



MEETING NOTES

Meeting Notes are not official until voted on by the Board of Education at its following Regular Meeting.

1. The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.
2. Members present: Ms. Arnold, Mrs. Crowley, Mrs. Murdoch, Mr. Perry, and Mr. Vorst
3. The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag
4. The Board of Education adopted the agenda and the switching of items five and six.
5. 6-12 Math Resource Adoption – Cori Kindl, Executive Director of Curriculum

The superintendent said that Cori Kindl and her team have been working hard on the 6-12 Math Resource Adoption, and she'll give you an update on where we are.

Mrs. Kindl said that you received the executive summary that I prepared in the last board update. As you know, we are in phase 2 of the 6-12 math curriculum revision process. The committee has concluded phase 2 with the recommendation of adopting Imagine Learning Illustrative Math as our resource. The executive summary is sort of like a first policy reading and outlines the process the committee went through. Our district leadership team vetted the resources, and ultimately, we landed on this resource as a recommendation.

This first reading opens the community review period. Last Thursday in our *District eNews*, there was a segment that informed the community about this review period and sent them to a website where they could review the resource and give feedback. The website will remain open until April 17th. The resource will also be available here at the central office if anyone wants to review it in person. The viewing times are listed on our website.

Please don't hesitate to reach out if you have any questions as you review the illustrative math. I would be happy to meet with you as well. We're really excited about this resource. As you know, we have adopted Imagine Learning Illustrative Math for grades K-5, and we're super excited to have that continuity, that rigor, the embedded thinking routines, and that alignment with our portrait. It allows kids to have some great dialogue around math and critical thinking skills together, rather than simply a teacher modeling how to solve a problem and students memorizing it.

Mr. Stewart said thank you and asked if there were any questions.

Mrs. Murdoch asked if there was a demo site for this one like there was with the other resources. Mrs. Kindl said she would check into that. There was a demo for teachers that I'm sure I can be able to get you access to. Mrs. Murdoch said, yes, I'd love that. Thank you.

Mr. Vorst asked what the feedback has been on the K-5 portion of this resource so far. Mrs. Kindl said I think very positively. As you know, implementing two resources at the elementary has been an extra lift. But from the feedback we've received from our teachers, they really appreciate having those thinking

routines and those warm-ups that have kids up and talking around it. The digital teacher edition for this particular resource is extremely user-friendly. They're tending to compare it against Wit (*and Wisdom*). And given the ease of use of illustrative math, it's winning in the conversations every time.

Mr. Vorst asked how the cost compares to any other resources you reviewed. Mrs. Kindl replied that it was very equitable. I had two other quotes, three quotes in total. Savvas enVision was the runner-up. Houghton Mifflin was the third resource that we reviewed. They're all very comparable.

Mr. Perry said that as far as the Algebra 2 scope and sequence personalization over the summer, can you kind of run through what that looks like, including the personnel involved, timeline, and things like that? Mrs. Kindl said that probably the only thing that we'll really have to take a look at as far as scope and sequence is Algebra 2, and that's because our Algebra 2 and the Ohio standards for Algebra 2 don't exactly line up with the Common Core. Because this is a national resource, we'll have to take it and resequence it. For example, their unit 1 in this resource might be our unit 6. We're going to have to take the resources that we've used to build Algebra 2, and this new resource and kind of lay out a scope and sequence so that we're aligned with the Ohio Learning Standards because Imagine Learning Illustrative Math is all based on Common Core.

Mr. Perry asked if this would be done over the summer. Mrs. Kindl said if this resource is adopted, each of the 6th, 7th, and 8th grade Algebra 1, geometry, and Algebra 2 teachers will come together over the summer to create the curriculum guides by grade level and by course. We'll take the standards that we adopted in the course of study, we'll take the resource, and we'll begin to lay out what each unit looks like using this new resource for teachers. And so, when teachers come back in those first three work days, we will roll out those curriculum guides. Teachers already had an introduction to this resource at Hilliard U last week. We will provide professional learning to teachers, much like we did last year with English language arts teachers with StudySync. We will offer stipends using our title funds for them to come in over the summer and receive training ahead of time, so it's not crunch time right before the first couple weeks of school. Teachers will have a choice on those dates over the summer on when to come in and be introduced to this resource in greater depth than they've received Hilliard U.

6. Strategic Plan – David Stewart, Superintendent

I'm excited to introduce the strategic plan to you. As you know, over the past year, an internal group comprised of teachers, principals, and central office staff worked diligently to craft a comprehensive roadmap for our future. Our north star throughout this process was the invaluable input of almost 300 community members who joined together to create the district's Portrait of a Learner. I will talk more about that in just a moment. Our strategic plan is not just a document; it is a collective vision that represents the aspirations, values, and expectations we hold for every student. This collaborative effort has been a testament to the strength of our community, and I extend my heartfelt gratitude to all who contributed to shaping the foundation of our educational philosophy.

As we unveil our strategic plan, it is crucial to underscore its overarching mission to ensure that every student, without exception, is ready for their tomorrow. The plan is meticulously designed to bring to life the core tenets of our portrait, emphasizing the development of resilient learners, self-advocates, critical thinkers, empathetic citizens, and purposeful communicators. Throughout the document, you'll also find the district's strategic priorities intricately woven into the fabric of each goal and initiative. These priorities reflect our commitment to fostering well-rounded individuals who excel academically and possess the skills necessary to navigate an ever-evolving world.

It is an extremely ambitious document, but one that I'm personally very proud of and one that our team is 100 percent committed to. With that in mind, it is important to remember that the recommendations in this document will be spread across the next five to seven years. However, if we truly endeavor to implement the recommendations made in this plan, we will fundamentally update and reshape the student experience in the Hilliard City Schools to closely align with the demands and expectations of parents, our community, employers, the military, and higher education.

While this does not require board action, I think it's important that the board is familiar with the plan, as it will drive much of our work over the coming years. At the conclusion of this presentation, I will discuss where we will go from here and how the board and our community will be informed of our progress. This document is not intended to be a scorecard. Much like the Master Facilities Plan, it is a set of recommendations that ask the district to reflect, evolve, and adapt to the needs of our students, their families, and our community in an ever-changing world. The intent is to examine every facet of the organization to ensure that we are organized and structured as an organization to meet best the demands of 2024, 2034, and beyond.

As you know, this entire process started about a year ago with the development of the Hilliard City Schools Portrait of a Learner. 300 community members, staff members, and students came together over several months in an iterative process to identify the five core competencies that our community believes are essential alongside a high-quality, rigorous, and relevant curriculum so that our graduates can truly be ready for tomorrow.

