

**BETHEL PARK HIGH SCHOOL
BOARD MEETING
Monday January 14, 2008****Meeting Minutes**

Attending: David Amaditz; Donna Cook; Susan Gout; Dick Rose; Chuck Scheuble; Ron Sustich; Dr. Tom Knight; Nancy Aloi Rose; Matt Howard; Leonard Corazzi; Dr. Zeb Jansante; Dick Fox; Kevin Hayes

1. The purpose of the meeting was to update the Board on the programming work for the High School, review the schedule for the Project, review the Goals Scoring Matrix results from the Board and administrative staff, and review demographic information on student enrollment and Bethel Park.
2. Dick Fox informed the Board that in the previous schedule for the project that had the project bidding in early 2009, there had been six to eight weeks of “float” included. This has now been used up. The revised schedule still shows the project bidding in early 2009. However, there will be the need for discipline in the process as it moves forward. The Architects will need to be disciplined in getting their work done in the allotted time. And the Board and District will need to be disciplined in making timely decisions. Dr. Knight spoke for the administrative and high school staffs, along with the Architects, when he said that they will attend two meetings a week if necessary to facilitate and assist the Board in this process, and not have the Board feel that their decisions are being rushed. Dick Fox apologized that he did not bring hard-copies of the revised schedule. These will be emailed to all Board members in the next several days.
3. Dr. Knight reviewed consequences to not meeting the schedule, including increased costs due to labor shortages resulting from work on the new casino and Penguin’s arena, along with possible construction in neighboring school districts; and the 1% (possibly \$600,000 – 800,000) additional cost mentioned by Dick Fox at the previous meeting for each month the bidding is delayed due to market conditions.
4. The Architects were asked if some of the market conditions, specifically labor shortages, could be overcome by bidding a project outside of Pennsylvania? Dick Fox responded that while anyone can bid on a public project, union work rules and prevailing wage laws will make it difficult to increase the worker capacity of this region by going outside the region.
5. A review of the Goal Scoring Matrix results was done by Dick Fox. He distributed copies of the Matrix Summary for both the Board scoring and the Administrative Staff Scoring. The top three major priorities per the Board scoring were 1) Active Learning (11); 2) First Cost (9); and 3) Operating Cost (7). The top three priorities for the Administrative Team were 1) Active Learning (11); Safe Environment (6); and three items with the same score of (5): Educational Alternatives, Special Needs Inclusion, and Interdisciplinary Teams.

6. Dick Fox noted that the average weighting of individual goals by both groups was 3.5. This indicates that both the Board and Administrative Team felt all the goals were important, just some more than others, but no goal was insignificant. All in all, the Matrix and the scoring provide a good platform for the Board to use as a tool for discussion.
7. Chuck Scheuble asked the Architects if the results of the scoring were similar to other districts where the Matrix had been used. Dick Fox said the answer to this question would be "Somewhat." First costs and operating costs are consistently important to Boards. Academic programs are pretty highly scored in most districts. However, it is important for the Board to realize that the Matrix was developed by the Bethel Park Administrative Team. As such, it reflects the understanding of the needs for your particular school. And it would seem by the Board scoring results that the Board agrees with this understanding. Donna Cook shared that she did not rank anything lower than a 3 because she thought the administration did a good job developing the matrix.

Mr. Fox stated that the Architects were a bit surprised by the relatively low priority given to "Safety" in the scoring. The staff's scoring was a bit higher than the Board's; this is understandable given that the staff work in the buildings everyday and "hold their breath" concerning the safety vulnerabilities encountered. Susan Gout mentioned that she had viewed safety through the perspective of a new, single and consolidated building that would be inherently safer than the present groupings of buildings.

8. Susan Gout noted that items where the Board's scoring and priority were similar to the Administrative Team reflects where they are on the "same page." She felt it would be worth discussing where there were disparities in the scoring to gain a better understanding of the different perspectives.
9. Susan Gout said it was apparent that Active Learning was something that would have to be incorporated into any design developed, based on its high scoring. However, she thought it very important to have any design developed be flexible enough to accommodate a different educational delivery methodology in the future.
10. The Architects were asked how the Matrix and scoring would be used within the design process? Dick Fox said that the Architects' goal would be to succeed in addressing each and every one of the goals listed on the Matrix. However, when push comes to shove later on and choices have to be made to delete this or that scope, the Matrix scoring will help to prioritize the decisions to be made.
11. Enrollment was discussed next. There were two hand-outs from the Architects, one with background information with population data and projections, and one with enrollment historical and projection information. Dick Fox mentioned that the state Department of Education (DOE) projections show a declining student population. However, historical enrollment information shows an ebb and flow to enrollment with the average high school enrollment in the last ten years being around 1,850, with the maximum in 2003 of 1,937.

12. There was a review of historical census information, along with sharing comments on the District's demographics with a professor of sociology and demographics at Carnegie-Mellon. In summary, the District's overall population is quite stable, staying between 33,600 and 33,800 over a ten-year period. The municipality is pretty saturated in terms of housing stock, and Bethel Park should remain attractive to home-owners for the foreseeable future. This all portends a relatively stable student enrollment. While some indicators point to an expected decrease, this could be offset by a roll-over in housing stock to younger couples with children, and a new or renovated high school being attractive to school aged families looking to move.
13. A demographic study would cost between \$7,000 and \$9,000. It was thought that this would not be necessary to expend given that the District would not expect to see any drastic swing in enrollment in the foreseeable future.
13. The Architects recommended that the District not design for less than their existing enrollment, or 1814. If the District were to seek maximum state reimbursement they would design for current enrollment plus 10%, or 1995. This almost 200 student difference would equate to about \$6,000,000 worth of construction, using an average of \$30,000 per student in reimbursement.
14. The Architects further recommended that the District not design the public spaces (e.g. auditorium, cafeteria) for less than a 2,000 student capacity. This is because to try and increase the size of such public spaces would be either costly or not possible once the space is built. And the District not plan for less than 1,800 in the classroom spaces. If the District does not want to build more classroom space now, it is easier to add classroom space in the future.
15. The Architects were asked if there would be a difference between the existing classrooms and a classroom designed for active learning teaching? Classrooms for active learning will be larger than the existing classroom to facilitate movement of students and teachers within them.
16. **The next meeting will be Wednesday, January 30, 2008 at 7:00 PM.** The agenda for the meeting will include a presentation on comparative space requirements between the proposed space for a new or renovated high school, and the existing high school space. The Board will be asked to provide direction on the enrollment to use for design of the proposed project(s).

The foregoing constitutes the Architects' understanding of the major points of the meeting. Any corrections, changes or modifications requested can be directed to the Superintendent's office, and copied to the Architects.

End of Document