

Hinsdale County School District – Ten Year Facilities Planning Process
Workshop 1 – Summary Report



The Hinsdale County School Board continued work on a 10 Year District Facilities Plan, Wednesday, November 16, at the Lake City Community School. Ten community members joined Board members Tara Hardy, Rob Hudgeons, and Phillip Virden along with Superintendent Leslie Nichols in a facilitated workshop designed to generate ideas for the production of the Facilities Plan.

The workshop was designed and facilitated by a team from Welborn & Associates – Janice Welborn, David Primus, Robin Weidenmueller, and Bernie Krystyniak.

Purpose

- Involve primary community stakeholder group representatives:
Community members attending represented a broad range of stakeholders including parents, teachers, neighbors, property owners, and local businesses. They included John and Kerry Coy, Patricia Crotwell, Gary Gibson, Grant Houston, Carolyn Hull, Linny Ramundo, Camille Richard, Carolyn Virden, and Nancy Zeller.
- Generate ideas on facility needs:
Break-out group and large group discussion provided a prioritized set of ideas that will be valuable in the creation of the Facilities Plan.

Programs and Curriculum in the Future

Leslie Nichols provided a short school history and a summary of curriculum and programs vision. This gave the group a view of possibilities for the idea generation section of the workshop. Dr. Nichols noted that the District has earned widespread recognition for excellence in recent years in a building that many recognize as in need of update and expansion.

Examples of learning possibilities that are not currently supported by facility spaces in the Hinsdale program are music, theatre, outdoor education, online courses, vocational training, and adequate laboratory support. Adequate support for STEM (science, technology, engineering, and math) programs should be considered. Support space improvement possibilities include lunch room, small group instructional spaces, nurses station, conference spaces, and physical education facilities. Technology support improvements would include increased internet access bandwidth via fiber optics.

Data

David Primus presented a review of data research gathered and developed by the Welborn & Associates team. The information included data from a peer survey of other school districts, the Colorado Department of Education, Colorado Department of Local Affairs (DOLA), the Hinsdale County Tax Assessor, and the Hinsdale County School District.

A binder of the most current reports was provided to all participants. Additional copies of the detail data reports and graphs are available on request.

The peer survey included responses from 23 school districts and focused on facilities configuration, projects, size, and use. Survey requests were sent to 41 districts, most with less than 200 students, to gather comparative information from other small enrollment districts.

The data was normalized for comparison, resulting in presentation of the data on a square foot per student basis. It was noted that the Hinsdale District ranked last in comparison to responding peers in absolute facility size and in size per student for total size, core classrooms, assembly spaces, and gymnasium. Hinsdale was next to last in exploratory classroom spaces and near the bottom in support and library space.

Over half of the responding districts, 14 of 21, reported large facility projects of \$50,000 or more within the last 3 years. Of those projects, ten utilized Building Excellent Schools Today, (BEST) grants in some combination with taxpayer funding. The BEST program was established in 2008 by the State of Colorado to provide competitive grants to school districts and other educational institutions for new and existing facilities projects.

The survey results also highlighted that Hinsdale had a notable lack of facility space for music, technology, health education, conference, auditorium, and gymnasium. Eleven of 17 respondents noted using their gymnasium for other things in addition to sports, including auditorium, community use, large group instruction, stage, and theatre.

The student enrollment growth projection for Hinsdale District was based on historical growth from 1990 to the present. It showed a modest, but steady, growth over the next 10 years from 111 students to approximately 121 in 2026. A variety of other historical and forecast data from the sources mentioned earlier was also provided to the participants.

Idea Generation Process

With the vision and data as the backdrop, the participants broke into three small groups to generate discussion and ideas on exploratory programs and classrooms, large activity spaces (assembly, physical education, sports, and other), and the basis for facility definition and comparison.

Groups reported back for discussion and all participants prioritized the results. These results will be used in the development of the facilities plan, which will be presented in the first quarter of 2017.

Exploratory Ideas

The ranking indicated the highest priority from the exploratory spaces discussion to be in technology and STEM space development (12), along with the need for dedicated nurse space (8). (Priority votes are noted in parentheses.)

Other discussion points included:

- Need test spaces for small groups (1)
- Technology practice is currently integrated, no separate lab is provided
- Use of combination classrooms provides efficiency (1)
 - Career and Technical Education/Media/radio station
 - Construction trades
 - Tech and vocational education (5)
 - Distance learning (5)
 - Music – acoustics and vocal (2)
- Outdoor educational space, skiing, trails (3)

- Adult education courses
- Supporting infrastructure is necessary – fiber optics, acoustics, creative scheduling

Large Activity Spaces Ideas

The participants indicated priorities for large activity spaces should include multiple-use, avoid duplication of existing resources, provide adequate parking (11), consider “green” building techniques (9), and be made available for community use.

Large spaces should be considered for gym, assembly, auditorium, physical education classes, and sporting events. High priority is noted for design consideration of storage (8), restrooms, off-street parking, and state requirements (3), e.g. locker rooms and officials’ space.

Things not to consider were duplication of existing community resources such as the theatre. Classrooms were considered higher priority than cafeteria or commercial kitchen (unless state funding is available). Fitness training that requires lots of equipment is low priority or should not be considered.

Factors in Defining Facility Needs

The 3rd group considered the question – “What basis, comparison or standard should be considered in defining how large the facility should be and what spaces should be included?”

The points noted by the breakout group included considering:

- government information on technology futures (e.g. Region 10)
- the combination of community, school, and local economy aspects together
- state standards on space and curriculum
- the effect of the school development and trends on future enrollment
- using the quantitative data from the peer survey in sizing
- using qualitative data on prioritized vision and possibilities

Next Steps

While no special subcommittees or supplemental groups were identified, John Coy (exploratory curriculum ideas) and Camille Richard (multi-use technology space and outdoor/environmental facilities) volunteered to be involved in additional work.

- Welborn
 - Organize and document, share with participants
 - Develop straw Facilities Plan for a first quarter 2017 workshop
 - Design and facilitate Workshop 2 in the first quarter 2017
- School Board
 - Review Workshop 1 results and provide any additional feedback at the Dec 15 Board meeting