

**To:** Operations and Facilities Action Team

**From:** Douglas Kahl // DK

**Date:** June 13, 2014

**Comm. No.** 9999

---

**Subject:** Independent School District #720  
Shakopee Public Schools  
June 5, 2014 Excellence in Operations and Facilities "Action Team" Meeting Minutes – Meeting #4

**Attendants:**

|        |                     |        |                       |
|--------|---------------------|--------|-----------------------|
| X      | Ted Aleckson        | Absent | Kristen Knox          |
| X      | Erik Allen          | X      | Kevin Koetke          |
| X      | Christine Amundson  | X      | Kristin Koller        |
| Absent | April Bengston      | Absent | Carla Kress           |
| X      | Heather Berndt      | X      | Brian Kroll           |
| Absent | Nancy Berndt        | X      | Larry Lacy            |
| Absent | Shawn Bouley        | X      | Donna Lane            |
| Absent | Chris Breault       | X      | Lisa Larson           |
| Absent | Tim Brosam          | Absent | Cindy Legg            |
| X      | David Bruns         | Absent | Leanne Lehn           |
| Absent | John Canny          | Absent | Ryan Liddell          |
| Absent | Rachel Carlson      | Absent | Kirk Lindberg         |
| X      | Ann Conrad          | Absent | Kim Loughlin          |
| X      | Peter Conrad        | X      | Jake Luce             |
| Absent | Jannette Costa      | X      | Natalie Macht         |
| X      | Chuck Doherty       | X      | Julie Maynard-Johnson |
| Absent | Grant Domke         | X      | Kari McGuire          |
| Absent | Bruce Finke         | Absent | Nicole McGuire        |
| Absent | Tom Frazier         | X      | Janelle Meier         |
| X      | Scott Garwood       | Absent | Christy Mennen        |
| X      | Kris Grabianowski   | X      | Marty Michael         |
| X      | Melissa Gregor      | Absent | Jon Miller            |
| X      | Will Grimmus        | X      | Wanda Monroe          |
| Absent | Denise Harinen      | X      | Chris Nadeau          |
| X      | Janni Hennes        | X      | Barb Odenwald         |
| X      | Gail Hill           | X      | Tony Pass             |
| Absent | Marge Hillman       | X      | Andrea Peck           |
| X      | Amanda Holm         | X      | Jared Peck            |
| X      | Jeff Imhoff         | X      | Kristi Peterson       |
| X      | John Janke          | X      | Peggy Philipp         |
| Absent | Christopher Johnson | Absent | Mike Piper            |
| Absent | Benjamin Kimball    | Absent | Nate Plagge           |
| Absent | Ericka Kimball      | Absent | Jamie Polley          |

|        |                       |        |               |
|--------|-----------------------|--------|---------------|
| X      | Jean Riederer         | X      | Jody Stone    |
| X      | Ford Rolfsrud         | Absent | Molly Susee   |
| Absent | Siera Romine          | X      | Todd Taylor   |
| X      | Pat Russett           | X      | Bob Techam    |
| X      | Julie Schlueter       | Absent | Julie Theis   |
| X      | Ed Schwaesdall        | X      | Mike Tillman  |
| X      | Dawn Selman-Schwieger | X      | Diane Toohey  |
| X      | Teresa Shanks         | Absent | Kelli Ulrich  |
| Absent | Sarah Snell           | X      | Jane VonBank  |
| Absent | Alyssa St. Martin     | X      | Pamela Wilger |
| X      | Adrienne Stark        |        |               |

**Board of Education Attendants:**

Mary Romansky, Chairperson  
Reggie Bowerman, Vice Chairperson  
Scott Swanson, Treasurer  
Angela Tucker, Clerk  
Matt McKeand, Board Member  
Chuck Berg, Board Member  
Shawn Hallett, Board Member

**Administration:**

Dr. Rod Thompson, Superintendent  
Dr. John Bezek, Assistant Superintendent  
Mike Burlager, Director of Business Services

