

---

Arkansas Division of Public School

---



---

Academic Facilities & Transportation

---

**ARKANSAS COMMISSION FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL ACADEMIC  
FACILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION**

**MEETING AGENDA**

**June 21, 2010**

**9:00 A.M.**

**Arkansas Department of Education Auditorium**

**Call to Order/Roll Call**

- 1. Minutes Meeting March 16, 2010**
- 2. Special Reports:**
  - a. Non Applying School Districts**
  - b. Facilities Advisory Committee**
  - c. Transportation Grant Program**
  - d. School Bus Operations General Report**
- 3. Partnership Program Update**
- 4. Appeals Procedures Rules**
- 5. Partnership Program Rule**

## Minutes March 2010

Summary Minutes of the Commission for Arkansas Public School Academic

Facilities and Transportation

March 16, 2010

Place: ADE Auditorium

Time: 8:30 am

Attendees: Dr. Tom Kimbrell, Commissioner AR Department of Education  
Mr. Mac Dodson, President Arkansas Development Authority  
Mr. Richard Weiss, Director AR Dept. of Finance and  
Administration  
Mr. Douglas Eaton, Director PSAFT  
Dr. Charles Stein, Assistant Director DPSAFT  
Ms. Barbara Dobbs, Administrative Specialist DPSAFT

### **Tab 1: Minutes Meeting March 16, 2010**

**Dr. Kimbrell:** Okay. We have a motion to approve the minutes of September 23, 2009 Commission meeting.

**Commission Action: Approved**

### **Tab 2: Draft Rule Changes: Specifications for School Bus Design.**

**Mr. Eaton:** Item 2 is one of a number of rules we are bringing back to you today, previously reviewed in September, after having gone through the open comment period. We have made minor adjustments as necessary. I am going to go through these one at a time. The first of these are the bus specification rule. The only change to that rule we presented in September was a requirement that after January 1, 2011, a sign be then posted on the back of the buses. That rule went out, with little questions, and it is recommended the Commission approve the amended rules governing the school bus specifications. The next step would be to submitting these to the Administrative Rules Committee in April.

**Dr. Kimbrell:** We have a recommendation from the Division to adopt the changes in the rules for specifications for bus design.

**Commission Action: Approved The Changes in the Rules for**

**Specifications for Bus Design.**

### **Tab 3: Draft Rule Changes: M and O of School Buses and Physical**

#### **Examinations of School Bus Drivers.**

**Mr. Eaton:** Tab three deals with the rule regarding examination of school bus drivers. By the way, I think you know, but in each of those sections you have all of the comments that were made, who made the comment, and what our responses were back to them. The significant change in the rules presented to you in September would allow, other than doctors, advanced practical nurses, to conduct school bus driver examinations. This change was very well received across the state by the school districts. There was one comment and did not pertain to the rule.

We are recommending approval; that the amended rules for physical examinations of bus drivers again, so we can proceed to the Administrative Rules Committee.

**Dr. Kimbrell:** We have the recommendation on draft rule changes for the maintenance and operation of school buses and physical examination of school bus drivers.

**Commission Action: Approved**

### **Tab 4: Rule for Bonded Debt:**

**Mr. Eaton:** Item four is the bonded debt rule. When we amended this rule, we only accounted for two changes that occurred in the legislature from last year; capital repairs and renovations to the rules, to allow a school district to use bonded debt savings for that.

There has been some other questions raised by ADE that will cause this over the next couple of months to reexamine some of the procedures in this rule, because the rule was written in early 2005, and there have been some procedures and differences in the weighted wealth index and a few other things that calculated. Time did not allow them included in this, but I have spoken with ADE Assistant Commissioner for Finance, and we are going to go back and look at this. For now, all this rule does, that we presented, was allowing the school districts to use the bonded debt savings for capital repairs and renovations. The rule includes those definitions.