Over the course of this year, teachers have been embedding these competencies into instruction, which has enhanced the learning for our students. I believe that several of our student presentations and board meetings over the year have referenced how these competencies have driven instruction. Just as these competencies are driving teacher instruction, they were also the driver of the strategic plan.

The development of the portrait of a learner was the outcome of the “envision” phase of the overall process shown on this slide. Once the portrait of a learner was complete and we transitioned into the strategic plan writing, we conducted a current state analysis to acquire a balanced portrayal of our present reality and identified priorities that will help our portrait come to life.

From these priorities, we established goals and strategies through an iterative vetting process, constantly using stakeholder feedback to guide their development. Writing teams met over the course of the year to study, deliberate, and draft recommendations. Those recommendations were then sent to our leadership team for feedback, which was then directed back to the writing teams for further refinement.

This process repeated itself multiple times until we landed on the finished product that had been presented to you. These steps completed the “inquire” and “design/develop” phases of this process. We will now be entering the “implement/succeed” phase, in which we will again reexamine all parts of our organization, begin to build capacity, and ensure that resources are aligned with our priorities to bring the best portrait of a learner and their recommendations to life.

The plan is broken into five goal areas:

- Goal 1: Student Learning
- Goal 2: Talent Acquisition, Development, and Retention
- Goal 3: Family Engagement and Student Well-Being

- Goal 4: Technology
- Goal 5: Student Experiences and Community

I will go through each of these goals individually, but in general, I want to share the structure of the document. Each goal is broken into multiple objectives, each of which revolves around several themes. Finally, under each objective is a set of recommendations. Again, I chose that word recommendation specifically as any number of factors can influence this work over the next five to seven years. We need to be learners and continue to be agile as an organization during that time.

Now, if you remember the first time I presented this to you, there were five goal areas. The fifth goal area was a facilities and finance goal. What we realized as we continued to work with the Master Facility Plan was that it needed to be its own document. So, what you will see is this document and the Master Facilities Plan always living side by side, anywhere one lives, the other will live, including currently on our district website. As a reminder, each one of these goal areas was written by a writing team, and each writing team was led by a cabinet member that I'll identify as I go through this.

I'm not going to read the entire nearly 30-page document to you tonight; you're welcome. Instead, I will briefly touch on each goal area and its intent, and I will highlight some of the key recommendations from that specific section of the document.

All right, so goal number one is student learning. We define this as the Hilliard City School District will cultivate deep thinking and learning for every student without exception through the intentional design of engaging environments, experiences, and communities of learning. Cori Kindl and Herb Higginbotham led this writing team. This goal area obviously focuses on our core business, and the objectives reflect everything from foundational learning and literacy in mathematics to college and career readiness to ensuring that learning is supported throughout the pre-k-12 journey by a sophisticated, data-driven system of support.

Some of the key recommendations include implementing readiness benchmarks for math and literacy, increasing access to experiential learning such as internships, pre-apprenticeships, and co-ops, embedding industry-recognized credentials into existing curriculum, auditing current curriculum for academic and post-secondary readiness, conducting an audit of our current assessment system and increasing the use of problem or project-based learning throughout the system.

Again, that's just a sampling of the recommendations. The document carries a whole lot more of them.

Goal number two is talent acquisition, development, and retention. The Hilliard City School District will attract, professionally develop, and retain innovative and diverse talent committed to our district's mission and success. This writing team was led by Roy Walker, Joyce Brickley, and Hilary Sloat. This goal focuses again on the recruitment, development, and retention of high-quality teaching and classified staff. The three objectives look at how we recruit employees, ensuring that our hiring practices result in a highly qualified teaching staff that resembles the demographics of our district and how we train and support those employees so that they desire to stay with us.

Some key recommendations from this goal area include updating our hiring practices to better align with our portrait of a learner, exploring nontraditional ways to train and support staff, not only with regards to their job responsibilities but also to support their own physical and mental health, updating

the way we onboard and train new employees and creating systems that yield ongoing feedback from different employee groups on their experience in the Hilliard City Schools.

Goal 3 is family engagement and student well-being. The Hilliard City School District will create a nurturing, inclusive learning environment that fosters student connections, prioritizes holistic development, and empowers self-advocacy so every student feels valued and can thrive. This goal-writing team was led by Mike Abraham, Molly Walker, Hillary Sloat, and Jamie Lennox. This goal focuses on partnering with families and our community to ensure that every student, without exception, is equipped with the skills and support to ensure that they're healthy, safe, and engaged in their learning.

Some of the key recommendations include expanding wrap-around services especially for our most vulnerable populations, creating experiences and opportunities that promote a healthy and active lifestyle, expanding efforts around substance abuse prevention, completing a district-wide ADA audit, ensuring that all families can access district information in the language they speak in the home, increasing family workshops and training, such as Hilliard U, and connecting families with outside resources to support their students learning, including social services, translation services, and community partners.

Goal number four, originally facilities and finance, is now technology. The Hilliard City School District will maintain a technologically advanced, agile, and engaging learning environment. This writing team was led by Rich Boettner, Mark Pohlman, and Mark Tremayne. This whole area looks to ensure that we have the infrastructure necessary to provide students with the experiences they need in order to be best prepared for the world in which they will live and work. It also looks forward to emerging technologies and how they might be integrated into the student experience and what teachers need in order to provide and support that learning. Finally, it looks to ensure that we as a system are appropriately leveraging data to make decisions and that we are actively partnering with our community to support the technology needs of all students.

Some of the key recommendations include evaluating and integrating emerging technologies such as virtual reality, artificial intelligence, and augmented reality. Considering nontraditional methods to encourage innovation by both teachers and students and creating infrastructure that allows teachers to connect with other teachers across the district and other parts of the country or the world. Fully implementing CIS security controls to ensure our network's and data's safety. Continuing our partnership with the City of Hilliard to implement strategies that bridge the digital divide, providing support resources for students and families who have limited access to technology, researching data systems that actually reduce the amount of data input by staff and allow more time for data analysis, and creating an advisory team of industry partners to stay updated on technological changes.

And finally, goal number five, is community experiences and partnerships. The Hilliard City Schools will ensure students have access to high-quality experiential learning, opportunities, and community partnerships that enrich their education. Mark Tremayne and Stacie Raterman led this writing team. This goal focuses on ensuring that we partner with families and our community to ensure that there is a pathway for every student that adequately prepares them for their tomorrow, regardless of whether that future is additional education, employment, enlistment, or entrepreneurship. The school seeks to expand experiential learning and community partnerships and explores whether traditional uses of time and space are still appropriate for tomorrow's learners.

Some of the key recommendations from this goal include expanding work that is already underway relative to innovation and discovery zones, high school and middle school electives, after-school enrichment opportunities, reimagining our innovative learning campus opportunities, forging formal partnerships with local, national, and global businesses, industry associations, community organizations, and universities, utilizing an alumni tracking system to gather feedback, develop networks, cultivate partnerships, and monitor post-secondary activity, and how we utilize time and space to support the needs of all students.

