

Citizens Jury[®]

Chatfield Public Schools

September 16-18 & 24-25, 1999

sponsored by
Chatfield Public School District
(ISD #227)

Citizens Jury is a registered trademark of the Jefferson Center

Produced by the Jefferson Center
October 1999

"I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome direction, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion."

Thomas Jefferson, 1820

The Jefferson Center would like to thank the following:

- The Jurors for all of their time, effort, and dedication;
- The many District residents who have supported this Citizens Jury project along the way;
- The Advisory Committee for their time and effort in planning the project;
- The Administration and staff of the Chatfield School District for their time and help;
- The Chatfield Board of Education for sponsoring this project;
- The witnesses for sharing their time and expertise;
- Helen Monsees and Joe Stinchfield for their valuable moderating skills;
- Monica Erickson and the staff at the Chatfield Public Library for being so accommodating.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Project Overview	1
Juror Recommendations	4
Facility Needs	5
Options For Addressing Elementary Facility Needs	7
Prioritization Of Options For Elementary School Facility Needs	12
Options For Addressing High School Facility Needs	13
What To Do With Current Elementary Building	14
Next Steps/ Follow Up	15
How the Recommendations Were Arrived At	16
Juror Comments	17
Juror List	19
Juror Composition	20
Juror Evaluations	21
Project Staff and Advisory Committee	22
Witness List	23
Agenda	24
About the Jefferson Center	28

PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Citizens Jury on Chatfield Public Schools was designed to bring together a representative group of district residents to identify, prioritize, and consider solutions to the current and future facility needs of the Chatfield Public Schools. After a failed referendum in 1997, the School Board met and decided that they needed a process that would be more inclusive of District residents. After considering various processes, the Chatfield Board of Education contracted the Jefferson Center to conduct a Citizens Jury. In deciding to move forward with this process, the Chatfield School District and community residents took a positive step towards engaging the public in an important planning process concerning the future of the Chatfield Public Schools.

The Citizens Jury brought together eighteen jurors who represented a microcosm of the Chatfield School District community. Over the course of two weeks, the jury met for five non-consecutive days. During the five days, the jurors toured school facilities, heard from a wide variety of witnesses, and deliberated together regarding the facility issues facing the Chatfield School District. On the final day of hearings the jurors finalized and issued a series of recommendations and suggestions. The jury presented their findings to the School Board, school officials, the public, and press.

The Jefferson Center

The Jefferson Center is a non-profit, non-partisan organization located in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Established in 1974, the Center is committed to generating thoughtful citizen input on issues of public significance. The central focus of the Center is the Citizens Jury process, through which randomly selected and demographically representative panels of citizens meet for several days to examine public policy issues and present their findings to decision-makers and the public. To date, the Jefferson Center has conducted twenty-eight Citizens Jury on a broad spectrum of topics. The Jefferson Center offers a range of citizen input services, in addition to the Citizens Jury. Further information on the Jefferson Center can be found on **page 28**.

Elements Of The Citizens Jury Process

The Process

The Citizens Jury is a unique process that allows decision-makers and the public to hear from citizens who are both informed and representative of the public. The process allows for considerable discussion and deliberation by the jurors to develop thoughtful and useful recommendations.

The Advisory Committee

An Advisory Committee, consisting of nine knowledgeable and thoughtful community members assisted the Jefferson Center and played a critical role in planning the hearings. The members were chosen to represent a variety of perspectives and opinions on the issues. The Committee worked with Jefferson Center staff to formulate the charge given to the Jury, assisted in the construction of the agenda, and aided in the selection of witness presenters. The Advisory Committee was instrumental in ensuring that the Jury heard from people representing various perspectives. The interest of the Advisory Committee was in the integrity and fairness of the process as a whole, not in a specific outcome. The Committee was on alert for any bias throughout the planning process. Members of the Advisory Committee were valuable advisors to the project. A list of project staff and Advisory Committee members can be found on **page 22**.

