

<p style="text-align:center">Community Committee on Neighborhoods and Schools Summary of Meeting February 12, 2008</p>

Member Attendance:

(See attached list)

Others in Attendance:

Jennifer Bennett, AISD Planning & Community Relations
Joey Crumley, AISD Planning & Community Relations
Dr. Janis Guerrero, AISD Planning & Community Relations
Rachel Hirsch

Proceedings:

- The meeting was called to order at 5:48 p.m. in Conference Room A-230 of the AISD Carruth Administration Center.
- There were no citizens communications.
- Andy Anderson opened up discussion on draft recommendations of the subcommittee addressing review criteria. The recommendations for review criteria were separated out into a chart format which described over-crowded, under-utilized, and schools not meeting state or federal standards. The chart followed with a more detailed document also addressing review criteria.
- Discussion points on review criteria included:
 - Transportation criteria should also include the evaluation of major transportation arteries and other physical barriers.
 - Enrollment criteria for over-crowded schools should be based on the number of students over 105% capacity and a gain of 5% or more per year for 2 consecutive years
 - Enrollment criteria for under-utilized schools should be based on the number of schools below 85% capacity and a decrease of 5% or more per year for 2 consecutive years.
 - The committee wants to have a threshold that would trigger an early communication process for the possibility of being over- or under-capacity.
 - “Over-crowded” and “under-utilized” terminology should be changed to more neutral terms such as “over-capacity” and “under-capacity”.
 - Issues of subjective versus objective criteria. Example: when children are eating lunch
 - Criteria for “current utilization of campus”
 - Could also include criteria for “range of services provided by school”
 - Should take into account special campuses
 - Should take into account utilization both during and not during school hours. For instance, classrooms could be empty, but they may be filled by offices for programs
 - Criteria for “possible other uses of the campus” could include opportunities for external programs and may also need to be considered in the overall decision-making process.

- Criteria should also include community and regional planning goals
- “Age of facility” criteria should be changed to “condition” of facility to address condition and adaptability of a facility.
- Concerns about using “functional” versus “design” capacity. The committee would like to see the draft formula for functional capacity from Joe Silva in the Facilities Office.
- Demographic criteria should be based on a minimum of 2 years, but may also need to include up to five years for bond program planning and construction considerations.
- The use of the CACs at each school are very important and perhaps need more training to reach out to the school community.
- The Campus Improvement Plan (CIP) should also include a communications plan.
- Dr. Guerrero suggested that the review criteria could be addressed in an overall decision-making process where each criteria would be considered at different stages in the process. The committee should also think about a flowchart, tiers of criteria, and definitions of the criteria.
- Committee members felt that it may be helpful for the Board to have all the review criteria in a simple “at a glance” format.
- Members then focused on a decision-making process to address different stages.
- Discussion points on the decision-making process included:
 - Using enrollment, academic performance, and capacity criteria as initial indicators for early notification.
 - The other criteria would then be addressed at subsequent community meetings.
 - The community should look at the criteria and determine the problem and how to address it. The district should just provide support in the process.
 - Ongoing communication is required throughout the whole process.
 - The process should begin in August or September and end in January or February so a school can address problems immediately and implement changes for the following school year.
- Kathie Tovo said she would look more in detail at the lengthier document to determine if any major review criteria are missing from the chart.
- Joey Crumley said that he would obtain functional capacity calculations for the committee to review at the next meeting.
- Andy Anderson said he would make changes to the review criteria chart and provide a process flow chart. Also, he indicated that at the next committee meeting on February 26, members would continue to look at the decision-making process and finalize review criteria.
- The meeting adjourned at 8:42 p.m.

CCNS Member Attendance Record:

	2007											2008				
	5/22	6/12	6/26	8/14	8/28	9/11	9/25	10/9	10/23	11/13	11/14	11/27	12/4	1/8	1/29	2/12
Andy Anderson	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sally Brackett	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓			✓	✓
Terry Clark	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Christiane Woodley Erwin		✓		✓	✓	✓		✓								
Chiquita Watt Eugene																
Lourdes (Lulu) Flores	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓								
Linda Gibeaut	✓	✓		✓	✓							✓		✓	✓	✓
Rev. Sterling Lands	✓			✓	✓			✓	✓							
José Marrero	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓					
Rachael Proctor May	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Susan Moffat	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Leroy Nellis	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓					✓	✓	✓	✓
Yolanda Pedraza	✓	✓		✓												
Rev. Ivie Rich	✓		✓													
Paul Saldaña	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓			✓	
Alfredo Santos	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓		✓		✓					
Kathie Tovo	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Jim Walker	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓		✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	

✓ = Present