So those are the five goal areas. Let me talk a little bit about what's next.

Currently, our leadership team is taking the entire set of recommendations in that nearly 30-page document and breaking them into short-term, mid-range, and long-term goals. I would define those as 1-3 years, 3-5 years, and 5-7 years. I don't believe any of that will be purely contained in 1-3, 3-5, or 5-7, but it helps us lay out the work that's ahead of us.

While this document will surely be shared with buildings, teachers, and administrators, I want to be clear that we are not adding yet another document to their plate. They will continue to be guided by the Yearly Commitment Plan. The Strategic Plan will drive the creation of the Commitment Plan each year and will be a document that is referenced continuously in our meetings.

As we head into the next five to seven years, I will directly reference the Strategic Plan in my weekly updates to the Board and presentations given to the Board at board meetings. We will also regularly update you on the progress being made relative to the Strategic Plan. As a reminder, the full document is available prominently on our website right next to the recommendations from the Master Facility Steering Committee, which we'll be discussing in more detail in just a few minutes.

Last but not least, I want to thank again the members of our staff who contributed to the writing of this plan. With that, I'll take any questions. And there don't have to be any questions. I'm fine with that too.

Mrs. Murdoch said I don't have a question, but it's a very comprehensive document. I think I have read it twice now and have absorbed maybe 30%. So, I look forward to seeing what kind of goals and things you pull out of that because there are certain places that, as I was reading, I'm like, oh, this is a really good thing that we could set some solid goals on it.

Mr. Stewart said that you'll see that real tangible work is both in the commitment plan year to year as well as our dialogue. This really should change our dialogue in a noticeable way. The presentations that you get, the information that you receive from us over the course of the next several years. I'm not going to say all of that, but most of that should start with a tie back to this strategic plan.

Mrs. Murdoch added that, clearly, a lot of work went into that. As someone who does this in their day job, this document took a long time. Mr. Stewart said it did, and that's why I wanted to call out the folks who led those writing teams as well as the writing teams themselves. They really were the ones who rolled up their sleeves, did the study that needed to be done, and then took the feedback from us to continue to refine and refine. Thank you.

Mrs. Crowley said I agree; I just want to thank the team. I think it's a lot to take in as Beth said, but I like the tie-ins with the curriculum that we've already adopted, the portrait of a learner, and the master facilities plan. I like how they all seem headed in the same direction. I really like that. And I like all the

support for the students, the families, the teachers, the staff, and the community. I mean, it includes everyone. Mr. Stewart said that was the goal. I should also point out that what you're referencing in terms of how everything kind of fits together seamlessly....I want to thank our partners at Battelle for Kids for guiding us through this process. I think, ultimately, it was their experience in doing this work that allowed us to refine to the point that we had that kind of coordination in there. Mrs. Crowley added I can see that. I can see how all of that has merged together. It's been a fun and neat process to be a part of.

Ms. Arnold said in just acknowledging Battelle, but as you read off the names for each of these sections, I could hear their voices when I read this. Without you saying, I knew who was in there, so it's definitely our voices, not just Battelle putting something on us. Mr. Stewart said you can see our staff's voices through that feedback process. We are a people business, and I think that's our strength as well. Ms. Arnold said it's reflected in there.

Mr. Perry said it's funny you guys were talking about this today. I was having a conversation with some colleagues from other districts, and they were telling me about this wonderful program they're bringing in with Battelle, and I said that we had great success with that, that we really liked it, and I think that's absolutely the case. That's one of the highest compliments you can give is a recommendation. To say that we've tried this, and I would recommend this to others, and I absolutely would. Thank you to the entire team. We're already seeing some of this work play out. One of the big things we are focusing on is parental engagement. We can't do any of the work we do without parental engagement. Already, we're reaching back out into the community, and we're seeing dividends and things like higher attendance rates. Already this work is impacting our school district in a positive way. So, thank you to everyone who not only put the document together but a lot of folks in this room who were part of that committee and who took the time to sit there hour after hour and craft a vision for what our school district can be.

Mr. Stewart said thank you. One of the challenges of dividing the goals and recommendations into 1 to 3, 3 to 5, and 5 to 7 years is that, like you said, many of those things don't fit neatly into buckets like that. You're right; much of this work has already started, and some of the work should be ongoing, which creates a little bit of a challenge. However, it will help us get organized as we craft the commitment plan. Jill and her team will begin their work on next year's commitment plan very soon. And you'll see this document living there as well.

7. Master Facilities Plan Discussion

You had asked for a dialogue on the master facilities plan. I thought it would be a good idea to do a quick overview of what you got from the Master Facility Steering Committee last time. I'm going to go through a few pages and then will open it up to all of you. I hope to walk away with your reactions and questions this evening. What do you need more information about? If we're lucky, we'll have the answers. Otherwise, we'll get back to you very soon with the answers.

As you recall, at our last meeting, the Master Facility Steering Committee delivered their recommendations. Tonight, we want to open the conversation up to all of you to share your thoughts and ask any questions you may have. As a reminder, I'm not asking for any final decisions tonight or any board action. This is simply an opportunity to discuss the recommendations of the committee. Please feel free to ask for clarification on any component of the recommendations. If I or our team is unable to answer your question at the moment, we will document that, and we will have answers by the end of

the week. I will start with a brief overview of the recommendations you heard in great detail at our last meeting.

I'll start with the first bit of feedback that the steering committee received from our community via a community survey. That survey yielded the planning guidelines the committee prioritized in developing the recommendations. Those guidelines, in order of emphasis, addressed aging facilities, enrollment imbalances, feeder pattern misalignments, housing developments and their potential impacts, provided equity and facility flexibility, and provided for special education space as well as ADA.

The second set of community input that the committee received revolved around educational options. After reviewing the planning guidelines I just discussed, the committee spent two full days creating four potential options for how the district could ultimately be configured at the end of this plan. Not surprisingly, the options, for the most part, revolved around the sixth grade. In the end, moving to three 6th-grade centers had the most support in our community and was the most practical. The community did have an interest in exploring 5th and 6th-grade buildings, but after further consideration, that concept was not the most practical from a curricular, financial, or logistical standpoint.

At this point, the committee took the input from the community, and the data gathered to begin developing recommendations. I think it is important to remind ourselves of the extent of the data gathered and considered. Obviously, the committee considered the condition of every facility. As you may recall, we use an industry-standard called Facility Condition Index to evaluate the condition of our facilities. The FCI is a ratio of the known needs of a building versus the cost of replacement. We consider anything below 10 percent to be our goal.

