

- A - Jim Gebhard
- B - Dan Robinson
- C - Harry Butler
- D - Leslie Kiesler
- E - Ron Rowley

Board of Education Mesa County Valley School District 51

May 1, 2007: Regular Meeting Minutes / Work Session Record &
Board Open Discussion

Adopted as Amended: August 21, 2007

| | A | B | C | D | E | | ACTION |
|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | x | <u>MEETING CALL TO ORDER:</u> 6:02 pm | |
| Present | x | x | x | x | x | | |
| Motion | | x | | | | <u>Work Session Agenda</u> The Agenda was amended to postpone the Honor Code Implementation Report, and add the School Safety Committee Report. | Adopted as Amended |
| Second Aye | x | x | x | x | x | | |
| No | | | | | | | |
| Motion | | | | x | | A. Grand Mesa Middle School HVAC Contractor Agreement [Resolution 06/07:89] | Adopted |
| Second Aye | x | x | x | x | x | ➤ The contract was awarded to Haining Heating and Refrigeration. | |
| No | | | | | | | |
| Motion | | x | | | | B. Dual Immersion Academy (DIA) Utility Easement [Resolution 06/07:91] | Adopted |
| Second Aye | x | x | x | x | x | ➤ The 15' square easement granted to Public Service of Colorado is for the purpose of maintaining and/or replacing utility lines. | |
| No | | | | | | | |
| Motion | | | | x | | C. Facility Design & Construction Standards | Adopted |
| Second Aye | x | | | | | ➤ Tim Mills reported the Standards are general guidelines. The work on the Standards has been accomplished by a subcommittee of the Long Range Planning Committee and Blythe Design. | |
| No | | | | | | ➤ Dan Robinson asked if the resolution could be amended at a later date. | |
| | | | | | | ➤ Tim Mills answered affirmatively, adaptations may be necessary. | |
| | | | | | | ➤ Jim Gebhard thanked Ron Rowley for leading this effort and being involved on the Long Range Planning Committee. | |
| | | | | | | ➤ Tim Mills added the Columbine Project will be a good, first project for the District to utilize these standards. | |
| | | | | | | Board members informally commended Ben Startzer, Executive Director of Technology, for being recognized for his District work in <i>Ed Tech</i> , a national magazine publication. | |
| Motion | | | x | | | <u>ADJOURN:</u> 6:08 pm | |
| Second Aye | x | x | x | x | x | | |
| No | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | <u>WORK SESSION TOPICS:</u> 6:09 pm | |
| | | | | | | ➤ Dual Immersion Academy (DIA) Middle School Task Force: Members: Mike Gallegos, Tim Casey, Monica Heptner, Julie Bradley, Mark Schmalz, Dan Robinson, Selestina Sandoval, Michele Rewold, Jose Melendez, & Isabelle Cordova (consultant). | |
| | | | | | | ➤ School Safety Committee: Judy Hegge & Tom Kalenian | |
| | | | | | | ➤ Budget: Tim Mills, Melissa Callahan deVita & Vi Crawford | |

- A - Jim Gebhard
- B - Dan Robinson
- C - Harry Butler
- D - Leslie Kiesler
- E - Ron Rowley

Board of Education

Mesa County Valley School District 51

May 1, 2007: Regular Meeting Minutes / Work Session Record & Board Open Discussion

Adopted as Amended: August 21, 2007

| A | B | C | D | E |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|---|---|---|---|---|

