

Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee
February 22, 2005
Audio Conference Minutes - Approved April 22, 2005

<u>Committee Members</u>	<u>Staff</u>	<u>Additional Participants</u>
Eddy Jeans	Tim Mearig	Deb Morse, Juneau SD
Carl John	Don Carney	
Dee Hubbard	Abdoulie Manneh	
Robert Tucker	Cynthia Dau	
Mark Langberg		
Thomas Richards		

Eddy Jeans, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:30 and proceeded with Roll Call. Absent from the committee meeting were Senator Gene Therriault, Representative Kevin Meyer and Harley Hightower. A quorum was established, new staff member, Abdoulie Manneh, was introduced and Eddy proceeded with an agenda overview.

Dee Hubbard made a motion to accept the agenda. The motion was seconded by Robert Tucker and passed by unanimous consent.

Eddy turned the meeting over to Tim Mearig to discuss revisions to maintenance points for CIP applications.

CIP Maintenance Scoring

Tim directed the committee's attention to the 11/30/04 Briefing Paper on the subject and to the objective/subjective criteria used to assess each application. This on-going effort to put these criteria/points down on paper is coming to a close with this review. Tim noted he had integrated the committee's suggestions from December and plans to have this finalized for adoption at the April meeting. Changes are as follows:

- Page 9 – Changed Assessment Seven (maintenance training) from an objective to a subjective assessment with corresponding revisions to the benchmark measurement.
- Revised the discussion section to reflect suggested standards for district best-practice using the old objective language.

Dee asked about adding a 70% threshold as an objective criteria versus the 90% that had been previously proposed. She also asked about holding a review of how points were earned and expressed concern over how districts would view point assessments. Tim responded that districts would get points per the committee's recommendations and that, as proposed under a subjective scoring, there is no longer a measurement at 70 or 90%. He elaborated that there will be a scoring team, using a scoring guide, which will provide consistency and further noted there will be training for scorers as well as a review of the process in the future. Both the scoring form and rater's guide will be on the agenda at the committee's April meeting for adoption. Prior to leaving this Assessment, the committee

directed a small syntax error correction in the benchmark section (i.e., “training methods” vs. “trainings method”). Dee also pointed out that the Conclusion paragraph on page 11 needed to be corrected to describe the change in objective and subjective points for maintenance from the previous scoring matrix to this proposed matrix (i.e., “maintaining the subjective assessments . . . at 25 . . . spread . . . over all five” and “objective assessments . . . rise from 10 points to 35”).

Dee then turned to page 5 asking about maintenance points coming more in line with the overcrowding points assignment. Tim and Robert both agreed that this has been in the mill for some time and that the proposed restructuring is an excellent product to start the process.

Discussion moved to the impact on districts of EED implementing these new scoring criteria. Don Carney and Robert discussed the possibility that all district maintenance offices may not have a computer. Others pointed out that there would be a computer they could use somewhere. Robert said that some issues are going to be difficult for districts to address. He stressed it should be made clear that this is for CIP points only, not for eligibility. Eddy agreed and asked that this be included in the application handbook; he called for a clear statement that it’s for ranking purposes only.

Robert asked about going through the document page by page but the chair chose to limit discussion to only the issues as brought forth at the last meeting to save rehashing the entire document. Robert asked the group to look at page six, regarding month-to-month completion records in Assessment Two and commented that they aren’t going to be beneficial. Tim clarified that the point of the assessment was more, ‘Are you getting the work done?’ There was discussion but the bottom line was from Eddy who stated this assessment is to make sure a district can produce a report, improve service, and pay attention to district needs. He indicated there would be no reflection on a district if something didn’t get done. It’s a management tool and having a report provides up to 15 points. There was then discussion about whether the 15 points in this assessment were an all-or-nothing based on receiving the three prescribed reports or whether partial points were possible. The committee agreed that each report could earn 5 points if provided and noted this needed to be clarified in the text of Assessment Two. Carl John added that the department was attempting to ensure each school district has the tools to have a successful maintenance program. Don agreed saying he talks with districts about options and use of the management tools and then follows up by showing them the information they’ve actually gathered. Conversation came to a close and Eddy asked Tim to do a final document. This will be up for adoption in April.

A Guide to Writing Educational Specifications

Tim brought the committee’s attention to page 30 of the referenced document and reviewed the changes made regarding the school equipment portion. He noted that a tabulated list of equipment remains as a standard but that the document no longer suggests that the educational planner is responsible for budgeting for any equipment. Instead, the document places that responsibility on a “project manager/construction manager” and set the timeline for equipment purchase action to coincide with the design

development documents. This approach was acceptable to the committee. In addition, it was determined that the term “school district” be used to describe the “project manager” referenced in paragraph 2.