**Facilitators:**

|  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| Christine Wroblewski, Teamworks              | christinew@teamworksintl.net |
| Pat Overom, ICS                              | pato@ics-consult.com         |
| Mike Hoheisel, Baird Financial               | mhoheisel@rwbaird.com        |
| Scott McQueen, Wold Architects and Engineers | smcqueen@woldae.com          |
| Douglas Kahl, Wold Architects and Engineers  | dkahl@woldae.com             |
| Josh Grenier, Wold Architects and Engineers  | jgrenier@woldae.com          |

*The fourth meeting of the Shakopee Public Schools "Excellence in Operations and Facilities Action Team" was held in the Auxiliary Gymnasium of Shakopee High School to discuss District Operations & Facilities.*

**Discussion Topics:**

- A. Dr. Rod Thompson, District Superintendent, opened the meeting with a brief update, acknowledging that the group wants to keep moving forward. The first presentation was from Corey Whitbeck of TaTonka Real Estate Advisors regarding a study his firm had done regarding available land in the Shakopee District. After Corey presented his findings, there were questions from the group.
  1. A question from an Action Team member: *What about this "land" we have heard about? What is available?*
    - a. Response, from Corey Whitbeck of TaTonka Real Estate Advisors: *The District is considering anything 20 acres or larger. Based on the map (shown at the time of the meeting), there are not a great deal of properties, in the Shakopee district, that fit the 20-acre minimum criteria. A brief summary of low-high costs of the properties was also presented.*

2. A question from an Action Team member: *Who is responsible for routing new utilities to undeveloped sites?*
  - a. Response: *The new owner of the site would be responsible for any necessary utilities they may need, however, it is hoped that the purchase price would reflect the need for such improvements.*
3. A question from an Action Team member: *How does zoning issues affect our decision-making process?*
  - a. Response: *Zoning layouts were intentionally not looked at or considered in the review of available 20+ acre properties. Zoning tends to be somewhat flexible for school use, and once a potential property is narrowed-in on, any potential zoning issues would be reviewed then.*
4. Follow-up from Dr. Thompson: *We will continue to work with consultants and seek feedback from the community, regarding future new property decisions or where a new building(s) would go in our future. As a reminder, the existing vacant site owned by the District is not necessarily the final place to build a new facility. The District could, for instance, sell that property if a better one comes along at some point.*
- B. Chuck Berg, from the District School Board, summarized the joint City/School Board meeting from Tuesday, May 27, 2014 to discuss potential facility shared needs.
  1. "Other" needs were discussed, needs that impact both the City and the District.
  2. A commonality was realized, in that the City/District residents are the ones that ultimately pay for the various improvements; to be good stewards of the tax-payers' money, an effort is being made to not duplicate services.
  3. Two City Council members and two School Board members will continue to meet to look at areas of interest between the City and the District, potentially such as additional sheets of ice, a community center, etc.
  4. Every time a new school is built, new fields are included. Every time there is city development, park space is typically included. A joint effort between the City and District could provide one site that accommodates two areas of need.
- C. Reggie Bowerman, from the Shakopee School Board, presented and summarized the results of the post-referendum survey.
  1. The survey was announced at a School Board meeting, then advertised through the District website, social media, and the newspapers. Hard copies were also made available at numerous locations throughout the District.
  2. Approximately 1,400 persons replied to the survey. 25% of those who replied (approximately 350 people) indicated they did not vote in the referendum.
  3. Based on the survey, the major reasons why the 25% did not vote in the referendum include *"lines were too long"* and *"I was too busy."* Additionally, under *"Other,"* common responses included *"I didn't feel very strongly," "I was undecided/unsure," "I was out of town,"* and *"I don't live in Shakopee."*
  4. For those persons who filled out the survey and did vote, approximately 60% voted against the referendum and 40% for it; this is consistent with the results from the actual referendum.
  5. For those who supported the referendum, their reasons included *"Greater opportunity," "Concerned about class-size and overcrowding," "Thought the plan was well thought out,"* and *"Do not like the idea of a large high school."* Some were not entirely convinced of the prescribed solution to their problems, but thought the plan was the best option available.
  6. Top three reasons were sought from non-supporters of the referendum. 54% of respondents listed *"I don't want to split the high school."* Other popular reasons included, *"I believe we can add on to the existing high school," "The plan was too expensive," "I want one sports team for Shakopee," "I don't believe a second high school will provide more opportunities for students," "I believe in a large high school,"* and *"I support a 9/10 grade-level building and an 11/12 grade-level building."*
  7. When asked if they had heard from a group (yes/supporters or no/non-supporters), 39% of survey-respondents indicated they had heard from neither group.
  8. When asked when they had made their decisions, 60% of survey-respondents indicated they made up their minds 3-6 months prior to the referendum.
  9. When asked if they felt they were informed, 83% indicated they *"knew enough"* or *"knew a lot."*