Board Open Discussion: High School Reform

- Board members discussed possible meeting norms and outcomes, as outlined by Randy Black from CASB at a previous meeting. Board members voiced the following norms: Provide an opportunity for everyone to speak, listen to understand, and avoid positional statements and look at perspectives.
- Tim Mills handed out notebooks containing documents to provide information and a chronology of high school reform efforts in the District to this point. The notebook included documentation of Board action, Board discussion, a reform goal update with timeline, and a comparison of District 51 high schools to other high schools in the state with 1,000 or more students enrolled, receiving an Excellent rating on the School Accountability Reports (SARs) for 04/05 & 05/06. The comparison also included: schedule information, credits, Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), Free & Reduced Lunch percentages, and 04/05 Drop Out and Graduation rates. An additional data chart displayed high school information for Colorado schools with 1,000 or more students enrolled, with Free & Reduced Lunch Percentages between 20-40%.
- Dan Robinson noted a correlation between high schools with Excellent performance on the SARs and high schools with low Free & Reduced Lunch percentages. District 51 high schools have a much higher percentage of students on Free and Reduced Lunch that are being retained. Dan commented this data indicates there are good things going on in District 51 high schools.
- Ron Rowley spoke of data that supports the block schedule for schools with a high Free & Reduced Lunch percentage.
- Jim Gebhard disagreed, and voiced an interest in reviewing said data. Jim favors "best practice" and supports the Baldrige Model for consistency and alignment. He considers the common schedule as the cornerstone of high school reform to move everything else forward in an effort to have consistency in curriculum and expectations.
- Bill Larsen addressed the Board, speaking of how the schedule has evolved. This is the first year of the flex schedule, and each high school has looked at teacher input and student needs. The same opportunity was made available for non-blocks and blocks throughout the day. Bill reviewed the information provided under Tab 2 of the notebook.
- Dan Robinson believes that after the Board adopted the high school reform goal [September, 2005] a lot of progress has been made; it is a process which will take time and is the job of administrators to implement. He is not disappointed.
- Leslie Kiesler concurred with Dan Robinson that it will take time to implement the schedule. She also reminded the Board of the core principles of high school reform: rigor, relevance, and relationships. With the Performance Based-Policy, the high schools will need the opportunity to have flexibility. She believes this is not an area where there can be "black and white, one- size fits all." The flex part of the schedule is a crucial element. It should be monitored and the reinforcement funded.

- A - Jim Gebhard
- B - Dan Robinson
- C - Harry Butler
- D - Leslie Kiesler
- E - Ron Rowley

Board of Education

Mesa County Valley School District 51

May 1, 2007: Regular Meeting Minutes / Work Session Record & Board Open Discussion

Adopted as Amended: August 21, 2007

| A | B | C | D | E |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|---|---|---|---|---|

- Leslie Kiesler gave positive acknowledgement for the work that has been going on, and honors this work to be the best for students. She believes that the structure of the schedule is secondary to what the schedule has in it. Her focus is to ensure what is best for kids.
- Board members discussed time as a limiting issue and the possibility of expanding the school day.
- Jim Gebhard does not favor compressing the curriculum into eight courses throughout the school year; he prefers fewer classes which delve into a greater depth of course work. Jim would like to see further research in evaluating schedules and achievement at schools outside of Colorado. He mentioned a best performing, Baldrige Model school, in Washington State, as one with year-long course opportunities.
- Ron Rowley agrees on extending the school day; however, he is unsure of the barriers to such a process. A course all year long may have advantages. He honors the school's ability in meeting student needs.
- Tim Mills will look at further data for all the high schools in Colorado. Currently, there are no schools having a 20%, or higher, Free and Reduced Lunch rate that are listed as "Excellent" on Colorado's School Accountability Reports. Tim believes that staff development, viable curriculum and essential learnings are essential for high school reform.
- Leslie Kiesler stated that after listening and talking to principals, this is a work in progress to get all the schools to a "common schedule." She favors continuing the work on schedules to address the needs of students who move across the district, and to work on the other important areas to improve achievement, such as curriculum mapping and staff development.
- Jim Gebhard believes the common schedule is a primary piece in the reform goal. Jim voiced his concern that the schools at the east end of the valley, Palisade High School and Central High School, have a low percentage of split-block classes, which does not conform to the "common schedule" as originally presented.
- Bill Larsen explained that one of the difficulties is that splits have to come with "sisters." Bill would like to move forward and keep the Board updated.
- Jody Frost talked about the students at Central High School that need extra support from home. CHS has a 37% Free & Reduced Lunch rate.
- Dan Robinson voiced his opinion that the high school schedule is one piece of 21 action steps, and needs to be kept in perspective.
- Ron Rowley added that the lack of split blocks at Palisade High School was not done to save time. He is concerned Grand Junction High School is migrating back to split blocks. Ron reminded the Board that the high school schedule was not adopted by the Board. He believes the schedule will evolve over time and there has not been ample time for this to occur. There will be uniqueness, and research will not be ignored.
- Leslie Kiesler asked if the Board would like to propose a formal agreement on the high school schedule in a resolution. Board members indicated a formal resolution was not necessary.