**Dr. Kimbrell:** I have a motion and a second to change the rule on bonded debt.

**Committee Action: Approved**

### **Tab 5: Facilities Master Plan.**

**Mr. Eaton:** This rule was brought to you in September. I failed to mention the other ones, but the comment period ran from the 25th of September to the 5th of November for each of these rules and we had one public hearing on October 14th, where we allowed comments on all of these rules.

The only changes to the Master Plan rule was to add or recognize the Custodial Maintenance Handbook and a change to the handbook, which put in a matrix of required inspections. And in order to be able to present that to the public we had to slide it through in the Master Plan rules, the one that best fit.

This is also recommended that the Commission approve these rules so that we can proceed to submission to the Administrative Committee in April.

A motion was made and seconded to adopt the rule on Facilities Master Plan.

**Commission Action: Adopt the Rule on Facilities Master Plan Approved.**

#### **Tab Six: Facility Distress Rule**

**Mr. Eaton:** The Facility Distress Rule, in September, was presented to you because we had to make changes which included the definition and procedures dealing with non-material failure. We made the changes to our rule and ADE made the same changes to their rule, dealing with fiscal distress. The changes made allows for districts to work with the Division ahead of time, if they find or we find something that can possibly lead to a distress situation. That is what the changes in our rule must do, and we took out the appeals section of the rule.

The rule prompted some comments, most were points that could be clarified in an explanation as to why the change was accomplished that may not require changes to the September submission. They are being brought back to you with the recommendation that the amended rules go forward to the Administrative Rules Committee in April.

A motion was made to adopt and was seconded.

**Commission Action: Approved**

#### **Tab 7: Draft Rule Changes on Governing Self-Construction Rule**

**Mr. Eaton:** Tab Seven deals with the self construction rule. This was mainly a rule that needed to be cleaned up. We had to bring the authorities under the Commission from the State Board of Education. It added the definition of self construction, the definition of Commission and clarified the notification procedure.

There were a few comments with one change that we did make in paragraph 6.03. That dealt with the fact that in the rule the way it was originally written, it

identified the bidding procedures. We took that out because if the law changes, and the bidding procedure changes, we'll have to run back and change the rule. After discussions, it was best felt to leave that the way it is, so the districts would not be mistaken as to how they had to advertise for procurement purposes. So that was the only significant change that was made as a result of the comments.

Many school districts do not have rules and policies governing construction, consequently we do have a number of errors during the year with procurements and wrong advertising, and bad awards, and things of this nature.

It is confusing, I will agree, and it is something that I think the Division long range would like to put out a desk side reference for the superintendents and give them step-by-steps, because many of them do not know.

**Dr. Kimbrell:** If you're in agreement that we need to do that is there anyway we can move forward and get that causal reference put together?

**Mr. Eaton:** We can certainly start on that Dr. Kimbrell. It is something that Dr. Stein and I have wrestled with, a how-to manual. With some of these areas for school districts, there just isn't a clear how-to manual.

**Commissioner Weiss** agreed it would be helpful

A motion was made to approve and a second to draft rule changes on governing self-construction.

**Commission Action: Draft Rule Changes on Governing Self-Construction Approved**

### **Tab 8: The Appeals Rule: Appeals to the Commission**

**Mr. Eaton:** Here is where it gets confusing. In September of last year we brought you a rule which was the basic appeals rule that was written and adopted March, 2008. In the session last year they interjected an organization called the Facility Review Board. The Facility Review Board has the right to hear appeals from the school districts to the Division determinations dealing with those programs that fall under financial laws.

The Review Board was set up, and it's working. We have already had some appeals. But there were also provisions, for example, that if there was an appeal made of a Review Board final determination, it's not called a decision, it is a final determination, and can be made to the Commission. So we have districts that can make appeals directly to the Commission under the program laws. Districts can make an appeal to the Review Board under the financial laws. And districts that can take the final determination from the Review Board appeal and come to the Commission.

Well, we wrote that rule up that way. And then after Dr. Kimbrell came aboard he, I and the attorneys sat down, and the general consensus was the school districts might get confused and not be able to understand as easily as we would like them for.