Additionally, the committee considered each building's educational adequacy. This is a difficult concept to understand, but essentially, educational adequacy looks at a building's deficiency relative to how we expect that building to deliver education to students in 2024 and beyond. This set of data really drives the planning guideline that the community asked for relative to equity and facility flexibility. This data acknowledges that regardless of condition, buildings built in the late 50s and early 60s were not built to support the way that instruction is delivered.

Not surprisingly, the committee considered enrollment projections developed by our partners at Cooperative Strategies. These were used as a tool to help illustrate the potential path of future development across the district and within current individual attendance boundaries.

Finally, the committee also considered building capacities and the over- or underutilization of individual schools. The committee had detailed information about current developments within our district, the potential student yields from those developments, and the type of housing being developed.

So, after two years of analysis, engagement, and planning, the committee's final recommendations were developed. While aging facilities were the driver of the need for this planning process, the process demonstrated that the needs around educational adequacy and building utilization were becoming equally important.

In the end, the recommendations lay out a 15-year road map that addresses not only the physical limitations of existing facilities but also their utilization and programmatic constraints created by facilities that were built six or seven decades ago.

So, just as a reminder, this is a three-phase set of recommendations.

Phase one is obviously dependent on a successful bond issue in November, likely in November 2024. In this phase, we would replace and build three new elementary schools: a new Brown Elementary, a new Beacon Elementary with a preschool addition, and a new Ridgewood Elementary. That would allow renovations at Britton, Brown, and the Hub to become sixth-grade buildings. Currently, in the plan, the Hub moves to Tharp. Also, there is about \$15 million set aside for a series of special projects. They include renovations to high school stadiums, the construction of the weight room at Darby High School, renovations of various auxiliary spaces such as elementary school playgrounds and middle school fields, improving visitor entry security, looking at our ADA compliance, and renovations to our fine arts facilities. The boundary planning process would also begin during this phase. The cost of phase one is around \$140 million.

About four years from now, we will have a second opportunity to go back to voters to generate about \$140 million for phase two without increasing the millage because there would be a drop in millage at that time. If successful, we would replace one elementary school and renovate two others. Those three elementary schools would be J. W. Reason, Avery, and Scioto Darby. We would do significant high school and middle school renovations. By that time, all our secondary buildings, except Memorial, will be getting to show their age and will need significant renovations to remain relevant.

Phase three would focus on all the remaining facilities that haven't been touched in phases one and two. At this point, I would estimate that it will be approximately a \$60 million dollar request. There will not be another drop in millage, so phase 3 would have to be a request to our voters to raise the funds for that.

One of the strengths of this three-phase plan is that it pushes a lot of construction into phase one, saving inflationary costs in phase two. We estimate that an elementary school built in phase two will probably cost around ten million dollars more than if it was built in phase one. So, the way these recommendations play out, we were able to push a lot of that construction early on to save on those inflationary costs.

A couple of closing reminders before I open it up to you all. Again, this is a reminder that this is a set of recommendations. Ultimately, you, the board, will determine our course of action. It is important to remember that our belief is that a boundary revision, otherwise known as redistricting, is necessary in the near future whether we build a single new facility or not. I cannot answer detailed questions at this time about redistricting because those decisions will be made in a community driven committee environment, much like the Master Facility Plan itself. Those decisions will not be made in a vacuum. Rather, they will be made in an iterative process that gathers community input and feedback throughout. Finally, I would also remind you that if timed correctly, both phase one and phase two of the plan will result in over \$140 million dollars in improvements in each phase without increasing the millage for debt service.

Before I turn it over to you, I want to thank Mike McDonough and Mark Dudgeon for their leadership of the committee. I want to thank Tracy Richter and Lee Hwang for their participation, although they're not here. And then obviously everybody on that committee who gave so willingly of their time, opinions, and expertise to land on what I think is a good set of recommendations. So that's a scaled-down overview of what you got last time, but I will turn it over to you then for dialogue, questions, or whatever you have.

Mrs. Murdoch said, at the last meeting, I remember we talked about \$5 million being set aside for maintenance and renovations, which will be ongoing from here on out. I know that Google does not have all the answers, but as I tried to do some research, the most common things I came across were recommendations for three to five percent of assets being set aside for maintenance and renovations. Now I know in the first few years that's probably going to be more than we need because we're doing all this other work. I was wondering if that was something we could go back to Tracy and Lee on and ask what their recommendation is for that number. I firmly believe that \$5 million is not the right amount.

Mr. Stewart replied you're right. The \$5 million refers to the permit improvement dollars we currently generate. One of the strengths of this plan is that we currently have about \$107 million in deferred maintenance. If this plan is implemented, it will take care of a lot of that deferred maintenance while still generating that \$5 million. So, the easy answer to that is we can't do what you're referring to without increasing the millage of the asks to our community. The upfront plan addresses so much of that deferred maintenance that we can put off that decision until later phases. We can certainly have a conversation with Tracy about industry standards.

Mr. Vorst said that Mike has a list of things that the PI fund can go towards, so I don't think there'll be a shortage. Mr. Stewart said that the list is ongoing. Without this master facility plan, it would be absolutely insufficient. I think we need to gauge, if implemented, then what those needs look like moving forward. But we will be able to access those dollars to do a lot of the other things throughout the life of this plan that otherwise, right now, we're not getting to.

So, a really good example I would give to you is the district taking on playgrounds. In my first two years of traveling around the district and meeting with elementary PTOs, I learned I was going to get beat up about playgrounds. The model we've had in place for decades is that playgrounds were the purview of PTOs. But we've reached a point with inflationary costs that an elementary PTO doesn't have the capacity to take care of that any longer. We've got the opportunity to create a standard, increase accessibility for all students, and address safety issues on those playgrounds. This is just one of the things in our current reality that we can't address. The \$5 million in PI funds currently gets eaten up by warm, safe, and dry, and things like playgrounds don't get in there. But we've got an opportunity, especially in phase one, to address so many different things that have been needed for so long and still access those PI dollars every year.

Mrs. Crowley asked if those playgrounds included swings. Mr. Stewart replied that we would create a master template. We already had a consultant look at our playgrounds, and we know which ones need what things, so we have started to address those. But really, we need a successful outcome to be able to do what we hope to do. Mrs. Crowley said I promised my son I would ask. He started a petition years ago. Mr. Vorst added that they're in high demand. Mr. Stewart said that as a former secondary person, I never knew how important playgrounds were until I came here. So, now I know.

