




332 Minnesota Street
Suite W Two Thousand
Saint Paul, MN 55101

tel 651 227 7773
fax 651 223 5646
mail@woldae.com

To: Attendees
From: Derek Gallagher 
Date: January 25, 2016
Comm. No: 152311
Subject: Independent School District #879
Delano Redesigned Secondary Core Planning Group
January 20, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Attendees:

Steve Heil, Delano High School Principal	steve.heil@delanoschools.org
Joe Vieau, Delano High School Assistant Principal	joe.vieau@delanoschools.org
Steve Schauburger, Delano Middle School Assistant Principal	steve.schauburger@delanoschools.org
Shane Baughman, High School Social Studies	shane.baughman@delanoschools.org
Mark Schramel, 8 th Grade Social Studies	mark.schramel@delanoschools.org
Jim VanCura, High School English	jim.vancura@delanoschools.org
Heidi O'Donnell, Middle School English	heidi.odonnell@delanoschools.org
Mandy Weinandt, High School Math	mandy.weinandt@delanoschools.org
Amanda Roff, Middle School Math	amanda.roff@delanoschools.org
Karen Hohenstein, High School Chemistry	karen.hohenstein@delanoschools.org
Becca Rue, Middle School Science	becca.rue@delanoschools.org
Tory Spainer, PLTW Technology	tory.spainer@delanoschools.org
Joe Finn, Technology Education	joe.finn@delanoschools.org
John Fitzer, Spanish	john.fitzer@delanoschools.org
Jason Koets, Band	jason.koets@delanoschools.org
Amy Glitsos, Special Education	amy.glitsos@delanoschools.org
Shallyn Tordeur, Project Base	shallyn.tordeur@delanoschools.org
Monica Kunkel, Media Center Specialist	monica.kunkel@delanoschools.org
Nick Main, IT Coordinator	nick.main@delanoschools.org
Marty Kittok, Custodian	marty.kittok@delanoschools.org
Bill Sarine, Community	wsarine@gmail.com
Rhonda Almquist, Parent	rksjalm@yahoo.com
Darrell D. Egly, Parent	darrell_egly@cargill.com
Laura Weber, Parent	mnwebers@fronternet.net
Bob Prell, ICS	bobp@ics-consult.com
Vaughn Dierks, Wold Architects and Engineers	vdierks@woldae.com
Kaitlin Schalow, Wold Architects and Engineers	kschalow@woldae.com
Patrick Triggs, Wold Architects and Engineers	ptriggs@woldae.com
Derek Gallagher, Wold Architects and Engineers	dgallagher@woldae.com

The Core Planning Group met at Delano High School Media Center. The discussion focused on a review of related projects and establishing a preliminary list of design criteria.

Discussion Topics:

- A. Members of the Core Planning Group and architecture team members from Wold Architects and Engineers introduced themselves.



- B. Vaughn, from Wold reviewed the Core Planning Group responsibilities and process:
 - 1. Responsibilities:
 - a. Represent all: You are not here for special interests.
 - b. Attend all meetings.
 - c. Be prepared – review meeting minutes and do your homework.
 - d. Be respectful of others.
 - e. Work with criteria, not solutions.
 - f. Discuss this with your community and bring input.
 - 2. Outline of Core Planning Group Process:
 - a. Introductions / Preliminary Ideas.
 - b. Tours / Common Language.
 - c. Criteria / Principles Development.
 - d. Continued Criteria Discussion / First Diagrams.
 - e. Firming Up Criteria / Diagram Development.
 - f. Diagram to Plan.
 - g. Finalize Criteria / Finalize Diagrams and Plans.
 - h. Recommendation to Board.
- C. The group reviewed several example projects at middle schools and high schools in the area.
 - 1. Additions and renovations at the following schools were discussed:
 - a. New Prague Middle School.
 - b. Edina High School.
 - c. Hermantown High School.
 - d. Pequot Lakes Middle School and High School.
 - e. South St. Paul High School.
 - 2. The group discussed several relevant design opportunities demonstrated by the example projects.
 - a. Designing a new entry allows for the creation of an identity for a school while also making the building safer by establishing a secure entry. Visitor navigation is also an important consideration.
 - b. Arrangement of lockers in clusters allows for easier student supervision by fewer staff and can reduce congestion in hallways.
 - c. Some example projects grouped classes by grade level while others grouped classes by subject. Determining adjacencies is an important driver of the core planning process.
 - d. The function of media centers has changed over the last ten years. One example included a nontraditional media center mostly comprised of an open collaborative work environment with concentrated media storage.
 - e. Several projects demonstrated smaller coffee shop style cafeteria spaces that provide a variety of spaces for eating or student work.
 - f. Extended classroom areas are not always limited to general classroom wings. Several examples demonstrated extended classroom environments for clustered specialty classes.
 - g. Technology education was reconfigured in one example to allow for various sizes of group collaboration and different learning environments in one flexible suite.
- D. Core Planning Group members engaged in small-group discussions to answer the question “What do you want your school to be?” from the perspectives of students, parents, staff, and community respectively. These lists began to define Criteria for the design, and they will be revisited and revised as work progresses.
 - 1. Students:
 - a. Variety in cafeteria spaces.
 - b. Coffee shop style commons space with access to microwaves.
 - c. Access to technology and device charging stations.