So with the help of the ADE attorney, we broke the rule apart. We took the same language that was in there and simply put it into two rules. And that is what you have here in Tabs Eight and Nine.

Now since we didn't change any of the language that was presented to you, we broke it apart and have started the process for the open comment period. It was put out on January 26th and the period ends on April 9th, and the public hearing was held on February 23, 2010. So we are in the open comment period now, and we have not received any, however, we probably will receive some comments before the April 9th deadline. In which case, we'll be bringing that rule back to you for clarification.

**Committee Action: Appeals to the Commission Approved.**

**Tab 9: Appeals to the Review Board.**

By separating it, we still have to tie together parts A or B, because they have the same title. It makes it a little clearer to the district. When they want to appeal, they have the process. Whether they want to appeal to the Review Board or the Commission, they have the process.

The other reason that we broke it apart is to make the Review Board appeal process easier. The appeal process to the Commission is rather cumbersome, but it is very demanding with regard to schedules and things with documentation you have to submit.

The Review Board procedure we set up was to allow it to be a lot easier and be user friendly. We wanted the districts to feel comfortable and understandable without being challenged when they have to get a Review Board hearing. And if you look at the two rules side-by-side, you'll notice that is the most significant difference; that the Review Board rule is a lot easier to implement than the Commission rule.

Gentlemen, they are out, both Tab Eight and Tab Nine and are now going through the process of reviews and that ends on April 9<sup>th</sup>.

**Dr. Kimbrell:** So we're not looking for action here.

**Mr. Eaton:** No, sir.

**Dr. Kimbrell:** Mr. Eaton, would you please give an overview for our other two Commissioners about how this Review Board is actually set up. And who, you know, without giving the members names, but if you've got them that would be great, but how that practice or that piece is going to be working from this point forward.

**Mr. Eaton:** Okay. The Review Board was established by legislation last year. It consists of five members appointed by the Governor. The Review Board consists of an architect, an engineer, a member of the construction industry, a school board member, and an appointee at large. And there were agencies that appointed those. AAEA, I think appointed one, AEA appointed the other, and The other ones were appointed by AIA, AGC, and I forget who appointed the fifth. Okay. Those five members have met. They met the first time for a general acquaintance meeting. We met with the legislator that drafted the bill, because there were some misunderstandings as to what was intended to be in the bill and what actually got into the bill. We got that clarified.

Their first charge was to put together procedures. They did that. The very first meeting that they held officially was to hear two of the appeals that came before the Commission in September but were withdrawn, and they elected to go before the Board. And that was Wynne School District and South Conway School District.

At the very first official meeting, or the second official meeting of the Review Board, they approved their procedures. They aren't rules, they approved procedures and those were drafted with the help of our office, with the help of ADE's attorney.

Once that was done they went ahead and conducted the two hearings. They had to meet a second time to make a final decision on one of the hearings. That has happened. And those meetings are concluded, the decisions were rendered. We haven't published the minutes yet, but both of those decisions have been decided by the Review Committee.

**Commissioner Weiss:** What was the disposition?

**Mr. Eaton:** Both of those dispositions, the Review Committee ruled that the Division's decision was accurate.

**Dr. Kimbrell:** So at this point the districts would be able to appeal the Review Board's decision to the Commission?

**Mr. Eaton:** Yes, sir. They can do that. They have 30 days from the date of the decision to submit a letter of intent to do that.

**Dr. Kimbrell:** Okay. And so those will come back possibly when we look at the other rule changes.

**Mr. Eaton:** Yes, sir. Hopefully, probably the next time we meet again we'll bring those back. Okay.

**No action is required by the Commission.**

**Tab 10: Partnership Rule.**

**Mr. Eaton:** Yes, sir. Last one is the Partnership Rule. The Partnership Rule is coming to you for the first time to present to you changes that we've been requested to make to the rule, and then to begin the open comment period.