Mrs. Crowley said, speaking of PTOs, last week you presented at the Britton Norwich Campus PTO meeting, and we got a substantial amount of feedback about Britton being moved to Tharp. They mentioned concerns about the water in front, crossing Davidson Road, and the Hub being in the same location. Are there any plans to readjust or rethink that? Or is that kind of set in stone? Mr. Stewart said he didn't know about readjusting but definitely rethinking. So, yes, I was obviously the recipient of a lot of that feedback. I listened and then had some long conversations with Mike and Mark. We've asked Tracy to come back this week. I'm not going to share what we've brainstormed because it needs to be vetted. But we've brainstormed a couple of other possible options, and we want to see how they might

fit into the overall scope of the plan. We may come back to you then, either with a better vetting of what's already in the plan and a better explanation of why that's the best way and how we're going to make that work or with maybe some alternate possibilities for that component of the plan.

Mrs. Crowley said I've also had a little bit of feedback from people in the community about the Hub being taken away from the center of Hilliard. There are concerns about kids, like, way out west, getting to classes on time. Has anybody expressed concern about this? Mr. Stewart said not a ton. I would argue that if you really think about it, THARP isn't really that much significantly further. I think that that's very doable. But again, we are also looking at other options, some of which would keep that more centrally located. Another thing that we need to be constantly thinking about is the Hub, the Innovative Learning Campus, which is part of who we are. It's not going away, not in this plan anyway. But there are components of it that were always meant to be an incubator of innovative practices. If they're really got at the Hub, then maybe they're really good for all students. Again, going back to the strategic plan, it includes looking at all the opportunities in the Innovative Learning Campus to identify what opportunities need to be on that campus and what opportunities could be pushed into our general buildings.

Mrs. Crowley said there was a lot of joy around the Arrow program, possibly going into all three of the feeder patterns. People seem to be really receptive to that. Mr. Stewart said one of the strengths of this plan is that it creates capacity. Now again, it requires boundary revisions, but it creates the capacity to do things like put an Arrow program in each feeder pattern because of ability and the need to create another opportunity for preschool space. So, I think that's a strength of this plan.

I didn't get into timing and phasing because we did that the last time, but I want to remind you that we're currently working with the construction community and our architects to examine the site at Beacon. A driver of the timing of this will be whether or not we can build a new Beacon while still occupying an old Beacon. That will be a huge component. If we can do that, we can build basically all the elementaries pretty much at the same time, or we can certainly build those two at the same time. If we can't, our only option for swing space is at Station, and we cannot swing two elementary schools into that space at the same time. So, in that case, we will have to stagger construction.

Mrs. Crowley said her last question was about redistricting since she hasn't been through that process yet. How do you get an objective group to participate? From the experience of the PTO last week, people seem fine with it until it involves their school and their kids. Then, there's a lot of emotion involved. Mr. Stewart said you will never see a superintendent or school administrator smile when they say boundary revision or redistricting. It's a difficult and emotional process. The best answer I can give you to your question is to start with your parameters. So, we will work with a third party to provide that objectivity through this process. I promise you they'll start with, let's not look at a map, let's not look at your kid's school, let's not look at anything. Let's start with what's important to us. Now, I can't say for sure what those parameters will be, but I can get close because they're all the same just about anywhere you go. Communities want to prioritize neighborhood schools and walk zones, safety, and balancing demographics. Boundary revision or redistricting ultimately ends up being more tweaking than a complete overhaul. If you think about it, there isn't going to be a scenario where a child who this year attended Ridgewood, next year will attend Brown Elementary. It's all about shifting to maybe another nearby school to create capacity. Ultimately, everybody is always fine. The kids handle it great. All of us adults struggle. You're never going to get a completely objective committee. You try to create an informed committee that understands the parameters, how the decisions were made, and how we're going to support those who are impacted. We ask everyone to be objective, but at the end of the day,

they're mom and dad, and they care what's best for their kids. I would send my child to any elementary school, sixth-grade school, middle school, or high school in this district. We do a fantastic job of providing a balanced experience across our buildings. Where the experience is different is driven mostly by the facility rather than by anything else. This plan hopefully addresses that.

Ms. Arnold said I'd add that during the master facilities process, Tracey mentioned getting some of those folks back into that same process when we get to look at those boundaries, just because those folks will have understood where everything came from. And again, it's about that information flow so that they understand why decisions were made to help guide that process as well. And if you take a look at the Master Facilities group, it's folks who came in knowing they're building, and this is what we've got coming out of it, and I think it's pretty good.

Mr. Stewart said I imagine there will be significantly more interest in the redistricting committee than the Master Facility Committee, but I hope that it includes a lot of people from that Master Facility Plan. You haven't asked when that would start, and I really don't want this to become about redistricting. I want it to be about the Master Facility Plan. Assuming success in November, I would anticipate that somewhere this coming winter, January or February of 2025, we will start to form this committee and do some of the foundational work. We hope the work can be done soon enough so that we can communicate and all the reassuring things so that all the boundary shifting can take place in the fall of 2027 with the opening of the new elementary schools.

Mr. Vorst asked if phases 1 and 2 would be done in one vote, one ask to the public, or would it be two. Mr. Stewart said that would be the board's decision. I strongly believe our recommendation in each phase will be a combined issue. So, I want to make sure that we won't be approving phase 1 and phase 2 in one vote. However, I anticipate that phase 1 and phase 2 will be combined issues. Melissa is going to talk about the phase 2 timing here in just a little bit. I would anticipate that our recommendation to you will be that they be combined issues for both operating and bond.

Mr. Vorst then asked if the vote for phase three would be eight years down the road, six years down the road, or something like that. Mr. Stewart said it would be closer to eight or ten than six.

Mr. Vorst said I share many of the same concerns that the girls mentioned about redistricting and how that whole process goes. How do we ensure that the narrative reflects our true intentions and doesn't get out of control? How can we share all the good things we're doing and that this is something we have to do anyway? I agree that no one worries too much about it until it affects their family. So, I share those concerns and think that's something we're going to need to have regular and repeated conversations about in the future.

I've been hearing about this since day one of being on the board, and I think that the way that this was done, I think, is the best. It's been well-researched and documented. You have received a ton of feedback. If there's a way to do a master facilities plan, this is it. Nobody can say you didn't try to inform us or engage us unless they're being willfully ignorant. Nevertheless, you can lead the horse to water, and you guys have definitely led them to water, so you've done a great job of getting all that feedback. One of the things that I had questions about was the 6th-grade model. When I first moved here, I said, we have a 6th-grade school, and it's kind of a unique thing. I didn't really know that that was a model. But after asking around to all kinds of different folks in the community, I realized that it's a really popular way for us to do things. I don't get the impression that there's any desire in the community to move away from that. Mr. Stewart said we were mildly surprised at the level of interest in exploring a

fifth and sixth-grade building even though the highest level of support was for maintaining the sixth-grade buildings. We dug into the possibility of a fifth and sixth-grade building, but it just isn't practical. I agree with you that we got that message loud and clear.