Juror Selection

The process for selecting the Jury began with a random telephone survey of Chatfield School District residents eighteen years of age or older. A total of 506 residents were initially surveyed; out of that number, 236 residents indicated an interest in participating in the project and received more information. Those who received information were asked to return a "Juror Information Form," and were entered into a pool of potential jurors. Eighteen jurors were then selected out of the 236 potential jurors to participate in the Citizens Jury project. The jurors collectively represented the community in terms of age, education, gender, geographic location, having children in the schools or not, and general attitude towards facility issues. A list of jurors and the demographic composition of the Jury can be found on **pages 19 and 20**.

Witness Selection

Individuals, knowledgeable on the issues, were called to serve as witnesses for the Jury hearings. They provided valuable background information as well as testimony on the various topics discussed throughout the hearings. The witnesses were selected to represent a wide range of issues, ideas, and perspectives. The witnesses included staff from the Chatfield Schools, and the Minnesota Rural Education Association, an architect, community members, and others. A complete list of witnesses can be found on **page 23**.

The Charge

The Charge to the Jury outlined the Jury's focus and provided direction for the hearings. It informed the Jury of their overall goals and objectives for the hearings. In this project, the jurors were asked to respond to two questions. The charge to the jurors was as follows:

- **What are the prioritized facility needs facing the Chatfield Public School District now and in the next 15 years?**
- **Given those prioritized needs, what actions should the District take?**

The Hearings

The agenda was carefully developed to provide the jurors with the necessary information to address the Charge questions. The hearings were divided into different sections so that the jurors would receive information to allow them to answer the Charge put before them. Over the course of the hearings, the jurors toured school facilities and heard background information pertaining to demographic and enrollment projections. They also heard about various needs and mandates driving the schools facility needs. The jury worked with, asked questions, and shared idea with an architect on possible solutions for meeting the needs. They also had ample time to deliberate with each other to form their recommendations. A complete Agenda for the hearings can be found on **page 24**.

Recommendations

The Jury's recommendations include prioritized needs, possible solutions to the needs, as well as suggestions regarding how the School District and community could work together in the future. The jurors presented their findings on the final afternoon to a public audience, which included members of the Chatfield Board of Education, staff members of the District, community members, and the press. The jurors had an opportunity to dialogue with the public about the process, the week, and their recommendations. The recommendations appear in this report using language that the jurors themselves approved. The recommendations can be found following this Project Overview on **page 4**.

Evaluation

At the conclusion of this process, the jurors were asked to complete an evaluation of the project. A key question on the evaluation form asked the jurors to consider the overall integrity of the project. A majority of the jurors felt that the project was conducted in an unbiased manner, with eleven indicating that they were "very satisfied" and five jurors stated that they were "satisfied". The final evaluation can be found on page 21. The jurors were also given the opportunity to write a personal statement about the project for inclusion in this report. These comments can be found on **page 21**.

JUROR RECOMMENDATIONS

We, the Jury, understand that our recommendations involve significant cost and perhaps some sacrifice to people in our community. However, in carefully considering the long term needs of our community and some of the significant facility problems in our schools, we feel the recommendations in this report are needed. They represent wise investments in our children and in our community's future.

Jerry Baudoin

Donald Gardner

Beverly Bernau

Dan Jaquith

Michele Bleskan

Joe Julian

Sheila Burfield

Tammy Julian

Terry Bradt

Therese Opat

Vivian Coe

Chris Rowen

Vern Crowson

Daryl Seidel

Bunnie Eberley

Lanny Severson

Gerry French

Joan Verdegan

Prioritized Facility Needs

In response to Charge Question #1, the Jury identified the following items as facility needs facing the Chatfield School District. Each juror was given fourteen votes to distribute among the identified needs, as each felt was appropriate. They were allowed to vote for an item more than once, if so desired. The numbers in parentheses represent the total number of votes received by each particular need. Some of the needs listed are lower priority items and may not need to be addressed immediately. The following needs are listed in order of priority.

There may be similarities between some of the listed needs. State mandated and recommended items are listed in bold and must be addressed. In addition, some of the mandated items may be related to state school funding.

