

Imagine OPRF Work Group-Board of Education Working Session

June 26, 2018

Compilation of Imagine Team Member Notes

At this meeting, Imagine discussed two conceptual drawings with the Board: Navy Blue and Burnt Orange.

Questions from board members:

- Mr. Craig Iseli: What problems does the Commons concept solve?
- Mr. Fred Arkin: What are the increased staffing costs / requirements created by the Commons concept?
- Ms. Sara Spivy: Where is the adaptive gym?
- Dr. Jackie Moore & Mr. Tom Cofsky: Do these concepts address ADA concerns throughout the building?
- Mr. Iseli: Have we considered student population growth--what if there is a large influx ten or fifteen years from now? How do these concepts ensure we are future-proofing classrooms? What is the problem we are trying to solve by moving FACS to the first floor?
- Mr. Matt Baron: This is a net gain of 12-15 classrooms? How does the proposed new PE/athletics space compare to the existing space--is it an increase in square footage or in rooms, gyms, etc, or the same? Can you put a percentage on the increase? We need the numbers to compare. Are we sure taking down the entire fieldhouse (vs piecemeal renovation) would be less expensive? How much less? Can the Board see an estimate of how much it would cost to create these proposed spaces but not demolish the entire fieldhouse/south end? What kind of phasing would be involved with taking down the fieldhouse/south end? How would programs continue to run?
- Ms. Spivy: How do the concepts impact time spent travelling between classrooms, and thus on instructional time? We need to maximize instructional time.
- Mr. Cofsky: Is there a benefit to taking down the entire South Building all at once? Where is IT tech support going to be? Can we get more information on project sequencing *and* duration?
- Mr. Iseli: Am trying to understand the key assumptions, e.g., what drove the size of the fieldhouse, the number of courts, etc.? Is this a facility designed to meet all wants? How do I make decisions about how to make cuts? Have to be sure that what we build is what we **need** and not a dime more.
- Mr. Baron: Need to understand the ROI, e.g., how much are we increasing the capacity for hosting events regionally?
- Mr. Baron: Can you tell us what kind of athletic competitions the school could host with the proposed facilities? Specifically, are there tournaments that OPRF could host if there were new facilities?
- Ms. Spivy: At what point in the process should obtaining a variance from the village be initiated? What are the green spaces for? For example, could these be used as instructional

spaces (botany)? Is a variance needed from the village for the extensions toward Scoville, the mall, into the alley?

- Mr. Baron: Why not build further into the alley between PE and the parking garage? What is the difference in cost between a lower-level pool and a first-floor pool?
- Mr. Iseli: Did you consider building elsewhere on the property?
- Mr. Cofsky: Have we considered building the new "South Building" structure as a new, standalone building first on one of the outdoor spaces, then demolishing the fieldhouse, so as not to have to disrupt any classes?
- Dr. Moore: Is there a benefit to moving the Little Theatre, or not preserving it as we are with the main auditorium--to free up that "lego block"? What would be the impact on PE instructional time (changing, getting to and from class)?
- Unattributed questions/comments: How can we structure the north end to facilitate curricular enhancement, teacher-to-teacher collaboration, and improved utilization? What do we expect out of collaborative spaces?

Likes / dislikes / comments

- Mr. Cofsky: Like the utilization of space above the cafeteria, the Commons is awesome. Faculty bullpens or shared offices--good concept, gains for staff through sharing of professional development and resources, which is in turn great for kids.
- Mr. Arkin: Seeing how a commons works in another school makes a profound difference. You can feel the welcoming nature of the building. Space for kids to be and stay connected is important. Enhanced security is a real benefit. Concerned about PE facilities. It is daunting to even consider removing and rebuilding the entire southend. Likes the neighborhooding of classrooms/flexible classrooms is much more efficient, expands capacity. We need to increase classroom utilization.
- Ms. Spivy: The commons concept is "huge"--directly impacts student health and mental/emotional well-being. Would like to better understand the models for the athletic concepts. . .need more specific information on usage, hours, how these proposals would solve or alleviate problems. What problems are being solved?
- Dr. Moore: Likes Commons and classrooms. Likes improved circulation for student efficiency and safety (including straightening corridors). Different opinion on PE. PE needs ARE curricular. And extracurricular activity is valid. It's okay to say we are going to enhance spaces that are used for extracurricular activity, research shows that students in extracurriculars are more engaged and successful. Regarding the field house, sees this as addressing problems we have had "for years" and notes "old doesn't always mean historical, if not functional." We need to "bring facilities up to date." Suggests we find a way to commemorate the FH. Track is a non-cut sport, yet some students don't participate because of congestion. It's very important to provide facilities that accommodate track and field along with all the other sports activities. We need to plan for concurrent uses. The community should see DETAIL on how the new south building would alleviate problems, and allow for greater use.

- Mr. Iseli: I really want SPED access to the commons and exterior (as in the Orange plan). Would like to get even more services into the commons if possible. It opens up a lot of things. Regarding PE, are we challenging ourselves to make tradeoffs? Or is the South Building proposal just including everything we WANT? We need to be absolutely sure we are not building more capacity than programming demands.
- Mr. Baron: Physical urgency (meaning deteriorating pools) would seem to dictate doing the South building first. Agree with Cofsky on building on “untapped real estate” over the cafeteria. Commons space is key to the schools that have them. Reinforcing Moore’s point, PE is education, mind, body, and spirit. Can we articulate what the hardest choices are? What is the risk/reward of digging below grade for the south building?
- Ms. Jennifer Cassell: Focus on increasing space for arts and centrally locating SpEd are critically important. Is the adaptive gym space (on Orange) sufficient/have we retained the space and functionality of the current adaptive gym? Excited about Commons. Heard from students (in Climate/Culture Cmte) about need for space to collaborate. We need a Welcome Center that creates a welcoming and inviting environment for the school. Safe and secure. Take care of the arts. Likes the concept of teacher shared offices, which she sees as useful for faculty collaboration and student wayfinding.

Issues related to phasing, projects, costs, menu:

- Mr. Arkin: How will phasing/prioritization be developed? Would like to have a prioritization roadmap.
- Mr. Iseli: Envisioning costs as 20-30 independent projects within the overall plan. Each needs a prioritization and rough cost; put in order of priority. (Including smaller and “enabling” projects)
- Mr. Baron: Need cost estimates to make decisions. Will want to know what percentage of total costs phase one is. The more itemized the “menu” can be, the better. The more the Board can get an overall sense of costs, the better.
- Dr. Moore: Make sure not to convey to the community “this is the cost for example for the library,” and then not do it for three years and the costs go up. Have to message to community that costs are not exact. Board should not “hang our hats” on specific cost numbers. Board should not ask for costs in a way that is going to be communicated to the public as the actual, exact costs.