Mr. Vorst said the one thing that maybe we just haven't got to yet. Maybe this is at a later phase of the MFP discussion, but our K-5 utilization is 86%, and we're talking about possibly adding total square footage to elementary schools. Is that what I'm gathering from the way that phases 1 and 2 will go? If we have flat enrollment projections for K-5, how can we make sure that people understand what we're doing if we are adding space but not necessarily adding students? I think it's easy to sell that the 60-year-old building needs to be replaced. Because it's just not worth our money to keep reinvesting into something that is at the end of its life. I told Mike earlier today that I understand we're not supposed to fly the plane until it crashes. You're supposed to retire it when it's at the end of its life. So, is there a metric as far as square footage per pupil or anything like that that we track? Obviously, you don't want a hundred percent utilization because you want to give yourself room to grow and that kind of flexibility. But if it could potentially mean millions of taxpayer dollars, I think we need to make sure that we get the size and the space right, given that we have flat enrollment projections for the next 10 years.

Mr. Stewart said that's a fair question. First, regarding your question about industry standards, yes, We used the Ohio Facilities Construction Commission's OSDM, the Ohio School Design Manual, for the educational adequacy study. It is a set of standards created by the state of Ohio that includes square footage per pupil. The other piece I would point out to you is the design priority the community gave us around equity and flexibility. Creating capacity will allow us to do things like put Arrow in each of the attendance boundaries. It would allow us to expand our special education program so that maybe someday we can serve every student in their home school rather than sending them to another building. All these questions are good practice because as we get to November, we're going to have to be ready to answer many questions like this.

Mr. McDonough added that one of the things that could go left of center on enrollment projections is the multi-family developments. Those could certainly fill up much quicker than a single-family development. When we work with our enrollment projections, they always say, hey, we feel really strong about five years out. When you go beyond five years, we're not as confident. So, I think if those multi-family complexes were to fill up quicker than we anticipate, we'd need the additional capacity to accommodate the growth that we would experience.

Ms. Arnold added, in addition, that some of those multi-family structures don't always stay the way they were originally designed. When we look at the Gables West, for example, which was an extended-stay hotel, then converted to condominiums, and then converted to the Columbus Metropolitan Housing Authority, it changes the dynamics, it changes the demographics of what students we'll see. So, we also need to be mindful of being able to respond to any demographic shifts.

Mr. Stewart said the reality is you're right. Our projections are flat over 10 years. The growth doesn't happen proportionally. We've talked about that, and what this does is build capacity. We do have a bit of a challenge with some in our community who drive in the western portions of our district. They look at me and say, you're nuts. Don't tell me enrollment is projected flat. I just drove through Brown Township. Or I just drove up Alton Darby Road. There's no way. If nothing else, we can say, if we're wrong, we've got the capacity to support that.

Mr. Vorst said I think it's a due diligence question that people are going to ask when they glance at something. You are not using all your space and you're adding more? It's just something that we need to be prepared for. Mr. Stewart said you're right. You never want to be at 100 percent utilization, either. So, what is that happy medium? I don't know. But that's a question we'll be prepared to answer.

Mr. Perry asked if adequacy is an average over the district. Eighty-six percent is an average? Mr. Stewart said capacity, not adequacy. So, my point is, there are some buildings that have...(inaudible)...capacity, so we're going for less than that. Mr. Stewart said when talking about capacity, you need to determine if you're talking about across a grade band or across the district. It's a little misleading because we have buildings like Ridgewood that are really overutilized and buildings that are really underutilized. Our job is to balance that utilization so that we've got capacity wherever we need it and that we can spread out programming where we want to put it.

Mr. Perry said I was trying to wrap my head around the exact same thing between educational adequacy and capacity utilization and conflating the two. For example, something that came to my mind was when we added additional rooms to the preschool; we added additional square footage even though we were district-wide; that does not affect capacity or utilization because that was square footage. So, if you had a building that's at 100 percent capacity, you can't add a new building. You add additional square footage to better utilize that space. That's still adding square footage. It's not actually affecting the district averages overall. Does that make any sense? Mr. Stewart said I don't think so. But, since you brought up the preschool, I think that is another strength of this plan. I know I mentioned it, but we can't find preschool space fast enough. We filled out that addition. It's been a great addition to the district, but it's full. So, creating a second location in another part of the district is another strength of the overall plan. Mr. Perry said I think we're saying the same thing.

Mrs. Crowely said I would agree. I've heard a lot of great feedback about adding on to the preschool.

Mr. Vorst asked what the projection on the number of seats we would add to the preschool was. Mr. McDonough said I believe it's 16 classrooms. We do half-day programs, so that's 32 sections of preschool potential.

Ms. Arnold said I only have one quick question because I'm very familiar with this plan. I don't think I have any questions about the plan having been part of it for so long, but looking down the road, as we get to say phase three and we do have to go back to the voters for bond, how concerned are you about debt capacity at that point based on where we are now and what we might be asking? Mrs. Swearingen said a lot of that will depend on what our assessed value is at that time, and right now, we have very conservative estimates of what that is and might be. I don't know that we can expect growth as we've seen over the past six years in our values, but if our values do continue to grow, then we may even be able to do that \$60 million without any additional millage. It will all just depend on what that looks like at the time. Ms. Arnold said, and obviously, where interest rates go. You don't have a crystal ball for 10 years? Mrs. Swearingen said no. Ms. Arnold said it's good to hear that something there's a potential for that next phase even to be no new millage. Mr. Stewart said, what you bring up there is why phase 3 is the least fleshed out in here because it will depend on what the capacity is at that time, and when whatever the board looks like at that time determines its time to go on the ballot.

8. Operating Levy Scenarios – Melissa Swearingen, Treasurer

The goal of this conversation this evening is to provide you with a starting point for our discussion surrounding the need for additional operating funds in fiscal year 2025 and to gather any questions that you might have. There is no expectation to select a scenario or to decide on any course of action tonight.

Please also keep in mind that the figures being presented are based on our November 2023 five-year forecast, with some updates made only at this point for the actual reappraisal results and for some ongoing state funding fluctuations that occur on a monthly basis. The forecast is being analyzed and updated for the May revision, and at this point, I would expect to see a few positive variances overall when compared to what was presented in November.

I'd also like to note that on March 14th, we convened the district's finance committee to review the information you are being provided this evening.

As you may recall from our November forecast assumption discussion, I spent some time reviewing our cash balance in each year of the forecast and whether we would comply with our board policy. I thought this would be a good starting point for tonight's discussion, as it is a key driver in our millage consideration.