Elementary School Needs

Appropriate classroom space (according to state recommendations) (25)

Safety Issues (23)

- **Fire (conforming to building codes)**
- Traffic
- Security (personal safety)

Space to keep pre-school and elementary school together (11)

Site Size (according to state recommendations) (11)

- Green Space
- Playgrounds

Special Education & Special Needs students need more space (for conferences, 1-to-1 teaching & learning) (9)

Updated Utilities (5)

- Ventilation
- Heat / Air Conditioning
- Water in the classrooms
- Appropriate wiring for computers & telephone

Appropriate space for Title IX and other mandates (5)

Sick Room – additional space (3)

Additional bathrooms (2)

High School Needs

Girls need appropriate locker rooms (Title IX compliance) (23)

More space for all fine arts programs (15)

Appropriate space/facility for agriculture program (9)

More space for music program (7)

Safety concerns (4)

Additional classrooms (3)

Flexibility to use existing space more effectively (3)

Community Education Needs

Keep Valley Land with the Elementary School (9)

Permanent space beyond 3 years (6)

District Wide Needs / Both Elementary & High School Needs

Space for gym-related activities (20)

- Junior High locker room
- Weight room in appropriate & **accessible** location
- **Girls locker rooms**
- Storage areas for gym & athletic equipment (**current situation violates fire code**)

Private areas for conferences, 1-to-1 activities, etc... (**data privacy implications**) (16)

Good competitive working environment to attract & keep good teachers (13)

More parking space (8)

More storage area (6)

More observation of building activities by School Board members (4)

Improved ventilation (3)

Options for Addressing Elementary School Facility Needs

In response to Charge Question #2, the Jury identified and evaluated several options for addressing the facility needs facing the school district. The following six options were identified by the Jury as potential solutions for the needs. The jury evaluated each option. Cost estimates for several options were provided by the architect, and are only rough estimates and contingent on the final plan. The six options are presented below, in no particular order. The pros and cons for each option, as identified by the Jury, are also presented below.

OPTION 1

Build a new Elementary School (K-6) on a brand new site (not at the existing High School site) with the state recommended acreage (approximately 15 acres). A plan to preserve and utilize the current Elementary building would be developed. The cost for land and construction is *roughly* estimated to be **\$11.4 million**. This option would qualify for state aid, which would reduce the total district cost of repaying the bond for the project.

PROS:

- More spaces
- Minimal maintenance
- Meet all safety mandates
- Address parking issues
- Attract growth
- Designed for new educational environment
- Designed for expansion
- Addresses community education needs
- Brings ECFE (Early Childhood & Family Education) back with elementary building
- Addresses safety concerns
- Addresses recommended open/green space & site size requirements
- Better learning/ teaching environment
- Flexibility in responding to future space needs
- Moves 5th & 6th grades out of the High School
- Relieves space issues at the High School
- Meets codes & elementary mandates
- Promotes residential/commercial development

CONS:

- City services/infrastructure need to be extended
- Land acquisition costs
- Busing costs
- Fewer students within walking distance
- Lost opportunities for cost saving with High School
- Less centrally located in community
- Need to develop a use for current Elementary Building
- Attract growth

OPTION 2

Build a new Elementary Building (K-6) on the existing High School site. A plan to preserve and utilize the current Elementary building would be developed. The total construction cost is *roughly* estimated to be about **\$10.6 million**. This option would qualify for state aid, which would reduce the total district cost of repaying the bond for the project.

PROS:

- Continuity for K-12 (all on same campus)
- More instructional space
- Minimal maintenance
- Meets safety standards
- Designed for new educational environment
- Reduce busing
- Opportunity to share space (facilities, equipment, etc...)with High School
- Land already belongs to School District
- Potential lower city services costs than Option 1
- Flexibility in responding to future space needs
- Addresses Community Education needs
- Brings back ECFC back with elementary building
- Interaction of staff
- Moves 5th & 6th grades out of High School building
- Relieves space issues at High School
- More efficient staffing
- Potentially creates commercial space downtown
- Meets codes & elementary mandates
- Land acquisition options available

CONS:

- Parking problems
- Puts K-4 students closer to High School students
- Limited land space if we want to expand
- Some athletic practice fields may be lost
- Cost of new athletic fields (including land acquisition)
- Upgrades in city services/infrastructure needed
- Traffic – no through street
- Need to develop use for current elementary building

OPTION 3

Extensive Remodeling and an addition to existing Elementary Building to comply with state requirements (including additional land acquisition). The total construction and land costs were *roughly* estimated to be **\$11.5 million**. State aid for this option is uncertain. However, if eighteen homes on two adjacent blocks are removed and the land is made available for the school site, state aid may be more likely.