- A - Jim Gebhard
- B - Dan Robinson
- C - Harry Butler
- D - Leslie Kiesler
- E - Ron Rowley

Board of Education Mesa County Valley School District 51

May 1, 2007: Regular Meeting Minutes / Work Session Record &
Board Open Discussion

Adopted as Amended: August 21, 2007

| | A | B | C | D | E | | |
|------------|---|---|---|---|---|--|------------------------------|
| Motion | | | | x | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Jim Gebhard voiced his appreciation for the work that has been done; however, he believes there is still a ways to go in using "best practice." ➤ Harry Butler voiced concern for the students moving from the west end to the east end of the valley and vice-versa. The mobility rate is a factor. ➤ Tim Mills summarized the discussion: To move forward with the schedule and continue to work on more commonality, take a look at moving outside the bus schedule, and to push forward the reform goal to include all those pieces for individual learners. Tim asked Board Members if this accurately summarized the discussion. Board members responded affirmatively. ➤ Dan Robinson added he wants the focus to be on the "big picture." He is confident in the administrators who have the expertise in these areas. ➤ Ron Rowley trusts the administrators to move forward. ➤ Harry Butler voiced his opinion that things are "still pushing together." <p><u>EXECUTIVE SESSION: 10:04 pm</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Property, CRS Section 24-6-402(4)(a) Present: Harry Butler, Jim Gebhard, Leslie Kiesler, Dan Robinson, Ron Rowley Tim Mills, Melissa Callahan deVita | Adjourn to Executive Session |
| Second Aye | x | x | x | x | x | | |
| No | | | | | | | |
| Motion | | | | x | | <p><u>OPEN SESSION: 10:17 pm</u></p> | Return to Open Meeting |
| Second Aye | x | x | x | x | x | | |
| No | | | | | | | |
| Motion | | | | x | | <p><u>ADJOURNED: 10:17 pm</u></p> | Adjourned |
| Second Aye | x | x | x | x | x | | |
| No | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | <hr style="width: 20%; margin-left: auto; margin-right: 0;"/> Jamie Sidanycz, Secretary Board of Education | |

Mesa County Valley School District No. 51

**Approval of Construction Contractor Agreement and Bond
For Grand Mesa Middle School
2007 H.V.A.C. Partial Renovation and Upgrade**

Board of Education Resolution: 06/07: 89

Adopted: May 1, 2007

WHEREAS, in response to an invitation to bid, Haining Heating and Refrigeration, submitted a sealed proposal for the contract for construction of:

Project No. 0607/065
Grand Mesa Middle School 2007 H.V.A.C. Partial Renovation and Upgrade
Grand Mesa Middle School
585 31 1/2 Road
Grand Junction, CO 81504

In the amount of One Hundred Twenty-One Thousand Two Hundred Ninety-Five Dollars and no/100 (\$121,295.00), which proposal was accepted by the School District; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the terms of the contract, substantial completion of the project is to be achieved by August 3, 2007; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the terms of the contract, the Contractor must submit to the District a Labor, Material and Performance Bond prior to the commencement of construction; however, the bond not being ready for approval at this time, it is the intention of the Board to delegate to the Superintendent of Schools the authority to approve the required Labor, Material and Performance Bond, provided such submission and approval is accomplished prior to the commencement of construction activities.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Education hereby approves the said construction contract and ratifies execution of the same by the Superintendent.

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board of Education hereby delegates authority to the Superintendent to approve the Labor, Material and Performance bond to be submitted relative to the contract in conformity with the contract, Colorado Law, Board Policy, and the requirements of this Resolution.

I hereby certify that the information contained in the above resolution is accurate and was adopted by the Mesa County Valley School District No. 51 Board of Education on May 1, 2007.

*Jamie Sidanycz
Secretary, Board of Education*

Mesa County Valley School District No. 51

**Utility Easement
Dual Immersion Academy**

Board of Education Resolution: 06/07: 91

Presented: May 1, 2007

WHEREAS, the District is the owner of property located at 552 A West Main Street, Grand Junction, CO, known as the Dual Immersion Academy (herein "School"); and

WHEREAS, Public Service Company of Colorado has requested that the District grant it a non-exclusive easement to construct, operate, maintain, repair, and replace utility lines and all fixtures and devices, used or useful in the operation of said lines, through, over, under, across, and along a course as said lines may be constructed at the School as fully described on the Attached Easement; and

WHEREAS, it appears that the interest to be conveyed will not materially interfere with the District's use or enjoyment of its property and that such interest, is not now needed for any other purpose authorized by law and that conveyance thereof will work to the benefit of the District.

THEREFORE, the President and Secretary of the Board are hereby authorized to execute, in behalf of the Board, the attached Easement.

I hereby certify that the information contained in the above resolution is accurate and was adopted by the Mesa County Valley School District No. 51 Board of Education on May 1, 2007.