This slide highlights some of the key components of board policy DBDA, which was approved by the board in August 2022. The board believes maintaining a cash reserve balance of 20 percent of operating expenses is necessary in the interest of sound fiscal management. An indication of a cash balance of less than 20 percent at any point during the five-year forecast triggers a discussion, and the superintendent and treasurer will propose options that the board may consider in that event.

This slide demonstrates our cash balance as a percent of operating expenses. These are actual results for fiscal year 2023 and projections for fiscal years 2024 through 2027. As you can see, we met the 20 percent benchmark for fiscal year 23 and are projected to do so for the current fiscal year and the next fiscal year. The percentage falls below 20 percent beginning in fiscal year 2026, and we have a negative cash balance projected for fiscal year 2027, which is not allowed.

As of the November 2023 forecast, our projected cash balance on hand is presented here in terms of date. I think this is an important perspective to consider. When the pandemic hit in 2020, the state cut our funding by three and a half million dollars in May with just one month left in the fiscal year. In any given year, the county's timeline for its final reconciliation and settlement of our property tax revenue can result in anywhere between a 30 and 45-day swing when we receive our real estate tax payment. This demonstrates the importance of having more than 30 days cash on hand in order to be able to make our payroll and cover any of our other operating expenses.

Our payroll averages \$12 million per month, as well as an additional \$4.8 million to cover the employer's share of benefits. A 20% cash balance in fiscal year 2025 represents approximately 73 days of cash on hand.

Our traditional forecast presents the financial information for the current fiscal year plus four additional years. As we walk through the potential scenarios, this extended forecast adds two additional years so that we can see the impact on our cash balance of a levy ask in November of 2024.

You can see here that the district is deficit spending, where expenditures exceed revenue, in fiscal years 2024 and beyond, and our cash balance is projected to be negative in fiscal year 2027. The existing revenue and expenditure projections shown here will remain unchanged as we walk through the scenarios.

As a reminder, a successful 2024 levy would take effect for the tax year 2024, which is the collection year 2025. This means the district would receive one payment, which represents one-half of collections in fiscal year 25, and then a full year of collections beginning in fiscal year 2026.

We discussed cash balance as a driver in determining the amount of a levy. Other key components to determining this amount are how long we want the levy to last and when we intend to go on the ballot. The longer we wait, the larger we ask, as it will delay when we begin collecting the additional revenue. The goal with our past operating levies has been not to return to the ballot for operating funds for at least four years.

Our forecasting software provides a modeling tool based on our cash balance reserve policy. You can see here that if you are planning to be on the ballot in the calendar year 2024, the millage range is 7.3 to 8.55 mills. Those rates provide the low and high points of the scenarios we will discuss. This is where the timing of going on the ballot comes into play. Delaying until 2025 or 2026 increases the amount of millage needed because we would need more revenue to overcome our operating deficit and maintain our cash balance policy...(inaudible)...

One mill generates approximately four and a half million dollars. This calculation is based on our total assessed valuation and remains consistent in all the scenarios we discuss. As mentioned, the levy millage needs estimator on the previous slide provides the high and low points of the three scenarios I have modeled for us to review. Here are the three scenarios.

Scenario one is 7.33 mills. With the proposed levy scenario, the district's levy life indicator is approximately three years, with a projected cash balance at the end of fiscal year 2028 of just over \$59 million. This represents 21.3 percent of expenditures. The projected cash balance in fiscal year 2029 is \$40 million, which represents 13.9 percent of expenditures, less than the 20 percent indicated in board policy.

Scenario two is 7.9 mills. In this scenario, the district's levy life indicator is approximately four years, with a projected cash balance in fiscal year 2029 of \$52 million, which represents 18 percent of expenditures. This is less than the 20 percent as indicated in board policy. However, I believe that some positive variances that we'll see when we actually do review and approve the May forecast will get us to that 20%.

The third scenario is 8.55 mills. In this scenario, the levy life indicator is closer to five years, with a projected cash balance at the end of fiscal year 2030 of \$44.2 million, which represents just under 15 percent of expenditures. The projected cash balance in fiscal year 2029 is \$65.7 million, which is 22.8 percent of expenditures, more than the 20 percent as indicated in board policy.

So, in scenario one, the total revenue generated is approximately \$34 million per year. This is highlighted, the green line, on the chart in front of you. Since we would be on the ballot in November 2024, we would only receive one real estate tax payment in fiscal year 25, which is the additional

revenue of \$16.9 million, which is the first highlighted green number there. Four years out, in fiscal year 2029, we would have an estimated cash balance of \$40 million, which is highlighted in yellow. That is just under 14 percent of operating expenses for that year and less than the 20 percent in board policy. Notice that this scenario creates a revenue surplus in fiscal year 2026 only, and that amount is just \$61,000. We are then back to deficit spending, even though we maintain a positive cash balance.

In Scenario 2, the total revenue generated is approximately \$36.6 million per year, again highlighted in green. Since we would be on the ballot in November, the first year's real estate payment collection in 2025 would be half of that, or \$18.2 million. Four years out, we would have an estimated cash balance of \$52 million, highlighted in yellow, which is 18 percent of operating expenses for that year, slightly less than the 20%. I already mentioned that I think we'll get to 20. Notice that this scenario also creates a revenue surplus in fiscal year 2026 only. That amount is \$2.7 million. And then we are back to deficit spending, even though we maintain a positive cash balance throughout that forecasting period.

In scenario three, the total revenue generated is approximately \$39.6 million per year, again highlighted in green. The first year's collection is about \$19.7 million. Then, we would have an estimated cash balance of \$65.7 million, here in yellow, which is 22.8 percent of operating expenses for that year, which does meet the 20 percent policy. We would have a revenue surplus in fiscal years 26 and 27, although in 27 it's only \$34,000. We are back to deficit spending starting in fiscal year 2028, even though we maintain a positive cash balance.

On the slide that showed all three scenarios, I mentioned the levy life indicators of each. This is a ratio that has several components that include the current year's fiscal year cash balance, what the budget is, the next fiscal year's budget surplus or shortfall, and then the current year's cash balance. This graph visualizes those three millage rates that we just walked through and shows a levy life below zero in fiscal year 28 for scenarios one and two and a levy life below zero in 2029 for scenario three. This tells us when we would likely need to return to the ballot for operating dollars if we were to go on the ballot in November 2024 and be successful.

Properties are taxed on their assessed value, which is 35 percent of the appraised value as determined by the county auditor. As a result, when you look at the cost per \$100,000 of appraised value, one mill is always going to equal \$35. To obtain the cost of the various millage scenarios, you simply multiply that \$35 by the millage amount, and I've provided those rates for you here for the three different scenarios that we just walked through.

