

TASK #1: LIST OF FACILITY CONSIDERATIONS

Part 1: Please expand on the list below of factors identified from previous Community Engagement sessions. What additional considerations does your group suggest be examined when developing the facilities recommendations?

Feedback from previous Community Engagement Meetings includes:

- Capacity for Full-Day Kindergarten
- Improve Security
- Cost of Maintaining Current Facilities
- Technology Upgrades
- Eliminate Elementary Grade Transitions Between Building

Part 2: TOP 5 PRIORITIES FOR REVIEW

Then select and record the top five priorities from your group's list of considerations in the section below (ranking is not necessary).

TASK #2: INFORMATION AND/OR DATA FOR FACILITIES REVIEW COMMITTEE

We would like to utilize the coming months to gather information needed for the Facility Review Committee. If you were a member of the Committee next year, what additional background information and/or data would you want to have available to assist in beginning the facilities' needs discussions and developing facilities recommendations?

The Lisle Community engaged in the *Vision 202* conversation, "Lisle CUSD 202 Current Facilities" at Session #4 held on Saturday, April 25th. Participants discussed the District's current facilities and if the schools effectively support the instructional needs of teachers and students.

The Saturday morning session opened with Mark Jolicoeur from the architecture and design firm Perkins+Will. Mr. Jolicoeur presented a brief overview of the current facilities including: Tate Woods Elementary School, Schiesher Elementary School, Lisle Jr. High School, Lisle High School, and the Meadows Center. The audience then learned about the upcoming Facilities Master Plan process, scheduled to begin during the 2015-2016 school year.

Following the facilities presentation, over 70 Session #4 participants worked in 14 small groups to complete the two tasks listed above. Facilitating Team members, Board of Education members and some District administrators are not asked to sign-in.

Following is a summary of the response from the groups.

TASK #1: LIST OF FACILITY CONSIDERATIONS & TOP 5 PRIORITIES FOR REVIEW

What additional considerations does your group suggest be examined when developing the facilities recommendations? Then select and record the top five priorities from your group's list of considerations.

FACILITY CONSIDERATIONS

With the Facilities Master Plan committee scheduled to begin work next school year, Session #4 participants were asked to offer recommendations for future Lisle CUSD facilities. Participants offered many suggestions and three areas were listed by participants in several of the groups. **Safety and security** related concerns were shared by more than half of the groups (8 of 14). Groups cited the need for safe access by staff to school after hours, solutions to parking and drop off issues and improved building security such as sprinklers, fire plans, and other life safety issues.

Another majority of the groups (8 of 14) offered suggestions related to both the current elementary buildings and possible **reconfiguring of grade levels and schools**. The option of building a new elementary school was mentioned by 4 groups as a possibility. Discussions related to having more efficient groupings for students generated comments about Pre-K through Grade 5 in one school versus Pre-K through Grade 3 and then Grades 4 through 5 in another school. Participants in a few groups also suggested repurposing current district space, and others specifically mentioned the need for educational **areas devoted to District specialist/resource teachers** regardless if it was reconfigured or included in new construction. A smaller number of groups questioned the District's **current location for central office** as an area to be relocated to make way for additional classrooms.

While a majority of the groups suggested ideas related to safety and security and reconfiguring of grade levels, slightly less than half of the groups offered ideas targeted to **flexible use of space** within the schools. Participants in 6 of 14 groups listed flexible/modular learning spaces with areas for technology as very important to future facility improvements.

PRIORITIES

Not surprising, the key facility considerations were also listed as top priorities by Session #4 groups. Groups had strong agreement for improved **safety and security** (10 of 14) and for exploring best ways to **reconfigure grade level groupings**, specifically the Pre-K through Grade 5 classes and options to **repurpose current spaces** within buildings (11 of 14). Throughout *Vision 202* sessions, **Full-Day Kindergarten** has garnered much discussion. Full-Day Kindergarten and the desire to house it with Pre-K and other elementary classes was listed as a priority by a large majority of the groups (11 of 14). A small number of the groups **identified space for specialist/resource teachers, flexible use of space** and **new versus renovated school buildings** as priorities.

TASK #2: INFORMATION AND/OR DATA FOR FACILITIES REVIEW COMMITTEE

What additional background information and/or data would you want to have available to assist in beginning the facilities' needs discussions and developing facilities recommendations?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION NECESSARY

Vision 202 leaders asked Session #4 participants to share suggestions for additional information they would like to know prior to moving forward with the Master Facility Plan next school year. Without question, **funding and financing** top the list with almost all of the groups (11 of 14). "How will the updates be funded," asked one group. "What dollar amount would the District have to pass a referendum?" asked another. Several groups wanted more information related to the cost of renovating schools versus building new schools. Others questioned the cost of maintaining multiple schools compared to one school. And some groups wanted to know the financial value of all school properties in light of possibly selling District buildings or land in the future.

Looking ahead to the possibility of facility improvements in Lisle CUSD, many of the groups (8 of 14) indicated they would like to see more specific details related to these projects. Participants identified the need for more information about **construction timelines, mobile classrooms** and what the **disruption would be for students**. The same large majority of groups (8 of 14), listed district enrollment and future enrollment projections as information that would be helpful to future discussions about facilities. "Is our enrollment projected to increase or decrease in the future?" asked one group. "What is the projected enrollment 5 years to 10 years?" asked another.

For a complete listing of all responses
see the April 25, 2015 CES-4 Verbatim Response Document found at
www.vision202.org/ces-4/