

## **Grapevine-Colleyville ISD Bond Steering Committee**

### **Meeting 4**

**Thursday, January 6, 2005**

The fourth meeting of the GCISD Bond Steering Committee was held on Jan. 6, 2005, in the Timberline Elementary Enrichment Center.

The meeting began at 6:12 p.m. with Paula Barbaroux passing out revised agendas. She stated that the goal of the meeting was to review remaining items not directly attached to facilities, otherwise referred to as FF&E (Fixtures, Furniture & Equipment).

Before beginning the FF&E and Technology review, Paula explained how the campus wish lists were derived. Originally, Dr. Paul Jennings conducted one-on-one interviews with each campus principal. Principals were told to create a wish list with no limits, but that they would be asked to refine and prioritize the list at some future point. A cursory general review of the list was conducted to strike items that are not applicable for capitalization purposes (cannot be purchased with bond funds).

Paula indicated that these lists most likely do not include everything, either because: (a) principals were cost conscious, or (b) because some principals were more familiar with bond programs than others and were therefore more able to develop extensive lists due to their experience level. Paula suggested that the principals may need to look at the lists one more time after additional direction comes from the committee.

Kirk Murdock spoke next and explained the three handouts distributed:

1. Technology Capital Improvement List –Original
2. Technology Capital Improvement List – Summary
3. Computer Replacement Cycle - 5 Year Plan

Dr. Jennings developed the Original Technology Capital Improvement List. Since then, Kirk has added some helpful designations:

- a) Red highlighting indicates that these items cannot be purchased with bond funds. Software applications cannot be capitalized.
- b) Crossed out items with a red \* were requested over a year ago, but have already been addressed with the prior bond's remaining funds.
- c) A red E stands for Equity (or inequity as the case may be). A red E indicates an item is for a specific campus and not district-wide. However, if members approve an E item, it could imply that all campuses would need to receive the same corresponding item and extending cost to all to maintain campus equity.
- d) The priority assignments 1-4 match those on the Summary Sheet

The Summary Technology Capital Improvement List condensed the original items, and eliminated those items already completed per (b) above. A NEW designation--a blue star--indicates Necessity for Educational Purposes. For example, digital cameras are integral to lesson plans at all levels. The wear and tear on these cameras, especially daily use by elementary kids, is real and needs to be treated as a necessary replacement cost.

The 5-Year Replacement Cycle is based on standards developed by an industry group (ISTI). It is essentially a plan to replace computers on a 5-year cycle. Unlike private industry, which replaces PCs within 3-4 years of purchase, education lags behind at 5-6 years. The last large installation occurred in 2000, using 1998 bond funds. Phase-in of new equipment occurred 18-24 months into the cycle as PC installs followed building re-wiring and major construction. As a group, these PCs (3,120 of them) will be

considered obsolete in 2006. A further consideration is that repair costs spike after 3 years, when the warranties expire. The district has PCs that are 10 years old – in the administration areas, not in the classrooms.

The proposed laptops on line 9 at a cost of \$2.4 million would warrant detailed committee discussion. Teachers want the ability to use the same software at home as they do at school to develop lesson plans and communicate with parents on grades (this does not fit into the instructional day). The costs provided were not for replacing desktops. Separate costs are provided for replacing desktops vs. utilizing laptops.

*Q: Does this infer laptops in lieu of or in addition to desktops?*

A: To be determined, possibly with the assistance of a Tech Subcommittee.

*Q: Have we implemented any laptops for teachers yet?*

A: No. Teachers do not utilize laptops. The laptops on wheels are for students.

*Q: Has the district considered giving the teachers the software to be able to work from home?*

A: We've only looked at it on a cursory level, so this is yet to be determined.

*Q: Are there confidentiality issues with grades being transported off-campus?*

A: Not given the web-enabled software product Kirk is currently investigating, which employs security certificates and encryption.

*Comment:* Given the technical savvy of the current audience (i.e., the illustrious committee members), and ever-changing technology capabilities, perhaps we should consider using a designated \$ figure for what does not yet exist but will be needed a few years out.

*End of Technology discussion.*

Next on the agenda: the FF&E discussion, led by Danette Murray and Scott Monaghan.

Caveats about the list: Where it is important to have delivery and installation, it's already been factored into the cost. In addition, some prices already have inflation built into them, as they might not occur to end of bond program.

There are Equity issues with this list as well, where...

- a) "Comparability" + E = acquisition of the item will create an equity between campuses
- b) A word other than "Comparability" + E = NO PROMISES; discussion needed; issues attached. This could create an equity issue (or inequity) between campuses.

Security Cameras and Card Readers was our next subject, moderated by Valerie See. All these costs are included in our Big Sheets. Costs for are being detailed and updated, and information will be mailed to members this week (Jan. 10) Floor plans denoting placement of cameras and card access will be made available to the technology subcommittee.

When cameras and card access readers were implemented with the 1998 Bond, it was for security reasons only. The District now has 301 cameras with a request for 208 more. At this time, we're not sure of the level of community support for additional cameras. Some view cameras as necessary for security and safety while others view them as a tool for discipline. The cameras now being requested will aid with student discipline issues as well as provide an additional level of safety. It is important to note that personnel are not available to monitor them (like security guards whose job it is to review monitors) and that we only capture 10-12 days of information, meaning for every new day added the oldest day is overwritten on the campus digital recording device.

*Q: How is server cost accounted for in this estimate?*

A: Replacement of the original 30 servers is included in the information committee members received by mail the week of Jan. 10, and includes the 4-year warranty on the servers as well as the cost of 208 cameras with a 4-year warranty.