So, which scenario? The goal with our past operating levies has been to not return for operating funds for at least four years. This four-year time frame aligns with phase two of the master facilities plan, which Dave discussed. We anticipate a few positive fluctuations from November to the May forecast to get us closer to the 20 percent cash balance for fiscal year 29 with scenario two. Therefore, scenarios two and three would accomplish this goal and would comply with the board's cash balance reserve policy.

Our next step in this process would be determining the operating levy's millage. We then need to pass a resolution of necessity and send that to the county auditor for certification. We would project doing this at the June 10th board meeting. We have two summer board meetings currently scheduled for June 10th and July 9th. We would then need to pass a resolution to proceed, which we could do on July 9th, and then file the resolution with the Board of Elections by the August 7th deadline. There are some additional components for state consent on the bond levy, and those could be accomplished within the

timelines that we've listed. We will review the May 2024 forecast assumptions at the April 22nd work session. Then, I will provide the forecast for approval on May 13th.

I'll open it up to questions from the board and do my best to answer any questions that you have. But if I have to do any additional modeling or calculations, I'll probably have to get back to you.

Ms. Arnold said, speaking of additional modeling, the cash reserve policy is set at 20 percent based on where we are comfortable with risk. You see a lot of entities looking at two months of paying cash on hand, which would be more like 16%. So, if we took our cash reserve policy down a bit, how would that help us roughly with, say, instead of 7.9? Could that bring us down significantly, or is it enough to accomplish anything?

Mrs. Swearingen said it could potentially do that. The one point that I would caution us on...I checked with our financial advisor, who we use when we issue debt. He indicated that there are two rating agencies, and they both look at that just a little bit differently, but that cash balance policy and actually being able to adhere to that are some indicators that they look at when assessing your bond rating. So, the only downfall is that that could be a trigger point where they would look to consider a potential downgrade. It might not happen immediately, but with the way this is all tied in, and we know that we're going to have hopefully several debt issuances over the next 10 years, I don't know that that's a risk that we would want to take on.

Ms. Arnold said thank you that's exactly what I was looking for.

Mr. Vorst said, David, we had talked briefly about some of the topics here. One of the things I asked was what is the amount of the tax increase for these different options for the middle 80% of homeowners in our district. Obviously, we have some extremely highs and some extremely lows. But for the meat right in the middle, do we have a ballpark?

Mr. Stewart replied yes and no. We don't really have a good grasp on what the medium house appraised value is. But if you take what Melissa displayed, it really is simple math in terms of extrapolating that out. Again, no matter what you do, a mill is always going to cost \$35 per \$100,000 in appraised value. And so, you can take that and do \$200,000 or \$300,000. It's pretty simple algebra to flush that out. What I don't have for you, and we'll continue to ask, is, what is that middle 80%? Is it \$250,000 to \$400,000 in appraised value? We don't have that answer, though.

Ms. Arnold said if you look at census data from 2022, which is the most recent, they put the median house in the Hilliard City School District at \$297,000. We know that data is out of whack. Mr. Stewart added it's just hard, given how much home values have increased in a very short period of time, even census data that recent. It could be 40 percent on top of that. It's hard to tell. I think, again, educating our community will continue to be really important. One of the things that we always have to do, and will continue to need to do, is to educate our community and make sure that they understand that back in the 70s, the legislature made sure that schools do not benefit from inflation. So, we'll have to explain that a levy that generates \$35 million the day that it's passed will continue to generate only that amount each year. For this reason, school districts have to go back to the voters continuously. Melissa and I were talking about this today. As a result of the most recent reappraisal, our effective millage dropped ten mills over the three types of levies that we have.

Mr. Vorst added that it's not the discussion for today, but it sounds like the biggest challenge is going to be basic education for the public. Few people have a firm grasp on this kind of thing.

Mr. Stewart said all I can say in response to that is we're up for it, and we're excited to do it. And we think it's worth it. We know we owe it to our community to be humble in our ask and make sure they understand the details of what you talked about.

Any further questions or reactions? Anything you would like more information about from our team?

Mr. Vorst asked if there is a historical standard on what the best way to approach this is as far as the life of the levy. I think we all don't want to get in a situation where we're going to ballot more frequently than we need to and want to make sure that every time we go, we're successful. Is that, is that a goal of how we do this, to make sure that we get the biggest bang for our buck when people go to the polls in November? Mrs. Swearingen said it's a combination of factors, I think. You definitely want to make sure that you're not creating fatigue, but at the same time, you don't want to have such a large ask that it's unreasonable to think that it would be acceptable. I think that tying it into the master facilities plan is a good strategy as we look to the next 10 years.

Mr. Stewart said I think the bigger driver is community history rather than industry standard. As Melissa pointed out in her presentation, our history in Hilliard has been a four-year promise. I know nobody really cares when it comes to new taxes, but our last four-year ask has now lasted eight years. So, I think that'll be part of that education as well.

Mr. Perry said I have a book that I've been borrowing from Stacie for the past three years. I still have it. It does show kind of historical trends. I mean, in Hilliard, we tend to do better in the presidential cycles. I feel like that's when more people come out to vote. People are paying attention. You know, we want to give the most people in our community the opportunity to give a say on their own taxes. It's a significantly better passage rate than when we do it in off-duty cycles.

Ms. Arnold asked how much it costs us to put a levy on the ballot. Mrs. Swearingen said it depends on what else is on the ballot. I think that is one of the reasons they eliminated the August election. It's expensive to hold an election, and a lot of time, there were only a few entities on the ballot at that time. So, you split the cost with whatever else is on the ballot. So, being on at a time when there are other issues is less expensive than if you're the only issue on.

Mr. Vorst asked how a levy campaign is funded. Where do those dollars come from? Mrs. Swearingen said they come from a committee that is a 501c4? It is completely independent of district funds. Mr. Vorst said so it's a nonprofit that's driven by private dollars. Mrs. Swearingen said they're not technically a nonprofit. They're a political action committee that generates their own funds to run a campaign.

Mrs. Crowley said I know the operating and the bond are separate, but what happens to the master facilities plan without this passing in November? Mr. Stewart said we'll be back to the \$5 million PI funds to maintain our facilities, and our emphasis will have to be on warm, safe, and dry.

Mrs. Crowley said this is a big opportunity. Mr. Stewart said it is, and we also know it's a big ask. But it's, it's an incredible opportunity, especially in those first two phases, to invest \$280 million in improvements to this community. I'm excited to share it with the community and to start building that foundation.

Mr. Vorst asked if it was too early to discuss how we'll actually structure the initiative on the ballot. Will it be MFP dollars and operating in the same yes-no box? Will there be two separate votes? How does that work? Mr. Stewart replied that would ultimately be your decision as the board. I think we have some thoughts that we'd be happy to share, but that would ultimately be your decision.

9. The Board of Education approved the February 2024 Treasurer's Report.
10. The meeting adjourned at 7:58 p.m.