The Partnership Rule has been in effect since basically 2005. It was modified a little bit in 2006. It was modified again in March of 2008, when we changed some of the basic procedures. The request to bring it to you this time is basically founded on two things. One is the Division has the charge to ensure that its approval or projects results in the most prudent use of State funds. And as so we have been reviewing projects with that in mind and making certain determinations over which projects we think should be approved and are worthy of State money, and perhaps which projects are not as strong, and perhaps need to be revamped, or weighted, or resubmitted at another date.

The second change for this rule, and I will go through each of these changes, is that we were asked to add a new category of project. That category is consolidation or annexation. So what I would like to do at this time is go through what those changes are and they're highlighted in your book. If you have any questions on those, please obviously feel free to ask.

The Division is proposing changes to the Partnership Rule for the following purposes:

1. To add consolidation or annexation projects as a category eligible for funding under the program.
2. To clarify the Division and its general charge to ensure the prudent use of State funds may consider alternative projects if they meet the standards of providing a facility that will support an adequate education.
3. That the limit of the State's financial participation may be governed by that alternative solution.
4. To clarify that in construction of a new school and additions to existing schools, the Division has the right to consider available space in any facility affected by grade reconfiguration, to support either the new school or the addition.

A motion was made and seconded to put this out for public comment.

**Committee Action:** Approved to put out the amended rules for public comment.

**Mr. Eaton:** That completes the items that are listed, are there any other questions?

**Commissioner Weiss:** Yeah, and forgive my faulty memory but in the paper within the last couple of days, some school district is out there hoping to sell some of their campus --

**Mr. Eaton:** Yes.

**Commissioner Weiss:** -- So they can raise money to finance a new -- some new construction and --

**Mr. Eaton:** Yes, sir.

**Commissioner Weiss:** -- you're talking about the Wickes-Van Cove issue, said there will be schools left over that were not being used. Do we, in anyway, have something to encourage them to sell those and refund the money to us or --

**Mr. Eaton:** The district that you're referring to is the Mena School District.

**Commissioner Weiss:** Okay. Yeah.

**Mr. Eaton:** Mena School District is attempting to sell two of its buildings, that they don't feel meet their needs anymore. One of them was a school that was in a small town south of Mena that they closed when that consolidation --

**Commissioner Weiss:** Hatfield.

**Mr. Eaton:** Hatfield. They have to reopen that school when they had the tornado, and they moved the junior high school down there. The junior high school that they have is a building built in the '40s in downtown Mena, but it was very difficult to be able to utilize it as a junior high campus. For one reason, they couldn't get any federal funding because it's in a flood plain, so FEMA wouldn't give them any assistance there. The building itself would have to have been added.

So what Mena decided to do is, they came forward with their custom built elementary school. We analyzed that and found that the Mena School District does not qualify for an elementary school, because they have sufficient space, because as long as that school is there downtown, and the rule allows us to consider that space, then they don't qualify.

So they've taken it upon themselves with the money they receive from the settlement, with the money they anticipate being able to get for selling those two schools, and with the money they feel that they already have in their construction

program, they can build that new elementary school. They will then end up with basically a K-12 campus.

They're building a high school right now and it is under construction. It was approved in the '07-'09 Partnership Program. They then moved the high school kids there, the junior kids up, and one of these domino effects; they moved the elementary children in.

The issue of getting rid of school buildings is a problem that any school district faces. You have to find some entity that wants to move into a community and be willing to take over that building. Having gone through it a number of times right here in Little Rock, within an SMSA as large as Little Rock is difficult. In smaller communities, it is even more so. Unless perhaps, uses, that I've seen in the past, not only in Arkansas but across the nation is, for example, rest homes, or retirement villages.

Here you have a school, one level, 900 feet plus classrooms, which can be adapted into small apartments, cafeterias, all of those things. It fits that bill if you have an entity like Marriott or somebody that wants to move in and put that facility out there. Otherwise, the best they can do is offer it up for sale.

Mena is going to try to go through an auction process. Then it brought on an auction firm that will go out and they will publicize the building. That is part of their contract. And then once that is done, they'll hold a public auction.