10. When asked how they received information about the referendum, major responses included *"District newsletter," "District mailers," "the Newspaper," "Word of Mouth," "Info sent home in Red Folders," "Social Media," "Referendum Central website,"* and *"District roll-out meetings for the public."*
11. When asked to provide demographic information, nearly 77% of survey-respondents were parents of students in the District, 36% were community members, 17% were parents of past District graduates, 13% were District alumni, 12% were District employees, 6% were parents with students attending another District, and 4% were retired.
12. Based on geographic distribution, when looking at what school survey-respondents lived closest to, there was a good distribution of responses, with no lop-sided concentrations from one section of the District over another.
13. A question from an Action Team member: *Can we simply list choices on a future ballot?*
  - a. Response: *No. We cannot put options on a referendum, as it is forbidden by State law. It is a simply up or down vote. A future referendum could be broken into pieces, each with their own up or down vote.*
14. A question from an Action Team member: *Are Task Forces and community involvement sought?*
  - a. Response: *Yes. We have had 3 or 4 community-based task forces in the past. Issues we are discussing today are based largely on the results of the previous task forces.*
- D. Scott McQueen, of Wold, updated the Action Team on requests made by the group at the previous meeting.
  1. An excerpt from the Minnesota Department of Education guidelines for school planning was presented, which described a recommended square-foot/student, based on school type; this document informs many District planning decisions. The guidelines recommendations do not reflect the recent changes to all-day kindergarten, which would increase the recommended square-feet/student at an elementary school (by approximately 15 square feet).
- E. Nancy Thul from the Academics Action Team, accompanied by three District Principals (Angela Turry of Pearson 6<sup>th</sup> Grade Center, Lori Link of West Junior High, and Jim Miklausich of East Junior High), updated the Action Team on requests made by the group at the previous meeting.
  1. Academics Action Team was asked to think big; where will the District be in 10 years? They are responsible for the goals, but not the steps to achieving those goals.
  2. Questions the Academics Action Team was requested to answer or elaborate upon, for the Facilities Action Team:
    - a. Can you provide more detail with what was shared with Guiding Coalition at the last meeting?
      - 1.) Response: *They are looking to provide students with a greater voice, in helping determine how they learn; problem-based or real-world learning; less emphasis on teacher-directed learning; more flexibility; less seat time; less about grade level and more on 'are you ready for the next step;' individual learning plans; the "6 Cs" (Critical-thinking, Communication/Collaboration, Character, Cultural, Confidence, Creativity).*
    - b. Why, from instructional perspective, is the 9-12 high school reconfiguration preferred?
      - 1.) Response: *There is an instructional benefit of having 9<sup>th</sup> graders in a high school (9-12), rather than a junior high (7-9), likewise, there is an instructional benefit to having 6<sup>th</sup> graders in a junior high/middle school (6-8), rather than a secluded 6<sup>th</sup> grade center. The 9-12 high school configuration does not automatically assume or mandate there be two high schools, however.*
      - 2.) Response: *9<sup>th</sup> graders have long been required to accumulate high school credits. Most colleges require credits from the 9<sup>th</sup> grade in their application process. The high school environment places greater responsibility on the 9<sup>th</sup> grader, when making course-selections, for instance, and has a greater developmental impact than the junior high model currently offers.*
      - 3.) Response: *There is a State mandate that requires ALL students to be college-ready at the end of their high school career; the 9-12 high school configuration would help account for this.*
      - 4.) Response: *Students are no longer competing on the regional level, it's at the global level. Student skill sets will need to adjust for this shift.*