Continuing the review to other areas of the publication, Dee noted a grammatical error on page six, first line (i.e., corrected “higher” to “hire”). Carl pointed out that on page 29, paragraph 3, the last sentence should read, “While the department does [insert NOT] regulate...” Also on page 29, the last paragraph will be replaced with Carl’s suggested language per his prior email to the committee.

These revisions were all adopted by unanimous consent

Guidelines for School Equipment Purchases – 2005 Edition

Eddy directed the committee to the next publication on the agenda for review. Tim initiated the review at page three, noting a formatting correction needed at line nine (i.e., extra spaces and a period). Eddy then led a group discussion of page 3, paragraph 1, last sentence. Points included a sense that selection/purchase should be with the district if it’s not considered “construction.” Some felt a clear definition of responsibility between school districts and their city/borough would be appropriate for this publication. It was noted that this publication becomes, by reference, regulation. Eddy wanted to reserve the department’s commitment on this issue. It was noted that 14.14.060 establishes that a school board is responsible for the design criteria but is not as clear about equipment purchases. Some members felt this may be a local issue since procurement approval processes differ between districts and municipalities. District representatives at the meeting advocated the publication simply state it’s the responsibility of the district to procure equipment – not leaving it as a possible choice among other options. It was asked where it was written that a borough was invited to share in decision making in this area. Tim referred the committee to subparagraph (f) which establishes the borough administrator as providing for the construction and major repair of school buildings. It was demonstrated that a school district was the repository of expertise for school equipment (e.g., who will know what centrifuge to purchase for a science classroom, etc.). Carl indicated he had expressed his concern to the committee via email. He felt that the wording of the sentence in question leaves an opening for the municipality or borough to dictate school equipment purchases and requirements thereby empowering the municipality in an area that should be decided by the district.

Eddy brought discussion to a close by saying that this document cannot be the tool used to spell out the regulations, neither is it an opportunity to expand on regulation or statute. He indicated to the committee that if it desired to make this absolutely clear, they may need to go through the complete public process. It was moved and seconded to leave the language as proposed and that a reference to AS 14.14.060 (h) would be added on page two under the **Authority** heading. The motion carried.

Review of page 4, paragraph 1 led to a discussion of book purchases being appropriate under equipment. It was initially thought that they could be, one time, for new schools.

However, this was later clarified with the determination textbooks cannot be purchased as equipment but that the one-time purchase of library books qualified.

Dee had a question on the dollar amount (\$300) listed as the “capitalization value” and wondered if this corresponded to the Chart of Accounts? Tim stated that it did in a general sense noting the qualifier that acknowledges that districts may set their own policies. Eddy stated that the current Chart of Accounts lists \$500 but that GASB 34 allows items valued below \$2,000 not to be capitalized.

Dee noted she felt the first sentence on page six regarding equipment purchases being limited to an individual school project was unclear and said she would forward a suggestion at a later date.

A member asked if the number of students served (i.e., as listed in the Table on page seven) is actually used to budget for equipment? Tim responded that absent equipment lists with itemized values the per student figure acted as a resource for budgeting purposes. In reviewing this section, Cindy noted the need for a closing parenthesis in the second to last sentence.

A member asked to review a summary of changes proposed for the two documents reviewed. Staff was reminded to incorporate the language Carl had suggested by email into A Guide to Writing Educational Specifications, page 29, paragraph 4. Regarding further differentiation on borough and district responsibility for procuring school equipment, Tim stated he was incorporating current language per the motion and reminded the committee that regulations could be introduced.

A member had a question on page 18 of the Guide to Writing Educational Specifications, regarding site size. Tim confirmed the reference to the companion documents listed were still current.

Preventive Maintenance Handbook

Committee members were polled to see if there had been adequate opportunity to review this publication outline. There was a consensus that time had been limited. It was agreed Tim would email the document again to the committee for comment and put it on the April agenda pending receipt.

The agenda was completed and the meeting wrapped up with questions from Tom and Dee about legislative updates. Eddy reviewed the current school funding bills, said that the Cost Factor Study would be released soon, and that the department budget would be finalized soon.

Carl requested that CEFPI be provided more of an opportunity to participate. Tim will add Janet Matheson, current president, to the interested parties list.

Motion to adjourn – Meeting closed at 4:15