



**MEETING MINUTES**  
**Park City School District Education Master Plan**  
**Planning Committee Workshop #16**  
**April 3, 2019**  
**1:00 – 3:00 PM**

Attendees: Anne Peters, Todd Hauber, Melinda Colton, Jill Gildea, Todd Hansen, Andrew Caplan – PCSD; Lindsey Ferrari, Clio Rayner, Christine Richman – GSBS; Chris Guarino – NV5

#	Description	Action by
1	Introduction 1. Reviewed Meeting Norms	
2	Facilities 1. Reviewed layout for existing conditions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. These will be laid out by school, one for each school</li> <li>b. Included in the layout               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Space list</li> <li>ii. High level facility condition assessment scoring</li> <li>iii. Demographics</li> <li>iv. Space Use Diagrams</li> <li>v. Section for the options and recommendations for specific school                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will have low hanging fruit</li> <li>2. Will have changes for each school that respond to the overall recommendations</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> 2. Reviewed overall master plan document layout <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. There will be three volumes               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Master plan</li> <li>ii. Ed Spec</li> <li>iii. Appendices</li> </ul> </li> <li>b. Draft of the Ed Spec - April 16<sup>th</sup> for PCSD review</li> <li>c. Draft of the existing conditions report – April 16<sup>th</sup> for PCSD review</li> <li>d. Discussion at April 16<sup>th</sup> could include a conversation around the draft of the education specification and the existing conditions</li> <li>e. Comments               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Will the scoring for the existing conditions have some interpretation of guidance for the public to understand context?                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The team will send the example to the PC for review before the 16<sup>th</sup>. Any comments on the approach can be addressed as part of the PCSD review.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
3	Communication Approach Recommendations 1. April 16 <sup>th</sup> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Public Information/Communication needs               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Results: Public involvement, education specification development and task force process has resulted in some great consensus                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Examples                       <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. 3 things a PCSD graduate should know</li> <li>b. Guiding Principles</li> <li>c. Criteria from task forces</li> <li>d. 9<sup>th</sup> grade in high school</li> <li>e. 7-8 grade together</li> </ul> </li> <li>ii. Process:: The presentation of options is just the beginning of a 6-9 month process to evaluate and prioritize the options</li> <li>iii. Roles:: It is the role of the Board to review the options through the dual lens of quality education and cost</li> <li>iv. Cost: Costs will be developed for the options that are most attractive to the Board and the public</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> 2. Communication time line <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. April 16<sup>th</sup> – Board Meeting</li> <li>b. April 17<sup>th</sup> – Steering Committee Meeting</li> </ul>	



