

VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL SITE DESIGN TEAM/PROGRAM COMMITTEE
Minutes – November 18, 2003

Present: Dan Nelson, Les Omotani, John Clarke, Jean Doerge, Rob Schebel, Cindy Todd, Taylor Johnson, Mary Whitaker, Scott Hatfield, Anjana Chandran, Fred Bell, Sam Kranovich, Allison Hansen, Ruth Henderson, Jamie Ehlert, Drew McLellan, Anne Lane, Sherry Snider, Denny Linderbaum, Vicky Poole, Donna Wilkin
Support: Phyllis Staplin, Dave Blum, Jody Ratigan, Dave Person, Galen Howsare, Brian Abeling, Gordon Dahlby, Kay Rosene, Liz Celandia-Fagen, Kim Jordan
RDG: Phil Hodgkin, Jeff Blosser, Eliz Erbes

Dr. Poole welcomed the members of the Site Design Team and Program Committee to the meeting. She asked those present to form discussion tables with at least one student and a representative from each committee. At each discussion table, committee members introduced themselves, talked about what brought them to this project and what they have learned from the process.

Dr. Poole said the goal of the meeting is to review the work of the Program Committee and to get feedback from members of the Site Design Team. She provided background information on the process to date, reviewing the studies and reports that preceded the current work. Dr. Poole talked about the criteria guiding the process, as established by the Board of Education. She reviewed the charge, roles and responsibilities of the Site Design Team and the Program Committee.

Dr. Wilkin outlined the work process conducted by the Program Committee. She noted the group was asked to focus on space allocations and recommendations for teaching and learning at Valley. The first task has been to work on the space allocations. The teaching and learning discussions will continue, Dr. Wilkin said. She commented on the process used to arrive at the current design concept. Dr. Wilkin noted feedback was gathered between Program Committee meetings. The group identified a number of points of agreement and issues left to address.

Hodgkin shared the design concept developed by the Site Design Team and reviewed by the Board of Education in August. He showed the results of the puzzle piece exercise. Hodgkin noted the design has been utilized to test program – how the space will be used. Now that program needs have been articulated, the architects can proceed with schematic design. Hodgkin reviewed the revisions made in the concept developed by the Site Design Team:

- Slightly more remodeled space, slightly less new space
- New space has been shifted slightly to the east
- Science/Math are together in one area of the building
- Family and Consumer Science classrooms and labs will be maintained at their current location
- The current footprint was reviewed; space allocation discussed
- The new construction space is flexible

Hodgkin responded to questions from the group.

Q: How much change is in the new/old footage? Is the space adequate for the needs identified by the Program Committee? A: More space would be desirable; we have many more needs than dollars to support them. Total square footage is the same. Remodeled space has changed from 75,858 to 95,000. New space has decreased from 129,408 to 122,187.

Q: Was the auditorium reviewed by the Program Committee? A: It was not discussed.

Q: How many parking spaces are identified in the new plan? In the old plan? A: Approximately 262 spaces were identified in the old plan; the new plan calls for 302. However, the parking space allocation has not been formally tested.

Q: Is the new plan within budget? A: The budget has not been fine-tuned or engineered. The budget is within the same parameters as the previous concepts.

Committee members then worked in small groups to review the current concept and to record ideas and comments. “Big Ideas” were shared as follows:

- After-hours access is needed to art room so students can work in art studios
- Control doors – access after hours?
- Location of special education classrooms – should they be closer to other classrooms; dispersed rather than in one area?
- Consider for future plans, how a new auditorium could connect to the current plan
- Ticket window in student services area
- Main entrance at 35th Street? Woodland?
- Curvilinears in hallways are great!

- Main entrance on Woodland
- Student services is in a good location, by student entrance
- Flexibility in new construction area – a positive
- Concern with lack of natural light in the math/science area
- Special education rooms all together? Current location is far from the humanities wing
- How long will this take to complete?

- Ventilation/noise with Instructional Technology and music located close to each other. May compete
- Need more class space; technology room, auto class entry
- Concern about air quality and air flow in the fieldhouse. Hot air could affect classrooms and surrounding areas
- Disperse lockers more. Concern with majority of lockers on north side
- Like flow of commons! Nice!
- More computer labs; need computers lining academic commons
- Special education location – all together or dispersed?

- Prominence of each entrance and purpose. Need definition of the entry (further clarification needed. Don’t hide it
- External cues from street, signage. Ways of locating spaces internally – floor/walls/color
- Loading dock – need to remember process for shipping/receiving. Need to define where deliveries occur
- Flexibility in classroom design; walls; allow for clustering
- Dining space – could it spill out into the commons? Bright, airy, open
- Lockers – size/dimensions/location
- Exterior corridor for pedestrians around the building with clear paths to entrances
- Are we going to be competitive? Will the remodeled facility help us attract teachers and students?

- Special education and technology education are isolated. We may be labeling that part of the building
 - A plus – the remodeling of this area
 - Special ed rooms have been pulled from the tower – a concern
 - Noise to media center from technology education classrooms
 - Loss of technology education classroom space
 - A plus – we have a greenhouse!
 - Electronics class is “buried” – needs a “clean” area
 - Woods and metals are boxed in – used to bringing equipment outside for use (welding, saws, noise, etc.)
 - Outside access needed – switch technology education and special education
 - Science/Math teacher areas and academic commons have been cut.
-
- Distance between student services and administration – these two work a lot together and should be in the same area
 - Science and Math have small academic commons
 - Computer labs for Math/Science?
 - Need student conference rooms in commons
 - Move multi-media lab down to Media Center. It’s not likely to get good supervision unless it’s near the Media Center
 - Math/Science/Family & Consumer Science area looks pretty traditional. Minimal flexible learning spaces – “cells and bells”
 - Computer labs must be more than 900 square feet
 - Technology education needs learning space – electricity room is too small. Auto may lose classroom
 - Special education: keep SCI and BD classrooms together; keep resource together; MD all together, helpful to be by bus
 - Lost new space/got more “old” space?

Q: Has square footage been assigned for furniture storage in the academic commons areas?

A: Not yet. Multiple scenarios are under development for this space.

Dr. Omotani asked the group if it is OK to proceed with the current concept and present it to the Board at the December 1 workshop. The group agreed: the current concept should be pursued and presented to the Board.

Next meeting Monday, December 1 5:30-9:00 p.m. LRC
Board of Education Workshop