*Jamie Sidanycz
Secretary, Board of Education*



FACILITY DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION STANDARDS

**MESA COUNTY VALLEY SCHOOL
DISTRICT 51**

Prepared By
The Blythe Group + co



Part I

Sustainable Design Guidelines Mesa County Valley School District 51

1. Introduction

Recognizing sustainability as a process rather than an endpoint, the Mesa County Valley School District 51 is committing itself to sustainable design by adopting these guidelines. In an effort to institutionalize the process, we are committing ourselves to being a responsible steward of our natural resources and making environmental stewardship an integral part of the physical plant operation.

We challenge the design community to help us build better schools that provide a superior learning environment, while reducing life cycle costs through conservation of energy and natural resources.

Rather than prescribing what is required in new facilities, we are presenting desired performance outcomes that may require further analysis to determine feasibility on a project-by-project basis.

Every new structure that is constructed without sustainable principles is a lost opportunity for the lifetime of that building. The benefits of a sustainable design are improved indoor air quality, cost savings for decreased energy consumption, improved learning environment and the teaching of conservation practices. These benefits will provide a better environment, help improve learning and save money over the life cycle of the building. Simply stated, students do better when their school is full of daylight, fresh air, and comfortable temperatures.

2. The Sustainable Design Process

MCVSD 51 believes that sustainable design offers an opportunity for superior learning environments and long-term cost savings in building operations and maintenance. These goals can be achieved simultaneously through facilities that accomplish the following:

- Enhance student performance and attendance
- Teach principles of sustainable design
- Harmonize the natural landscape
- Provide higher quality lighting
- Consume less energy
- Conserve materials and natural resources
- Enhance indoor environmental quality
- Safeguard water

To achieve the above, one must balance the short-term costs and risks of sustainable design with its long-term benefits. MCVSD 51, for all future schools, intends to:

- Build schools that are state-of-the-art without being experimental.



- Use exemplary buildings as precedents, rather than reinventing previous work in sustainable design.
- Share risk and rewards by collaborating with other benefactors of sustainable schools, such as the City of Grand Junction and state and federal agencies.
- Use performance agreements, where appropriate, to further share the risks and rewards with contractors.

In keeping with the desire to use resources wisely, MCVSD 51's philosophy is to design schools for durability, functional flexibility, maintainability, and ease of de-construction/recycling after a useful life.

We advocate an integrated, multi-disciplinary design approach with review and input by all stakeholders. By using a whole building approach, systems can be integrated with supporting systems on its site and interdependencies can be better understood to provide the desired outcomes. Designs will be evaluated not only for cost, but for life-cycle cost, quality-of-life, future flexibility, efficiency, overall environmental impact, productivity and creativity.

To create a successful high-performance building, an interactive approach to the design process is required. This means everyone involved in using, operating, constructing and designing the facility must fully understand the issues and concerns of all other parties.

In order to achieve this integrated collaborative approach, it is intended that some of the following management steps will be implemented:

1. Clearly define sustainable goals in requests for qualifications, requests for proposals and bid review criteria.
2. Select team members who are experienced with or interested in using sustainable design strategies.
3. Establish contracts that encourage collaboration and excellence in sustainable design and construction practices.
4. As soon as the project is established, review similar projects with exemplary results for resources and lessons learned.
5. Establish an electronic conference site and encourage feedback from stakeholders.
6. Set standards and measurable goals for sustainable building performance (e.g. lighting density, energy consumption per square foot, percentage of materials to be locally procured).
7. Develop an energy model that evolves with and informs the design.
8. Look for design opportunities that provide multiple benefits and cost tradeoffs.
9. Evaluate costs and conduct value engineering only from a whole building perspective.
10. Expand the timeline for design to allow for evaluation of new systems and products and to perform building simulations.
11. Include methods of monitoring and evaluating building performance.
12. Perform post-occupancy inspections with operational improvement in mind.



3. Features of Sustainable Schools

The following features collectively represent a comprehensive sustainable school:

1. Sustainable site planning and landscape design.
2. Use of renewable energy sources.
3. High quality and energy efficient lighting.
4. Energy efficient building shell
5. Energy efficient HVAC systems
6. Indoor environmental quality, including environmentally preferable building materials, indoor air quality, acoustics and total moisture control.
7. Water conservation
8. Security
9. Kitchen operations
10. Recycling and waste management
11. Construction waste reduction and recycling
12. Commissioning
13. Maintainability
14. Buildings that Teach