PROS:

- Public sentiment in support of preserving Potter Auditorium
- More space
- Moves 5th & 6th grades into elementary building (away from High School)
- Helps relieve space needs at the High School
- Addresses parking issues
- Meets codes & elementary mandates
- Improves some safety issues at the Elementary School
- Addresses green space & site size needs
- Addresses Community Education needs
- Brings ECFE back with elementary building
- No major city services required

CONS:

- Property acquisition costly, difficult, and time consuming
- Safety – still on Highway 52
- Construction through school year a challenge (where do we put the students)
- Limited land space

OPTION 4

Remodel Current Elementary School to put K-2 in 1954 building; lease space in 1918 & 1934 buildings; build a new building for 3-6 at existing High School site. The total cost for this option was unavailable, at this time. This option may qualify for state aid.

PROS:

- No new land needed
- Buys us time
- Gets 5th & 6th grades out of the High School
- Helps relieve space issues at the High School
- Does not use up athletic field space
- Smaller (less expensive?) new building required
- Preserves downtown building
- Less disruption to community (no displacement)
- Less disruption to children during construction
- Possible income from 1918 & 1934 buildings

CONS:

- No continuity of K-12
- Not enough room in 1954 building for K-2
- May need to add more space on ground level (resource room, Phy Ed)
- Does not address Community Education needs
- Need to have Special Education at both buildings
- Safety – K-2 still on Highway 52
- Duplication of some spaces at both buildings
- State funding unknown

OPTION 5

Remodel and add to existing Elementary building without additional land acquisition. The cost to remodel the existing building and to construct additional space to bring the facility into compliance with standards is *roughly* estimated to be **\$8-9 million**. This option would not qualify for state aid.

PROS:

- Price
- No new land acquisition
- Community support
- Could do land acquisition in stages?

CONS:

- State approval to proceed highly unlikely
- Less green space than Option 3
- No state funding
- Parking problems
- Limited land space

OPTION 6

Do nothing to existing Elementary Building.

PROS:

- No immediate construction or land acquisition cost

CONS:

- Does not address space needs
- Potential for fines & penalties from state for non-compliance
- Possibility of building condemnation for K-12 use
- Condemnation would force immediate action
- Continued high maintenance costs
- Defers inevitable costs to a future date

Prioritization of Options for Elementary School Facility Needs

Following significant discussion and deliberation, the Jury found Options 4, 5, & 6 to be unacceptable options for addressing the facility needs of the Elementary School (see previous page for description, pros, & cons of these options). The Jury suggests that the remaining three options be further pursued by the District for additional study and input from the community.

For each of the remaining 3 options, the Jury voted whether that option was “preferable”, “acceptable”, or “unacceptable.” A total point value was then calculated for each option by counting each “preferable” vote as two points, each “acceptable” vote as one point, and zero points for each “unacceptable” vote.

Each juror identified one preferred option. Each juror then rated the other two options as acceptable or unacceptable. Jurors were allowed to abstain from voting. The results are shown below.

Elementary Option	“Preferable”		“Acceptable”		“Unacceptable”		TOTAL POINTS
	Votes	Points	Votes	Points	Votes	Points	
OPTION 1	(7)	14	(5)	5	(5)	0	19
OPTION 2	(9)	18	(7)	7	(1)	0	25
OPTION 3	(1)	2	(6)	6	(11)	0	8

OPTION 1 – Build a new Elementary School (K-6) on a brand new site (not at the existing High School site) with the state recommended acreage (approximately 15 acres). A plan to preserve and utilize the current Elementary building would be developed. The cost for land and construction is *roughly* estimated to be **\$11.4 million**. This option would qualify for state aid, which would reduce the total district cost of repaying the bond for the project.