- d. Natural light and views.
- e. Welcoming aesthetic that is clean and modern.
- f. Small group flex spaces with ability to project images and record audio and video.
- g. Accessibility (ADA) in all areas.
- h. Updated, more functional bathrooms.
- i. Better circulation.
- j. Comfortable furniture.
- k. Even climate control.
- l. Flex spaces available before and after school.
- m. All-gender facilities options.
- 2. Parents:
 - a. Secure and inviting environment.
 - b. ADA Accessibility.
 - c. Buffer between lower and upper grade levels.
 - d. Usable spaces near main entrance.
 - e. After hours study space.
 - f. Updated concessions and school store.
 - g. Easy accessibility during events.
 - h. Family friendly facilities.
 - i. Intuitive circulation/good signage.
 - j. Consistent room numbers.
 - k. Easy and safe drop-off, better traffic flow.
- 3. Staff/District:
 - a. Even climate control.
 - b. Coffee house.
 - c. Natural Light.
 - d. Continuity to aesthetics.
 - e. Durable finishes.
 - f. Multi-purpose space.
 - g. Collaborative staff work space.
 - h. Central office.
 - i. Satellite office.
 - j. Staff toilets.
 - k. Collaboration among grade levels.
 - l. Technology accessibility throughout, especially in flex spaces.
 - m. Central media center.
 - n. Storage, especially safe science storage.
 - o. Ability to close off areas of the building.
 - p. Adequate meeting space.
 - q. Adequate staff dining.
 - r. Discipline separation.
 - s. Better management of drop-off and bus entry.
 - t. Technology hub.
 - u. Central nurse office.
- 4. Community:
 - a. Easy access to facilities.
 - b. Better traffic flow inside and out.



- c. Community-relevant spaces near main entrance.
 - d. Bring community and kids together.
 - e. Professional meeting spaces.
 - f. Family friendly facilities.
 - g. Expansion of TAC offerings.
 - h. Teachable sustainability measures.
- E. As a large group, members discussed their most loved and most hated features of their current buildings.
1. Loved features included:
 - a. The natural light and views offered by the high school media center.
 - b. The buffer between the upper and lower grade levels (though some members viewed the opportunity for collaboration between these two groups as a better goal).
 - c. The sense of pride/identity that the community has with the school.
 - d. Facilities that can accommodate trades-based technology education.
 2. Hated features included:
 - a. Poor security particularly on the middle school side of the building.
 - b. Poorly coordinated parking and traffic.
 - c. The underperforming heating and cooling system.
 - d. The patchwork of aesthetics that fail to represent the pride taken in the school by the community.
 - e. Poor circulation/pinch points.
 - f. Lack of ADA accessibility.
- F. Next Steps:
1. Group members will continue conversations with the community.
 2. The Core Planning Group will tour area schools on Friday, February 3, 2016.
 3. The next regular meeting for the Group will be on Wednesday, February 17, 2016. At this meeting, the Group will download information and images from the tours, begin developing a common language for design, and continue to develop Criteria for the project.

cc: Eric Linner, Wold

MH/ISD_879/152311/min/1.20.16 Secondary CPG