

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