OPTION 2 – Build a new Elementary Building (K-6) on existing High School site. A plan to preserve and utilize the current Elementary building would be developed. The total construction cost is *roughly* estimated to be about **\$10.6 million**. This option would qualify for state aid, which would reduce the total district cost of repaying the bond for the project.

OPTION 3 – Extensive remodeling and an addition to existing Elementary building to comply with state requirements (including additional land acquisition). The total construction and land costs were *roughly* estimated to be **\$11.5 million**. State aid for this option is uncertain. However, if 18 homes on two adjacent blocks are removed and the land made available for the school site, state aid may be more likely.

Options for Addressing High School Facility Needs

In response to Charge Question #2, the Jury identified and evaluated several options for addressing the facility needs facing the High School. The following six options were identified by the Jury as potential solutions for the needs. The jury discussed each option. Cost estimates for several options were provided by the architect, and are only rough estimates. The Jury felt that the options for addressing the High School needs were related to specific Elementary School Options. The High School Options considered were:

OPTION A – No changes

OPTION B – Construct a building addition plus remodel the existing facility to gain new gym, new locker room, additional music, vocal, & band space, agriculture lab (\$3.4 million)

OPTION C – Same as Option B without building a new gym (\$2.4 million)

OPTION D – Remodel using only space freed up by moving 5th – 6th grade to Elementary School (additional classrooms only), (no new gym, no new locker rooms, no music, vocal or band space, no agriculture lab) (\$0.5 million)

OPTION E – Remodel Girls locker room only (\$100,000)

OPTION F – Combination of all remodeling in options D & E (\$0.6 million)

The Jury's recommendation for addressing the needs at the High School take the form of answers to the following three questions. Only those jurors who had voted for a particular Elementary option as either "preferable" or "acceptable" voted for the related question. Abstentions were allowed.

- (1) If Elementary Option 1 (new elementary school on a new site) were proposed, which Option for addressing the High School needs would you most prefer?
- (2) If Elementary Option 2 (new elementary school on existing High School site) were proposed, which Option for addressing the High School needs would you most prefer?
- (3) If Elementary Option 3 (remodel and add to existing elementary building) were proposed, which Option for addressing the High School needs would you most prefer?

Elem. Option	High School Option	Votes
1	A	0
	B	5
	C	2
	D	1
	E	0
	F	4

Elem. Option	High School Option	Votes
2	A	0
	B	1
	C	12
	D	0
	E	0
	F	2

Elem. Option	High School Option	Votes
3	A	0
	B	5
	C	2
	D	0
	E	0
	F	0

What To Do With Current Elementary Building IF A New Elementary Building Is Proposed?

The existing Elementary school building and especially Potter Auditorium are very important assets to the entire community. If a new Elementary School is to be constructed, the Jury strongly encourages that a plan be prepared to preserve and utilize these assets to benefit the whole community.

After discussion, the Jury developed some ideas for potential uses for the existing building. These ideas are listed below. This is not an exhaustive list, but a sampling of ideas. The Jury strongly encourages the School District to include a plan for the existing building with any proposal for a new Elementary Building.

The Jury believes that there are alternate uses for that building that would not be subject to the same K-12 Minnesota Department of Children, Families, & Learning requirements, but would meet general building and safety standards.

- Community Center, which may include:
 - Fitness Center
 - Potential for different funding options (e.g. Challenge Grant)
 - Potter Auditorium as Arts Center
 - Senior Nutrition Center
 - Some Community Education Programs
 - Emergency Services Offices
 - Historical Society Uses, including museum
- Lease/Sell – generate revenue
- Apartments
- Continued use by District for arts or theater programs
- Business Incubator (encourage new businesses)
- Renaissance Zone (office & retail space)

Recommended Next Steps For The District

The Jury developed recommendations for the School District and School Board regarding next steps to take. A significant amount of the next steps relate to communication, information dissemination, and additional community involvement. These statements are a brainstorm and are in no particular order.

