

MEETING MINUTES

PROJECT: Queen Anne Elementary School
Seattle Public Schools

PROJECT NO: 2015917.00

DATE: 14 March 2016

FILE NAME: 160314 (SDAT 02 mins).docx

SUBJECT: School Design Advisory Team (SDAT) Meeting 01

MEETING DATE: 25 February 2016

TIME: 4:30-6:30

LOCATION: Queen Anne Elementary School

ATTENDEES:	X	Joe Bailey -Fogarty	QAES	JBf
	X	Nancy Buran	QAES, Nutrition	NB
	X	Jenny Brailey	Parent	JB
	X	Gloria Chambers	Neighbor	GC
	X	Julie Colando	QAES	JC
	X	Elena Damm	Parent	ED
	X	John Leary	Parent	JLa
	X	Jenny Lee	Parent	JLe
	X	Patty Maxfield	Neighbor	PM
	X	Amy McCue Jessee	QAES	AMJ
	X	Megan Palumbo	QAES	MP
	X	Ted Panton	Parent	TP
	X	Geness Reichert	Neighbor	GR
	X	Jeffrey Riley	QAES	JRi
		Jeff Rothenberg	QAES, PE teacher	JRo
	X	Mark Stewart	Parent	MS
	X	Vince Gonzales	SPS	VG
		David Mount	Mahlum	DM
		JoAnn Wilcox	Mahlum	JW
	X	Forest Payne	Mahlum	FP
	X	Corrie Rosen	Mahlum -	CR

The following represents the architect's understanding of discussions held and decisions reached in the meeting. Anyone with amendments to these minutes should notify the author within five (5) days of the minutes date in order to amend as appropriate.

CORRECTIONS TO PREVIOUS MEETING

- :: Item 1.2 - It was noted that the growth in student enrollment from the current 440 students to the projected 500 student capacity would be a 12% increase in population.
- :: Item 1.7 - The enrollment numbers for the reopening of Queen Anne Elementary in 2010 was incorrectly

noted as 400 students in the presentation to the SDAT. The correct count was 223 students.

ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION BY
1.1	Agenda and introducing Corrie :: CR/FP presented the agenda for the meeting and made introductions.	
1.2	Spectrums exercise :: Participants were asked to place a dot on 22 “spectrums” developed to highlight desires for the project that are inherently exclusive to one another. (This was intended to capture initial impressions and to spark conversation to be continued throughout the SDAT & Schematic Design phases.) :: The 6 boards were themed with the following questions: :: The QAE community values? :: What are QAE’s site priorities? :: What are QAE’s program priorities? :: What are QAE’s school priorities? :: What should the heart of QAE be? :: How should the classrooms (grade levels) be organized? Observations and clarifications of the results: :: Community Values :: Participants differed on their interpretation of the “Historic Focus” vs “Modern Focus.” Interpretations ranged from aesthetic preference to teaching style (similar then to “Traditional” vs “Future-Thinking”). :: “Equity (New and Old)” was explained to promote a balanced design goal while “Push the Envelope (New)” would give preference to the new construction spaces, investing money to make those spaces the most modernized possible. :: “Interior Corridors” can be employed if the new construction happens in between the two existing buildings but has budget implications with the use of circulation square footage. “Covered Exterior Circulation” can create a designated path but not be conditioned interior space. :: “(+8) Classrooms in Existing Buildings” would displace other functions to the new construction, such as the Library or Administration. :: Site :: Given the current conditions of the Queen Anne Elementary site, participants were weary of simply desiring what they do not currently have. Therefore: “Maximize Site for Open Space” and “Softscape Play.” That said, others suggested that elementary school students need plenty of green spaces for play and those are the ones that students are attracted to. :: Program :: A “Central Resource Area” designates one main hub for Special Education, ideally centrally located for easy access for students coming for services and specialists going to the students in or near their classrooms. “Multiple Resource Areas” divides up the resources and makes them more accessible for students and staff than one central location. :: Much discussion occurred suggesting that the space set aside for the Gym	

might not be the appropriate program from which to find square footage for a Project-Based Learning Lab.

- :: - It is important to note that the votes for “Four Lunches” vs “Two Lunches” have both idealized votes and votes given the current space constraints. Many participants noted that, given adequate space, two lunches would be ideal for scheduling purposes. That said, two lunches may defeat the purpose of a small-scale, less noisy lunch that Queen Anne currently promotes.
- :: There was apparent consensus in the school priorities categories.
- :: Heart
 - :: - Discussions were started about the heart of Queen Anne Elementary being the classrooms. Although this was not added to the list, with no definite heart after this exercise, the classrooms should be considered part of this discussion in the future.
- :: Grade organization -
- :: Most of the participants leaned toward a K-1, 2-3, 4-5 grouping of grades. -

1.3 Functional Programming Exercise

- :: CR presented instructions on an activity to think about programming space around learning activities, rather than just number of desks in a classroom.
- :: Groups of 4 or 5, including 2 QAE staff in each group, began with a blank diagram with bubbles representing learning process and picked two ideal group sizes to encourage that process
- :: Next, they wrote down “tools” that would be used for activities related to the respective learning processes, which could be actual tools, or types of spaces, or furniture/equipment
- :: Finally, they picked subjects or grades and drew shapes that would encompass 3-4 learning processes that they might use to teach that subject.

Tools that were brought up in multiple groups include the following:

- :: Recording studios for audio/video production, tutorials, etc
- :: Project-Based Learning Lab or Maker Space, incl. teaching kitchen/demonstration table -
- :: Breakout spaces -
- :: Gym -
- :: Garden -
- :: Stage -
- :: Display space -
- :: Various furniture types -

1.4 Foundational Questions Exercise

- :: CR introduced an activity called 1-2-4-All, asking each participant to write down an answer to each of the following questions. Next they paired with another participant to discuss both of their answers. The pairs formed groups of 4 or 5, and selected their favorite answer to share with the group.
 - :: What does it mean to be an adaptable learning environment?
 - :: Accommodate different types of learners, and types of spaces that make them comfortable
 - :: Spaces that can connect or become more intimate

- :: Things being able to move, morph and be flexible
- :: Polarities: Open spaces, but intimate. Learning different subjects.
- :: Flexibility to accommodate different learners, small groups, large groups
- :: Ability to define internal spaces according to the learning or the social objective
- :: Need for ease of physical adaptability, so spatial configurations be changed quickly without too much supervision
- :: What makes a school healthy, both physically and emotionally?
 - :: - Community with shared values, student-centered decision making, natural light, green spaces, positive discipline, mindfulness, collaboration, compassion for others, & global perspective
 - :: - Need for a space where staff can go, unwind for a few minutes, collaborate, coordinate, discuss. If your staff is healthy, then your school is going to be healthy.
 - :: Communication. Safety & supervision. Access to natural light and outdoors.
 - :: Considering multiple viewpoints, perspective-taking, honesty. Clean, clutter-free.
 - :: - Non-toxic environment, no sick-building issues. Cleanable. Concern over pendant lights collecting dust. Concern about fluorescent light quality.

1.5 Summary of Activities

- :: The aggregated results of these activities will be reported back at the next meeting and made available on the district project website.