I've talked to the school district, I've given them my advice on what I think they should do before they have that auction and I think they're going to heed that advice, and we'll just wait and see what happens. But they're going to offer up two schools, with the intent of building another one that they wouldn't otherwise qualify for.

**Commissioner Weiss:** Thank you.

**Dr. Kimbrell:** It indicates that the second point that you were asking about in this Wickes-Van Cove situation, this rule has that in there. They are going to have to demonstrate what they are going to do with that space.

**Commissioner Weiss:** Yes.

**Dr. Kimbrell:** Either use it for other education or get rid of it. I would like to tell you that the State has ownership of a school district right now, the Twin River School District. We have met with -- and the State Board has asked us to develop a plan that we will present in April, that we will actually dissolve that district for all practical purposes at the end of June 30th. We are in the process of getting appraisals on all of those properties that they own, buildings and real estate, and the State will be finding a solution for selling those to satisfy their debt, as we now will be splitting that district into six different contiguous districts.

It's a first for us to do that. We met with those six districts yesterday over at GIS, and we've all agreed to the split and how it will be done. Nobody wants the properties or the buildings, and so we'll utilize the proceeds from the sale of those, to satisfy their debt.

**Commissioner Weiss:** Where is Twin Rivers located?

**Dr. Kimbrell:** DR. KIMBRELL: It is in Randolph-Stone County. It's the old Williford School District, Raven being up that way.

**Commissioner Weiss:** Okay.

**Dr. Kimbrell:** So getting rid of those properties are going to be difficult. There is some real estate land, that probably will bring some, you know, which somebody will want. The facilities themselves, it's going to be difficult. One of them is built in the middle of nowhere. So that's one of the reasons in this rule, that we, as the Division in the State, need to have some input, as to when you go and consolidate and going to build a new building, make sure it's in an area that is going to be vibrant and continue to have educational needs.

**Commissioner Weiss:** And this proposed rule does that?

**Dr. Kimbrell:** Yes, sir.

**Commissioner Weiss:** Okay.

**Mr. Eaton:** Sir, if there are no further questions of any member of the Commission that concludes the prepared agenda.

**Motion was made to adjourn and seconded.**

**Dr. Kimbrell:** Thank you all for attending.

### **Non Applying School Districts Report**

AR. Code Ann. 6-21-811 establishes that the division shall monitor school district Partnership project submissions each biennium on the even numbered year to identify school districts that did not apply for state funding for necessary facilities to meet adequacy requirements and that notification shall be made to the school district.

### **Facilities Advisory Committee Report**

AR. Code Ann. 6-21-113 established the Educational Facilities Advisory Committee. The original appointees were to serve 4 years and whose terms

expire April 1, 2010. Sen. Johnny Key and Rep. Monty Betts have requested and received the members consent to serve another 4 year term.

### **Transportation Grant program Report**

Act 1207 of 2009 amended AR. Code Ann. § 6-19-1, by establishing a School Bus Safety Equipment Pilot Program. This program was funded by the legislature for \$140,000.00 and authorized the Division to institute a grant of equipment program to provide school districts with safety equipment to augment the responsibility of identifying motor vehicle violators who pass a school bus while stopped to load or unload students. The report covers the awards from the first applications.

### **School Bus Operations General Report**

This report is to provide a general update on those initiatives of the state to assist school district transportation operations. It will cover; (1) Bus inspection program, (2) Transportation Safety Plans, (3) Licensing Report program.

### **Partnership program Review**

The Partnership Program Overview is an update on the progress of the school district projects funded under the state Partnership program. The report will cover the program from 2006 through 2010 and will require Commission Action for acceptance.

### **Appeal Rule**

In March 2010 the Commission approved, for comment, changes to the rule governing Appeals to the Commission. The comment period for this rule began on September 25, 2009 and ran through November 5, 2009 with a public hearing on October 14<sup>th</sup>, 2009. The rules presented here today are in actuality an extract of the rule presented to you in September as pertains to the Review Board process dealing with appeals filed by school districts. It will be recommended that the Commission approve the amended Rules Governing Appeals to proceed to submission to the Administrative Rules Committee in July.