- Have a definite plan for the existing building
- Hold caucuses & small group discussions
- Convene community discussions
- Get public together
- Public forums
- Newspaper articles and special mailings
- Clear, simple communications
- Figure out how to get the information to the most people, especially tax information
- Put an information binder from Jefferson Center in the Library
- Put information on the Internet
- Make edited tape of proceedings available?
- Get more information about the agriculture program
- Consider the possibility of staging the project or doing it in stages
- Consider posing several options to the voters (structure the questions)
- Encourage and have One-on-one discussions
- Give people accurate and complete information, and let them decide. Don't force them.
- Address people's concerns up-front
- Separate facts from opinions (create fact-sheet)
- Carefully choose good communicators to bring information to the public to ensure accurate representation of the Jury's recommendations
- Try to develop a trust relationship with the public
- Use Jury members to assist with communication and future steps
- Understand and be sensitive to concerns and tax implications for farmers, senior citizens, and low-income citizens
- Goal should be a well-informed voter
- Have a complete long-range plan; be sure that good planning actions follow
- Move ahead quickly but with good planning. Phase the infrastructure, if needed.
- A comprehensive plan & coordination between School Board & City Council
- Trust - reveal all information using good format
 - Do not talk down to people
 - Allow question & answers & dialogue
 - Ensure good follow-up
 - Don't "fake" the answer. "I don't know" works well
 - Acknowledge information on all sides (e.g. declining enrollment)
 - Be careful to *listen*; guard against preaching

What is Different Now?

Why Did We Arrive at These Recommendations?

The Jury wanted to express some of the reasons why they arrived at their recommendations. They acknowledge that some of their recommendations are similar to the referendum posed in 1997, and wanted to explain to the community what the Jury feels may be “different” now and why they arrived at these recommendations

- We received a significant amount of information.
- We had an opportunity to hear several perspectives.
- More people were involved in the process.
- Attitudes may be different than they were at the time of the last referendum.
- We have a better understanding of specific issues including:
 - State & Federal Mandates – fire, safety, special ed., Title I, Title IX, etc...
 - How education is paid for
 - Teaching and learning style changes

JUROR COMMENTS

"I really do believe that the jury process was an excellent way of being able to understand the issues and problems facing the Chatfield School District. Although, I do not completely understand the mandates and taxation regarding the financing of a new building, I really do see the District's problems now and it was the jury process that brought that to light."

- Jerry Baudoin

"Although serving on the jury was informative and interesting, I feel some of the information provided to the Citizens Jury may have been misleading. In the Initial Report (page 5, line 8), I was uncomfortable with the use of the word 'farm' as used to determine the number of people on the Citizens Jury living on a farm. I feel that the number of people selected as living on a farm does not accurately reflect the population of the Chatfield School District living on a farm and earning their only or primary income from farming. I am also uncomfortable with 'farm', 'agricultural', 'rural', and 'country' being used interchangeably without consistent meaning. For example, approximately 60% of residents of the Chatfield School District are 'rural' yet the 'agricultural net tax capacity of the Chatfield School District is 41.68%."

- Beverly Bernau

"We were kept busy and well informed by the people of the Jefferson Center. Each juror was given a summary of the sessions as they were finished to add to their notebook to review. I thought it was an interesting time to be involved in."

- Vivian Coe

"I was pleased to have the opportunity to serve on the Citizens Jury and found it to be a very rewarding experience. I feel the resources provided to us to form our recommendations were very good. The timetable was about right for us to consider and deliberate over the information. I will be a better person for having been a part of the Citizens Jury. Thank you."

- Vern Crowson

"As a process, it was fantastic. The Jefferson Center did one whale of a job!"

- Donald Gardner

"I believe that conducting a Citizens Jury to explore the current and future needs of the Chatfield School District was extremely worthwhile. After having the opportunity to hear an immense amount of information, it did seem somewhat overwhelming. However, it is reassuring to have a solid base of facts and knowledge with which to formulate an educated decision about important issues. I feel that this community should not be disappointed about any kind of decision that is made about any issue as long as the community is provided with accurate, trustworthy information. If everyone can weigh available information and formulate an educated decision based upon that information, then the rest should take care of itself."

