

**MONROE COUNTY COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORPORATION**  
**BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES**  
**Work Session, July 8, 2008**

**MEMORANDA**

The Board of School Trustees of the Monroe County Community School Corporation met in work session, for which proper notice had been given, at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, July 8, 2008, at the School Administration Center, 315 E. North Drive, Bloomington, Indiana.

**Board members present:** Jeannine Butler, Teresa Grossi, Valerie Merriam, Jim Muehling, Lois Sabo-Skelton, Sue Wanzer and newly appointed Board member Vicki Streiff.

**Also present:** James Harvey, Superintendent; Janet Tupper, Administrative Assistant. Others present for discussion of specific topics are referenced in the notes of this meeting.

President of the Board, Teresa Grossi, called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

1. **School Board Member Districts** – Present for this discussion were Tom Bunger, School Board Attorney; Jim Fielder, Monroe County Clerk; and Ruth Hickman, Voter Registrar.

During Mr. Harvey's review of the history of School Board member districts, he noted that the original MCCSC organization plan in 1968 identified School Board member districts by townships. In 1994 the Board changed the district descriptions to precincts. Since then the precincts have changed – some were added, some combined and some eliminated. The county has been working to purge voting rolls and now there is a problem in that precinct descriptions for Board member districts in the Board's Bylaws do not match the reality of precincts as they are drawn. Mr. Harvey suggested if the Board stays with precincts it will be necessary to have a way to audit districts every time precincts change. He said the Board could stay with precincts, go back to townships or have all districts identified as *at large*.

Mr. Fielder explained that the county has gone from 96 to 67 precincts. However, he said he did not think they would have a problem helping people know the School Board district in which they live.

Dr. Butler asked if precincts change again can we define School Board districts by streets as opposed to precincts. Mr. Bunger said the Board has done that effectively when we identified those precincts in 1994 because they are defined by street boundaries. He said because everybody votes for everyone it does not cause a problem with voting; all this does is to identify regions within which somebody has to live.

Mr. Harvey asked if there is any concern regarding the size of districts. Mr. Bunger said when the revision was made in 1994, the smallest district was 7377 and the largest had a registration of 7976. Mr. Fielder explained state requirements for precinct sizes, i.e. they cannot exceed 1500 registered voters and current precincts are between 800 and 1200. He said precincts cannot cross legislative or congressional districts but those restrictions do not apply to school board districts.

Ms. Wanzer wondered if we could use the three middle school attendance area descriptions for three School Board member districts and the others *at large*. Mr. Bunger said the problem is by Statute we can propose a change but the process for changing this is the Board adopts a proposed change, runs legal notice of change and constituents have a right to file an objection. He said it then goes to the Indiana Department of Education and the IDOE must agree with the proposed change. Mr. Harvey noted that we are talking about changing the reorganization plan adopted in 1968. He suggested that we might be better off staying with political definitions since we change attendance areas as our population shifts. Mr. Fielder said after the 2010 census there will be a review of precincts and after 2011 they will have to tweak them again because the cities will be going through elections. He said the more precincts we have the more expensive it is to maintain.

Dr. Butler understood that if the School Board member districts are left as they are the only question

would be the number of registered voters in each. Mr. Bunger confirmed her assumption since the boundaries have not changed.

**Consensus:** Board members decided to keep School Board member districts as they are and include a note on the school system website referring people to the Voter Registration for confirmation of the district in which they live.

1. **Fairview Building Project** – Present for this discussion were Karen Adams and Trudy Litz, Fairview Principal and Assistant Principal respectively; and the Fairview Elementary project architectural team: Mary Krupinski, Derek Marshall, Jayne York, Megan Chafin and Randy Stair.

Mr. Harvey explained that Fairview must make AYP (average yearly progress) in the fall and spring to avoid more critical sanctions. He said if the Board decides to pair Fairview with another school to create a K-2, 3-6 grade level configurations or create a magnet school the building plan will change. He said with the uncertainty of restructuring efforts and of the state and national economy, if the Board decides to delay the project for a year it would not change the bond issue.

Ms. Krupinski introduced the project team members and reported that since getting project approval from the DLGF (Department of Local Government Finance), they have met with teachers and culminated with a design that Ms. Adams took back to the staff. She reviewed the design and floor plans, noting the main entrance to the building will be off of 7<sup>th</sup> Street. She talked about development of the site for parking, bus and parent drop-off, and playground area.