- 5.) Response: *Very few districts have the 10-12 configuration? Single-grade schools are equally rare. Most districts that maintain such configurations do so due to budgetary or facility constraint reasons.*
- c. How will that reconfiguration affect 6<sup>th</sup> graders and 9<sup>th</sup> graders?
  - 1.) Response, from Angela Turry: *There is a degree of stress on students when they transition from one school to the next. Removing one of those transitions would be beneficial.*
  - 2.) Response, from Angela Turry: *6<sup>th</sup> grade is pretty boxed in with their scheduling; having them included in the middle school/junior high would offer them similar curriculum and elective-possibilities to those offered by the current junior high.*
  - 3.) Response, from Jim Miklausich: *The amount of electives offered to 9<sup>th</sup> graders would be greatly increased if they attended the high school. There are space, demand, and budgetary constraints in making those same electives possible at the junior high facilities.*
  - 4.) Response, from Lori Link: *We cannot fully meet the needs of all the students with the current demands placed upon the schools. The junior highs want to be junior-/middle school environments, but are forced to deal with high school (and college preparation) requirements of their 9<sup>th</sup> graders.*
- F. Dr. Thompson offered the Action Team a "tour inside the mind of a Superintendent". As the District's educational and facilities needs are complex, he's been brainstorming possibilities for the group's future consideration. He offered one possible expansion option to the current High School (of many possibilities).
  1. The District needs the space to be competitive (sports, activities, academically, etc.) with other districts.
  2. There also needs to be space for those not involved in sports; what is available for extra-curricular activities, intramural sports, clubs, and other student-based groups?
  3. In order to not be over-capacity by the time an 800-student expansion were completed, a new high school addition would need to be planned for more than 800 students. This does not account for the replacement of lost fields and parking.
  4. Maybe then there's a CAPS academy built to offer opportunities and for additional capacity.
  5. As growth continues, there's still a possibility for a 2<sup>nd</sup> High School if needed.
  6. A major addition could always be built to meet current needs and re-purposed for a different use in the future.
- G. Scott McQueen opened the table-based discussion portion of the meeting.
  1. As a table, record your "Confirmed Needs" and your "Needs Requiring Additional Information" on the large sheets. The groups worked for 40 minutes discussing their beliefs around need. After lots of discussion each group reported out to the large group.
    - a. Responses, per table:
      - 1.) Table 1
        - a) Confirmed Needs
          - i. *Broader vision for current H.S. land*
          - ii. *Accommodate 10 year enrollment growth*
          - iii. *More after school activities (sports, marching band, education, etc.)*
          - iv. *Competitive in academics and sports*
          - v. *A joint athletic/activities complex with the City (i.e. ice sheet, gymnastics, chess club, business, etc.)*
        - b) Needs Requiring Additional Information
          - i. *Better understanding of Rules: Regulations on area around H.S. and other schools*
      - 2.) Table 2
        - a) Confirmed Needs
          - i. *10 year*
          - ii. *Need additional High School (9-12 grades) space (1600 students)*
          - iii. *Need Elementary space*
          - iv. *Need a referendum to pass*

3.) Table 3

a) Confirmed Needs

- i. *Space*
- ii. *Athletic facilities*
- iii. *Pick up pace*

b) Needs Requiring Additional Information

- i. *Maximum number of students on this site*

4.) Table 4 (no occupants)

5.) Table 5

a) Confirmed Needs

- i. *Additional capacity all levels*
- ii. *Track/football facility upgrades*
- iii. *Opportunities for all*

b) Needs Requiring Additional Information

- i. *1600 vs. 3200 class sizes/school sizes*
- ii. *Technology/on-line learning reduce class sizes*
- iii. *SCALE – PSO direction in Shakopee*

6.) Table 6

a) Confirmed Needs

- i. *Space/capacity*
- ii. *Early Childhood space*
- iii. *Sports facilities*
- iv. *Fine Arts facilities*

b) Needs Requiring Additional Information

- i. *Can current Jr. High be expanded? As that will have space issues in future. ??Elementary??*
- ii. *Need to figure out what we are going to do before we look at land, etc.*

7.) Table 7 (no occupants)

