. She repeated both firms were very skilled.

Edelen stated he was not impressed with BLDD, particularly the poor lighting and poor materials used, including floor tiles, nor did he favor the heating and cooling system they put in place. CMBA had a simple, effective heating and cooling system. He was also please with the architectural design of the building and the way they incorporated all units under the roof instead of above it, and by providing easy access to elements that need repair throughout the building.

Brown asked if we had had a chance to hear from others who have worked with both firms. Stutz stated the Estes has worked with both firms, and noted the two-way-communication was better with CMBA. Stutz also said for her it came down to the little things like materials selected and execution of the projects, as well as the ability to pass a bond and she feels like CMBA would be a better choice. She felt like the community would connect better with CMBA.

J. Smith asked how big the sites were. Stutz stated the CMBA K4 building they saw was 1,500-1,800 for 500 students, and it did not seem cramped. He also asked about the two story BLDD building, and D. Smith stated they chose a two story because they were adding on to the high school and did not have the space to have other options.

Discussion continued about which firm would be a better choice.

B. Board will charge the Superintendent and Estes Construction to work with the selected architectural firm for a recommended contract to bring to the Board May 10, 2017 for approval.

Motion by Redmond, seconded by J. Smith, to charge the Superintendent and Estes Construction to work with the selected architectural firm for a recommended contract to bring to the Board May 10, 2017 for approval.

Motion carried 5-0.

7. New Business

A. According to the Master Contract, Article 11.1, the Board of Directors is to approve any new payroll deductions. We are requesting that you approve a new payroll deduction for existing employees who will be participating in the GRMC Day Camp.

Motion by Jones Bair, seconded by D. Smith, to approve a new payroll deduction for existing employees who will be participating in the GRMC Day Camp.

Motion carried 6-0.

B. Approve the parking lot project for bid.

Motion by Jones Bair, seconded by J. Smith, to approve the parking lot project for

bid.

Motion carried 6-0.

C. Approve fees for the 2017-18 School Year.

Motion by Redmond, seconded by Sieck, to approve fees for the 2017-18 School Year.

Motion carried 6-0.

8. Board Discussion

Redmond noted she was pleased with the process to select the architect firms, as she was able to visit both sites.

9. Board Talking Points None

10. Adjournment

Motion by Jones Bair, seconded by Redmond, to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried 6-0.

Meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

Board Calendar:

Regular Board Meeting

6:00 p.m., May 10, 2017