Mr. Harvey said the Sassafras Audubon Society had contacted him about saving the current Fairview chimney when that building is demolished and removed from the site. Specifically, they are concerned about the swifts that live in the chimney during the summer. He asked if the chimney would stand by itself when the building is removed. Ms. Krupinski said they had talked about it and looked at it and she believes that it would be in the middle of the big play area for the new school. She agreed to explore the feasibility of leaving the chimney in place but suspects it would need some bracing.

During ensuing discussion, Ms. Krupinski confirmed that the gymnasium is standard size. Mr. Harvey said there could be some Parks & Recreation family programs on the ground level; it is intended to encourage community use. He said the Bloomington Parks & Recreation Department is the only community group that really wanted community use of the school. He said the nurse's area could be used for a community room and although there was no feedback from many organizations, we did receive feedback from Southern Indiana Pediatrics.

Mr. Scherer said if everything goes according to schedule, we will break ground for the school in January. Dr. Grossi asked if we break ground and the Restructuring Committee comes back with another plan, what will happen. Ms. Krupinski said we will still frame the building and will have block exterior walls and corridors. She said the classrooms are 900 sq. ft. plus casework. She said the classrooms are more narrow and long to serve large and small group activities. Dr. Butler asked if the study committee recommends grades K-2 at Fairview, would it be difficult to adapt to primary or intermediate level. Ms. Krupinski said no, it could be adjusted. Mr. Harvey warned about over-specifying a building; for example, Rogers was built for K-6 but has been used for K-2 for almost 25 years.

Regarding alley easements on the property, Mr. Marshall said he thinks the site was designed for a subdivision and the school system bought all of the lots. Ms. Krupinski confirmed that there is no physical improvement that reflects an alley; however, there are five alleys on the property including two through the existing building.

Mr. Muehling said this is exciting but the question is if we are going to go forward with this. He said he has an extremely strong feeling about this project. He said after all the effort and work and the extremely unusual approval of the bond issue, the uncertainty of funding from the State prompts thoughts of pushing this project back. He said the *Project School* is uncontrollable but what we can control is what is going on here. He said if we have funding in place he is in favor of going forward with the Fairview project. Dr. Grossi agreed; she said that she would prefer to put something else on delay. She said we will always have competition.

Mr. Harvey said his reason for bringing it up is because it seems we are at a point that it is compelling to raise the question, i.e. spending \$13 million to \$14 million when the question is where it will be five or 20 or even 100 years from now. Dr. Grossi recalled that our community said it loud and clear that they are dedicated. Ms. Wanzer said she thinks it is responsible for this question to be asked, but the project has her wholehearted support. Mr. Harvey agreed that the Board had already made a decision; he was just trying to say this is where we are. He said construction drawings are the next step and the project will be up for bids in October or November if the Board wants to sell bonds in December.

Dr. Sabo-Skelton said she has seen the community support and she believes it will be an incredible school for our community and for downtown. She said she is ready to move forward. Ms. Wanzer agreed with Dr. Grossi, i.e. if we have to put something else on hold she thinks this project should move forward.

Ms. Krupinski responded to additional questions, confirming that there will be an elevator in the building; the exterior will be red brick; daylight will come through where the roof is split; there will be glass at the end of the stairs. Considering requests for Fairview to be a 'green' school, she said they are looking at using daylight and sun screening. They will use linoleum along with carpet for acoustics and terrazzo in corridors.

Ms. Streiff voiced concern regarding the use of rubber chips on the playground, noting that some special education children sometimes eat the chips. Ms. Adams responded that they had not had those issues at Fairview.

Mr. Stair said a geothermal system is planned for this building. He said the beauty of geothermal is that it is simple in the way it operates and the maintenance required; there will be individual control in every classroom. He said they drilled test borings on the property and there is limestone at eight feet and it continues all the way down 300 feet. He said that is great because limestone is the best thermally conductive material and the cheapest to drill.

In response to a question regarding the possibility of having self-flushing toilets, Mr. Scherer said that has not been decided. He said a power outage can cause trouble. Mr. Stair also noted that there are great maintenance problems with self-flushing toilets.

Mr. Scherer advised that what the Board had seen in these plans is what everybody wants and preliminary indications are that we are over-budget. He said we will have to do some value engineering but there are some final decisions to be made before moving forward with construction documents.

The work session adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

---

Teresa Grossi, President

---

Jeannine Butler, Vice President

---

Valerie Merriam, Secretary

---

Susan P. Wanzer, Assistant Secretary

---

Jim Muehling, Member

---

Lois Sabo-Skelton, Member

---

Vicki Streiff, Member