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c. Early May - Survey and Board member hosted neighborhood discussions</li> <li>d. Mid-May - community forum</li> <li>e. May 21<sup>st</sup> - Board meeting</li> </ul> <p>3. Public Involvement approach discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Survey goals             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Does the public agree with the criteria assessment</li> <li>ii. Give feedback on options as a whole</li> </ul> </li> <li>b. Neighborhood discussions hosted by Board members             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Need to provide an overview of what these would look like</li> </ul> </li> <li>c. Public discussion hosted by outside organization</li> <li>d. Ask the Steering Committee to reach out to their contacts             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Need to develop content that is clear and can be shared</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
4	<p>Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Discussed draft matrix approach and preliminary scoring             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Reviewed the graphic of evaluation matrix                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Top is the alignment options that are scored by the grade alignment task for criteria</li> <li>ii. Alignment options included are every rational option out there with the following assumptions                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 9 in high school</li> <li>2. 7 and 8 always together</li> <li>3. K-4 together</li> </ul> </li> <li>iii. Current graphic for review does not have Pre-K or 9-12 yet but these will be included later</li> <li>iv. Reviewed how the alignments were scored based on the criteria provided by the task force</li> <li>v.</li> </ul> </li> <li>b. Next level proposes number of schools for each level and scores those based on School/Class Size criteria using the projections for enrollment</li> <li>c. Next level shows how existing and new locations can be used for these facilities and scores those based on School Locations criteria</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Reviewed options for Pre-K that will be included based on the criteria from Grade Alignment             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Neighborhood</li> <li>b. Centralized</li> <li>c. Hybrid</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Reviewed options for High School             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. 1 high school</li> <li>b. 2 high schools</li> <li>c. 1 with a special high school</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. Comments             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Need to role out updated timelines for the process now to May 21<sup>st</sup> and May 21<sup>st</sup> and beyond before releasing any other material                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. GSBS to update timeline to May 21<sup>st</sup></li> <li>ii. PCSD to develop timeline for May 21<sup>st</sup> and beyond based off of graphic layout from GSBS</li> </ul> </li> <li>b. Want to try to make viable options that are not eliminated only based on their cost                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The team would like some time to consider approaches to respond to this goal</li> <li>ii. This could be part of the process after May 21<sup>st</sup> as well</li> </ul> </li> <li>c. How do we want to address questions based on educational programming and delivery?                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The task force removed programming discussions form the grade alignment decision because there are other, more appropriate ways to address these issues</li> <li>ii. This could be addressed on the 16<sup>th</sup> as part of the grade alignment introduction</li> </ul> </li> <li>d. Can grade alignment scoring be used to eliminate options?                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. It is the only task force that is educationally focused so it seems appropriate as a first stage of prioritization based on quality education</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>e. How is transportation being addressed as a part of this plan?               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. PCSD alone cannot solve this problem though the details of the options may help</li> <li>ii. Transportation can be reviewed in the context of the preferred approach for quality education and cost</li> </ul> </li> <li>5. Discussed approach for upcoming meetings               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. April 16<sup>th</sup> presentation - focus on what is best for learning and kids                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Introduction from Andrew</li> <li>ii. Superintendent initial thoughts</li> <li>iii. Timeline to May 21<sup>st</sup> and beyond</li> <li>iv. Present Guiding Principles and Ed Specs without details</li> <li>v. Present all the task force criteria</li> <li>vi. Present scoring for educational delivery                       <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Grade alignment</li> <li>2. Guiding Principles</li> <li>3. Combined scores</li> </ul> </li> <li>vii. Present 2 top options from this standpoint                       <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Show the matrix with these options and then each option individually</li> </ul> </li> <li>viii. Scoring for School/Class size and beyond will be discussed in more detail with the costs at a later date</li> <li>ix. Facilities information is more applicable to the cost conversation and will be presented at another time</li> </ul> </li> <li>b. Approach for the Steering Committee Meeting on April 17<sup>th</sup> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Everyone gets two minutes to present their thoughts</li> <li>ii. Discuss scoring - both how it was scored and the justification for the scores</li> </ul> </li> <li>c. May 21<sup>st</sup> presentation                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Goal to have costs of preferred options</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>6. Comments               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Want to daylight how options compare to existing facilities as early as possible and in a simplified way that is understandable                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Buildings green, yellow or red</li> <li>ii. This information is currently available for a building condition standpoint but not from an educational suitability standpoint</li> </ul> </li> <li>b. What do we need from the public?                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. To date the public has had to opportunity to weigh in on the development of the criteria</li> <li>ii. From this point forward they need to..                       <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review how the options align with that work</li> <li>2. Educate themselves on the work to date</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>c. Group should meet Monday April 15<sup>th</sup> for a dry run of the presentation</li> <li>d. GSBS to provide the presentation layout on Wednesday April 10<sup>th</sup></li> <li>e. Board can ask questions to get more detail in certain areas                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Team to discuss possible questions as part of the preparation</li> </ul> </li> <li>f. The goal of this process is to have the community lead towards a scenario that is the best for the community</li> <li>g. Want community feedback completed by second week in May</li> <li>h. Master Plan development process should conclude with the marriage of the values with cost                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Show synthesized options</li> <li>ii. Express the values</li> <li>iii. Express the costs</li> <li>iv. What is the approach that best responds to both</li> </ul> </li> <li>i. PCSD needs to develop a board decision tree and calendar that addresses implementation                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. How to phase</li> <li>ii. What are the funding sources</li> <li>iii. What is the education programming</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
	<p>Next steps and Action items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review website layout for opportunities to clarify content - <b>Ongoing</b></li> </ul>	<p>PCSD</p>



# THE FUTURE OF LEARNING

	2. Define outreach approach for April/May - <b>PCSD to confirm recommendations above</b>	<i>PCSD</i>
	3. Provide updated scope in response to items above	<i>GSBS</i>
	4. Provide detailed schedule for the next eight weeks	<i>GSBS</i>
	5. Create a graphic for the PCSD schedule/plan	<i>GSBS</i>
	6. Invite SC, LL, Task Force to the Board Meeting on April 16th	<i>NV5</i>