### **Partnership Rule**

In March 2010 the Commission approved, for comment, changes to the rule governing The Partnership Program. The comment period for this rule began on March 17, 2010 and ran through April 23, 2010 with a public hearing on April 14<sup>th</sup>, 2010. It will be recommended that the Commission approve the amended Rules Governing the Partnership program to proceed to submission to the Administrative Rules Committee in July.

**SUMMARY MINUTES OF  
THE COMMISSION FOR ARKANSAS PUBLIC SCHOOL ACADEMIC  
FACILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION**

**MEETING  
September 7, 2012**

**Place:** ADE Auditorium  
**Time:** 10:00 a.m.

**Commission Members in Attendance:**

Dr. Tom Kimbrell, Commissioner, Arkansas Department of Education  
Mr. Richard Weiss, Director, Arkansas Department of Finance and Administration  
Mr. Mac Dodson, President, Arkansas Development Authority

**Others in Attendance:**

Mr. Tony Wood, Deputy Commissioner, Arkansas Department of Education  
Mr. Mark White, Attorney Specialist, Arkansas Department of Education  
Dr. Charles C. Stein, PE, Director, Division of Public School Academic Facilities  
and Transportation  
Mr. Terry Granderson, Assistant Director, Division of Public School Academic Facilities  
and Transportation  
Mr. Murray Britton, Senior Project Administrator - Planning, Division of Public School Academic  
Facilities and Transportation  
Ms. Carol Bowman, Administrative Analyst, Division of Public School Academic Facilities  
and Transportation

**Quorum was met.**

**Meeting called to order.**

**Agenda item:**

**1. Summary Meeting Minutes – March 28, 2012**

**The Commission approved the meeting minutes for March 28, 2012, meeting.**

**2. Rules Changes**

Mark White presented one rule for final approval and requested the Commission approve releasing three rules for Public Comment. After the Public Comment period, the final rules will be presented to the Commission for its review.

**a. Rules Governing Maintenance and Operation of Public School Buses and Physical Examinations of School Bus Drivers**

Mr. White stated that this rule had been before the Commission previously, but as a result of the Public Comments indicating a dislike of the sanctions section, that the sanctions section had been removed. The changes needed were inserted in two places adding language referring to statute. Mr. Weiss asked if it was the same effect, and Mr. White said yes.

**The rule was approved by the Commission to forward to the Arkansas Legislative Council Administrative Rules and Regulations Subcommittee.**

**b. Rules for the Specifications Governing School Bus Design**

Mr. White indicated the Division had a committee who met to draft the changes presented to the Commission.

**The Commission approved the proposed rule revisions and released the Rules for the Specifications Governing School Bus Design for a thirty day public comment period.**

**c. Rules Governing the Academic Facilities Partnership Program**

The Partnership Program rule has significant changes that include changing Warm, Safe, and Dry projects definition and prioritization. In the back of the Commissioners' book is a list of the extensive meetings the Division has had prior to the Commission meeting. The Division is starting to meet with all the Education Service Cooperatives beginning on September 12, 2012 to explain the proposed changes.

Dr. Kimbrell stated to the other Commissioners that he was on the original Task Force, and the proposed changes are in line with what the Task Force designed things to do, and that he has met with many of the original Task Force members during this process. He stated this proposal is an effort to meet the long-term needs of schools instead of just repairing them. Dr. Kimbrell indicated these rule changes will get a lot of public comments and the Commission will pull from those comments.

Mr. Weiss indicated he was in full support of releasing the rules for comment and that the Commission will meet to review the Public Comments.

**The Commission approved the proposed rule revisions and released the Rules Governing the Academic Facilities Partnership Program for a thirty day public comment period.**

**d. Rules Governing the Facilities Master Plan**

Dr. Kimbrell stated school districts can work on developing their Master Plans.