8.) Table 8

a) Confirmed Needs

- i. *Space for 9th graders the H.S.*
- ii. *Need space for 6th graders somewhere in the 6-8 configuration?*
- iii. *Need more space for students in general*

b) Needs Requiring Additional Information

- i. *Why can't 9th graders be offered curriculum if they were not integrated with 10-12.*
- ii. *What is the cost? 800 vs. 1000 building addition*
- iii. *Other options for selling CFC?*
- iv. *Can we have an addition to Jr. High?*
- v. *What direction the education team is going. Virtual learning – Capstone – like to help gauge how much space we need.*
- vi. *Have other school scenarios (like Rods addition to H.S) that we can break down and Brainstorm.*

9.) Table 9

a) Confirmed Needs

- i. *6-8 space*
- ii. *9-12 space*
- iii. *6th Elementary (possibly Pearson)*

iv. *Additional sheet(s) ice*

b) Needs Requiring Additional Information

i. *Upgrade athletic facilities*

10.) Table 10

a) Confirmed Needs

i. *Need 9th Grade in H.S.*

ii. *Middle school model based on the Academic Design Team presentation*

iii. *Need facilities for all in the community*

– *Sports Fields / Ice*

– *Senior Center*

– *Intramurals*

b) Needs Requiring Additional Information

i. *Need information on operating costs for new school*

ii. *4,000+ new jobs are coming to town. How many will live here? How many students will that add?*

iii. *What is the projected lifespan for CFC?*

11.) Table 11

a) Confirmed Needs

i. *Intramural space needed*

ii. *Add capacity to schools needed*

iii. *Need to start discussing the facilities situation and options/ideas so we can deal with capacity issues. Brainstorming ideas.*

iv. *Need sheet of ice, more courts, other sport needs.*

v. *More opportunities for students. Like electives and activities. Like tech. clubs, chess club, marching band, etc.*

b) Needs Requiring Additional Information

i. *For new land cost for if sports facility. Separate from school referendum.*

ii. *Cost to add additional 800 vs. 1000 vs. 1500 capacity.*

12.) Table 12

a) Confirmed Needs

i. *More space to accommodate future projections*

ii. *9-12 and 6-8 important*

iii. *Increasing opportunities (intramural, marching band, orchestra)*

iv. *6th center, Pearson Elementary*

b) Needs Requiring Additional Information

i. *Why do we not have additional opportunities all other schools have?*

ii. *Is it money, attitude, staff?*

13.) Table 13

a) Confirmed Needs

i. *Classroom space*

ii. *Addition indoor act space*

iii. *Additional outdoor act space*

iv. *Additional food service, plus common space*

v. *Ice*

b) Needs Requiring Additional Information

i. *Classroom space:*

ii. *Size – future needs. How big can we go? What are the costs? Sacrifices to do this?*

- iii. *Additional food service, plus common space*
- iv. *Need more definition*
- v. *How do we work with City and Youth Groups?*
- vi. *Activity dome*
- vii. *Turf fields*

14.) Table 14

- a) Confirmed Needs
  - i. *Additional H.S. capacity*
  - ii. *Need more activity space*
  - iii. *Additional capacity at Jr. High*
  - iv. *Central Family Center "what do we do with it"?*
- b) Needs Requiring Additional Information
  - i. *Academic center, activity center*
  - ii. *CAPS Program – more information. How does it fit in the plan?*
  - iii. *What is the Avid Program?*
  - iv. *Impact of PSO on-line learning, CIS*

15.) Table 15

- a) Confirmed Needs
  - i. *Academic space*
  - ii. *Academic options/electives*
  - iii. *Sports space – artificial turf*
  - iv. *Common space*
- b) Needs Requiring Additional Information
  - i. *Income hosting events*
  - ii. *Future expansions at Jr. High and H.S.*

H. Concluding Key Messages from the Action Team members:

- 1. More space is definitely needed at all levels.
  - 2. We are not looking for a band-aid.
  - 3. Sports and fine arts are definite concerns. (And we need field turf.)
  - 4. We agree that 6-8 and 9-12 is the direction (for grade configuration) that we want to go.
  - 5. We want the Academic Team's work to inform our work. They are tied together.
  - 6. We want to have a brief break mid-meeting at each meeting.
- I. The next Guiding Coalition / Facilities Action Team meeting will be held on June 17, 2014 from 6:00-9:00p.

cc: Attendees  
Absentees  
Facilitators  
Board of Education  
Rod Thompson, Superintendent  
Sarah Koehn, ISD #720