



Blueprint for the Future Committee Consensus

Presentation to the Board of Trustees
April 17, 2014



How We Came Together

- Over the course of four meetings during the month of February 2014, the Blueprint for the Future Committee developed consensus on several items. We have described how our committee came together, what we learned, and what we agreed to report from our efforts.
- The District invited members of the community to serve on the Blueprint for the Future Committee, and approximately 65 residents (employees, students, parents, and business people) volunteered. We held four Tuesday evening meetings, on February 4, 11, 18, and 25. We dedicated approximately 500 hours to learning about the District's facilities needs, the options for addressing them, and in developing consensus.



How We Came Together


Our efforts were supported by District staff and consultants:

- Darrel Adair, director of maintenance and operations
- Dave Bannon, GBA, architectural consultant
- Mark Berg, PlanNet, security and technology consultant
- Jerry Buck, PlanNet, security and technology consultant
- Jazmin Castellano-Luna, Spanish language translator
- Ralph Figueroa, project manager
- Erik Greenwood, chief technology officer
- Brad Jackson, director of special youth services
- Pat Karlak, public information officer
- Kari Kikuta, LPA architectural consultant
- Jomay Liao, LPA architectural consultant
- Trish Lockhart, director of curriculum and instruction
- Rick Martens, director of student support services
- Brad Minami, director of purchasing
- Patti Neely, director of facilities, planning, and construction
- Dianne Poore, assistant superintendent of business
- Lori Raineri, Government Financial Strategies, financial consultant
- Erik Ring, LPA, architectural consultant
- Wendy Rogers, LPA, architectural consultant
- Bruce Saltz, controller
- Paul Sevillano, assistant superintendent of education
- Susan Stocks, director of special programs
- Keith Weaver, Government Financial Strategies, financial consultant
- Dave Young, PlanNet, security and technology consultant



How We Came Together

- We divided our working time into meeting as a committee of the whole, and as subgroups comprising the following topics:
 - Accountability and Finance
- Energy Conservation and Sustainability
 - Facilities, Fields, and Outdoor Areas
 - Safety and Security
 - Student Learning
 - Technology
- Many of our members also took tours of the District's school sites offered by the principals at each of the District's 19 campuses.
- At each meeting, attendees studied the issues, shared varied opinions, and came back to the committee of the whole to report out priorities and future considerations. We then discussed equitability and accessibility in relation to 21st Century learning.



What We Learned

- Each of our meetings had a main area of focus.
- Our first meeting addressed:
 - *Understanding of Committee Purpose & Function, Sub-Group Selection and Introduction to Facilities*
- We learned that the District has eight high schools, eight junior high schools, three specialized school sites, and a District office. We learned that the District serves more than 30,000 students; has more than 260 buildings, most of which are 35 to 63 years old; has 129 buildings that have never been remodeled/refurbished; and has approximately 70 percent of its buildings in need of repair.



What We Learned

- Committee members learned about the Facilities Master Plan process under way, which will be completed in June. We learned that the needs assessment portion of the Facilities Master Plan had already identified significant basic facilities needs.
- We also learned about the vision of the campus and classroom of the future, with flexible spaces for collaboration and use of technology.
- It is expected that our Facilities Master Plan will indicate the need for something approaching \$1 billion to be invested in our schools.
- Our second meeting addressed:
 - *Understanding of Operational vs. Capital Funding, How Bonds and Taxes Work, and What Might be Affordable*



What We Learned

- Committee members learned that the District will have revenues of approximately \$283 million to spend on basic operations this year, which is 10 percent less than five years ago. We also learned that three-quarters of the revenues come from the state and that 80 percent is spent on teachers and other staff. We learned that the District has approximately \$10 million that is subject to various restrictions, but could be invested in facilities.
- We reviewed Measure Z and learned that tax rates are averaging less than \$25 per \$100,000 of assessed value. We learned that the District could afford a \$249 million bond measure for a tax rate of \$30, the limit on projected taxes for a 55% voter approval bond measure.



What We Learned

- Our third meeting addressed:
 - *Understanding Public Information Research*
- Attendees learned that the demographics of our total community are not reflected in our voters, and that the survey addresses what voters think.
- We learned that 60 percent of voters think their community is headed in the right direction, more than 55 percent of voters think schools need additional funds, and that it is feasible to think that a bond measure could pass, although a public information campaign would be needed.
- We learned how our Board of Trustees maintains relationships with all the different constituencies in our community, including the five cities and five feeder elementary school districts.



What We Agreed to Report From Our Efforts

- Student, parent, and business community involvement in both District and community decision-making is an important element of the process.
- Our students and staff deserve the best possible environment: one that is welcoming, safe, efficient, and provides technology resources for student learning. Specific attention should be given to:
 - Flexible and accessible 21st Century environments with furnishings that support differentiated learning styles and student collaboration
 - Utilization of technology for security, sustainability, sustainability, and energy and water efficiency



What We Agreed to Report From Our Efforts

- Aligning educational needs to relevant programs and facilities that prepare our students to be college and career ready
- Improve campuses' access for security and safety
- Interactive (two-way) discussions with the community to educate them on all the issues
- An emphasis on infrastructure, and adequate maintenance funding set aside for the upkeep of newly renovated facilities



What We Agreed to Report From Our Efforts

- The District's facilities serve the entire community. Schools serve public education purposes and also recreational and community needs. Maintaining and improving school facilities is a community responsibility.
- The Committee recommends a bond measure in November 2014.
- We do not expect a bond measure of \$249 million to be sufficient to address the District's needs. We recommend an aggressive pursuit of resources for facilities. We view this as a first step on a long journey that over the long term will need to reflect a prioritization process which embraces equity, safety and student achievement. The first priority should be basic infrastructure needed for school operations.



What We Agreed to Report From Our Efforts

- Consideration of a bond measure should begin with accountability. The statutorily required Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee should be formed before the Board considers action to place a bond measure on the ballot. The oversight committee should review the proposed bond project list and confirm that the projects can be completed with the anticipated bond measure funding before the Board takes action to put a bond measure on the ballot.
- The oversight committee could also be tasked with establishing benchmarks to measure progress of the facilities projects to be completed with bond funding. The benchmarked performance should be regularly reported to the community via the website www.auhsdblueprint.us.



What We Agreed to Report From Our Efforts

- The Committee learned a great deal about the school facilities and funding, and realizes that the general public doesn't have this information. A public information process is important to illuminate the Blueprint Committee's work and conclusions for the larger community.

I participated in the Blueprint for the Future Committee in February 2014, and I support this consensus report.

Kath McLaughlin

Ann Lee

Gregorio

Kenneth
Diana Lopez

Carlos Berad

Julie Marquez

Janet Berardi

Chad

Jackie Brock

Lance Monday

Janet Brown

John

Morania Chavez T.

Leslie

Jeri Chumarian

Michelle Ramstetter

S. Lamon-Cash

Louise Sweete

Victoria Estrada

John

Julia E. Fejo

Kimberly

Ma Rosa Guzman

Deb Lidame

John

J. Villaseñor

Jovann Iniesta

Blanca Davera

Laura Williamson

I participated in the Blueprint for the Future Committee in February 2014, and I support this consensus report.

Mona Eskom

L. Jansen

Nancy Malott
I Nakayama

Brad Watson

Janet Adams

Rolfe Figue

Rick Martens

Ben Scott

Paula

Kerry

Doreen

Janet

Paul Lewis

Paula

Paula

Paula

Paula

Paula

Paula

Paula

Paula

Paula

Paula

Paula

Paula