**The Commission approved the proposed rule revisions and released the Rules Governing the Facilities Master Plan for a thirty day public comment period.**

**3. Statewide State of Condition of Academic Facilities– October 1, 2012**

Presented by Terry Granderson, Assistant Director, Arkansas Division of Public School Academic Facilities and Transportation

The annual report is a statutory requirement of the Division.

Mr. Weiss asked about school districts' utilization of SchoolDude.

Mr. Granderson responded that school districts were using SchoolDude significantly better than last year. The Maintenance and Operations section of the Division works daily with school districts. Many times the Division gets one person trained in SchoolDude at a school district, then the person leaves or retires, and a new individual must be trained.

Mr. Granderson called attention to page 6 of the Report to a table showing total of facility costs. This is the same table shown in the 2011 Report because there was not a new funding cycle this year. This table will change in next year's Report because of the 2013-2015 Partnership Program project cycle.

Page 7 shows inspections the Division conducted.

Much more detail is included in this year's Report regarding State Mandated Inspections. Top of page 8 indicates the other four State agencies the Division is in contact with. The Division enjoys a very good relationship with the agencies, and they are sending more information to the Division. The Division and the four State agencies are trying to get set up to electronically provide the reports to the Division. Mr. Granderson explained the process used, and stated the school districts are up-to-speed.

The report after page 11 contains the 15 State Mandated inspections the Division is aware of that are required by various State agencies.

Report #2 indicates how well the school districts are doing with regard to completing the State Mandated Inspections.

Dr. Kimbrell asked if this Report has been in the State Report before, and Mr. Granderson responded no, but the Division wanted to show that the staff was doing. School districts should use SchoolDude to record the inspections. There is a problem (page 11 middle section) because some administrative staff are on 9-10 months contracts and not working during June when the work should be documented and entered into SchoolDude.

Dr. Kimbrell asked about school districts listed on the Report with "N/A" or "0". Mr. Granderson responded "N/A" is not applicable, i.e., if a school district does not have an elevator. The "0" means the school district did not record the information in SchoolDude so the Maintenance staff calls and makes site visits to work with the administration. Some school districts over reported and others under reported because not certain how to record the reports.

**The Commission approved the report for dissemination as required by law.**

#### **4. Academic Facilities Master Plan Program – State Plan – October 1, 2012**

Presented by Murray Britton, Senior Project Administrator - Planning

The Report explains various state academic facility programs and lists committed projects and completed projects for all of the funding programs.

The state-wide Master Plan is based on the school districts' Master Plans' budgetary numbers for their next four-year plan.

Dr. Kimbrell asked if the first spreadsheet was the committed funds and status of projects. Mr. Britton indicated yes, with some variance on those still under construction.

Mr. Weiss questioned some page 45 project costs and the state financial participation amounts. The Division was instructed to correct before submitting the state plan

Dr. Stein reconfirmed that the Division will review and verify the numbers.

**The Commission approved the report for dissemination as required by law.**

#### **5. 2012 Facilities Master Plan Approval**

Presented by Murray Britton, Senior Project Administrator - Planning

Commissioner's Memo # COM-13-019 dated August 28, 2012, was done to notify the school districts the 2012 Master Plans were all approved.

Mr. Weiss commended the Division staff on good work.

**No Commission action required.**

**6. Guidelines for 2013 Master Plan Update and Preliminary Master Plan**

Dr. Kimbrell stated he pulled this item from Agenda because it will require additional work and will be considered at a later Commission meeting.

**7. Green Ribbon Schools**

Presented by Murray Britton, Senior Project Administrator - Planning

Mr. Britton stated the USED program began last year and that Mena's Acorn High School won national recognition.

Mr. Weiss stated it was an impressive accomplishment and he hoped more schools participated this year.

Dr. Kimbrell hoped the State continued to participate and that the Division would encourage the school districts.

Mr. Britton presented the 2013 Application, and indicated there were only two changes. One change was to allow the school districts to apply, and the dates were also changed.

**The Commission approved the application form for Arkansas participation in the 2012-2013 Green Ribbon Schools program.**

**Meeting adjourned.**