*Q: Are some of the new cameras due to expansion at the campuses?*

A: No. If portables remain, we may need to add more cameras. There could even be more requests if we continue with portable buildings. If members decide to go with a building addition, cameras won't be needed it for portables.

*End of Security Camera discussion.*

Paula asked for the members to participate in one of two break-out groups: Technology or FF&E.

### Technology Group Discussion

Discussion of the rationale for wireless, interactive white boards, and classroom projectors ensued: The justification for a large potential investment in these items will be needed to be tackled by the committee.

History on projection units: when the district first looked at implementing multimedia in every classroom back with the 1998 Bond Program, we ended up putting in TV's instead of projection units. The projection units at the time required darkening the classroom and cost \$4,000 apiece. There are legibility issues with the TV's, and so teachers have turned increasingly to the portable projection units. There is a high demand for improved multimedia tools in the classrooms. Some teachers have resorted to combining existing PC resources and shaping them into ad hoc social studies "pods" (labs) incorporating projectors on carts as needed. There are also significant space issues when addressing improved projection unit capabilities.

*Q: Is the district tracking curriculum requirements to technology?*

A: Yes. But unreasonable requirements do occasionally come up, such as online TAKS testing requiring all students online at the exact same time to take the test.

*Q: Do all 900 classrooms need projectors?*

A: Many teachers say yes. Principals vary in their response, so need to do more homework.

*Q: As committee members, is it our role to sign off on a (a) lump sum amount for technology and leave the strategic decisions about improving technological learning environments to the district personnel, or are we expected to (b) participate in a detailed evaluation?*

A: More of (a) than (b), but district personnel are looking for affirmation of standards, taking into account variable usage by teachers, and equity issues needing to be managed with a phased in approach.

We talked about the possible merits of establishing a Tech Subcommittee. Names of interested committee members were forwarded to John Allison and Kirk Murdock.

### FF&E Group Discussion

Discussion included whether an FF&E allowance should be considered for campuses, rather than trying to predict what items might need replacing in five years. Safety issues of campuses and whether the community would support additional cameras was also discussed. There was also a question raised about band uniforms and whether they could be purchased with bond monies.

## Huckabee's Handouts

The last part of meeting was opened to questions concerning the last meeting's handouts.

Gary Rademacher and Doug Benson of Huckabee were on hand to answer any questions committee members had about the BIG SHEET handouts provided at our December 8, 2004 meeting.

*Q: Field Turf: What is the total cost of all field turf line items at all locations?*

A: Performing a quick calculation, Paula Barbaroux factored 7 locations @ \$725,000 each, to arrive at a rough total of \$5 million. The actual number is 6 locations @ \$1,010,540 each for an exact total of \$6,065,240. The reason for the higher amount is because the initial calculation did not include the costs associated with fees for architects, engineering or permitting.

*Q: Does GHS not have a football field of its own?*

A: Yes, the GHS competition football field for freshmen and JV football is the field most think of as belonging to Cross Timbers Middle. It is a shared football field between GHS and CTMS. CHHS has a football competition field at the site for freshmen and JV. That field is not shared with any other campus.

*Q: District Wide: Please explain the catch-all \$7.5M for painting in relation to the individual painting line items that appear on selected campus sheets.*

A: The \$7.5 million achieves the district's painting plan over the 5 years. If the committee turns down the overall painting plan, however, then members would be asked to review the individual painting requests. The individual requests were left in this purpose, so there is duplication of total cost.

*Q: Glenhope Elementary: Line Item #352: Add Science Lab. Is this line item here because of a comparability issue between elementary campuses? How can a science lab be "added" so inexpensively? Is this a re-use of existing space? If yes, should this be classified as a renovation instead?*

A: This is a renovation of an existing classroom that needs to be equipped with running water to become a science lab. It will be reclassified as a renovation.

*Q: CTMS: Lines R20051 and 278 appear to be \$1M duplication.*

A: Agreed. (Hooray, we saved \$1M ...just like that).

*Q: Grapevine Elementary: Why does GES have no additions, yet maintains a portable? It appears HMS, CES, CMS, and Timberline all set out to replace their portables, but GES has not.*

A: The portable at GES is being used because it is there, but is not necessary. Therefore, no requests were made to add classroom space. The campus utilizes it for meetings and other activities. In a different example, CMS has several classroom additions on its list, but they wish to keep their portable for specialized use in the event not all additions are approved by the committee. If the district renovates the fine arts section the way specified, then a portable won't be required, but if not, they may wish to keep it.

*Q: At the time these lists were compiled, what direction did the GCISD administration give to the campuses regarding treatment of portables?*

A: There was no directive by the administration regarding portables. We didn't tell them to suggest additions or not. The committee needs to address the issue of portables vs. building additions as part of its overall decision making process.

*End of Q&A.*

Kay Waggoner concluded the meeting with these remarks:

The committee has met four times thus far, but starting with the next meeting, the job will get more difficult. The tough questions will begin. Dr. Waggoner expects members to be conduits to the community and looks to us to help set priorities and to decide what stays and what goes. She looks forward to working with the committee on the challenges ahead. She expressed appreciation for their time and effort and for their dialogue that is occurring.

The meeting adjourned at 8:16 p.m.

The next meeting is on Thursday, January 20, 2005, from 6-8 p.m., at the Timberline Enrichment Center.

*Cheerfully submitted by Lori Napier, BSC Secretary*