- Chris Rowen

"The Citizens Jury process was 100 percent O.K. Everything was top notch."

- Lanny Severson

"I hope people in the Chatfield community and the School District understand that we (the Jury) were answering specific charge questions created by the Jefferson Center and the School District. The solutions to those particular problems posed do not necessarily address other related issues such as community growth, fairness in property taxation or in city assessments. These related issues are of great concern to me and other jurors, but were beyond the scope of our jury project. I hope that everyone gets adequate answers to all of their concerns."

- Joan Verdegan

JURORS

NAME	OCCUPATION	RESIDENCE [*]
Jerry Baudoin	Retired	Town
Beverly Bernau	Farmer/Day Care Provider	Farm
Michele Bleskan	Business Consultant	Town
Sheila Burfield	Secretary/Homemaker	Town
Terry Bradt	Software Support	Town
Vivian Coe	Retired	Farm
Vern Crowson	Hobby Farmer/IBM	Farm
Bunnie Eberley	Mayo Clinic	Farm
Gerry French	Registered Nurse	Country
Donald Gardner	Retired Farmer/Insurance Adjuster	Farm
Dan Jaquith	Security Officer	Country
Joe Julian	Plant Operator Attendant	Town
Tammy Julian	Dietary Cook	Country
Therese Opat	Secretary/Bookkeeper	Town
Chris Rowen	Account Manager	Farm
Daryl Seidel	Police Officer	Town
Lanny Severson	Apartment Manager	Town
Joan Verdegan	Family Business/ Engineering Administrative Assistant	Town

^{*} Survey Respondents were identified as Farm if they answered yes to the following question:
"Are you or your immediate family currently farming land or retired from farming?"

JURY COMPOSITION

One of the key goals of any Citizens Jury is demographic balance. Potential jurors were first identified through a random telephone survey designed by the Jefferson Center. The final eighteen jurors were carefully selected to be representative of Chatfield Public School District. Below is a chart of the demographic targets for this Jury. In some cases, assigned targets were not entirely achieved due to last minute cancellations and substitutions.

Demographic Category	ACTUAL % OF POPULATION	JURY TARGET	FINAL JURY
Gender – Male	50%	9	9
Gender – Female	50%	9	9
Education – High School or Less	41%	7	7
Education – Some College or Tech School	34%	6	5
Education – College Graduate or More	25%	5	6
Location – Town	50%	9	9
Location – Country	17%	3	3
Location – Farm ¹	33%	6	6
Age – 18-34	20%	4	4
Age – 35-54	43%	8	8
Age – 55+	37%	6	6
Children – K-12 in Chatfield Public schools	33%	6	8
Children – Pre-kindergarten	7%	1	1
Children – No K-12 or no pre-kindergarten	61%	11	9
Attitude ² – Vote Against almost any Increase	22%	4	3
Attitude – Lean against Increase	26%	5	6
Attitude – Lean Towards Increase	32%	6	6
Attitude – Vote For almost any Increase	13%	2	2
Attitude – Don't Know Refuse	7%	1	1

¹ Survey Respondents were identified as Farm if they answered yes to the following question:
“Are you or your immediate family currently farming land or retired from farming?”

² Survey Respondents attitudes were identified based on the answers to the following question:
“If the Chatfield School District were to ask the voters for an increase in property taxes to remodel or expand existing facilities, or to build new buildings, which one of the following statements best describes your feelings?”

JUROR EVALUATIONS

In general, how do you feel about the Citizens Jury on Chatfield Public Schools now that you have completed the project?

5	Very satisfied
13	Satisfied
0	Neutral
0	Dissatisfied
0	Very dissatisfied

One of our aims is to have the staff conduct the project in an unbiased way. How satisfied are you with their performance in this regard?

11	Very satisfied
5	Satisfied
2	Neutral
0	Dissatisfied
0	Very dissatisfied

PROJECT STAFF AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Project Staff

Moderators

Helen Monsees
Joe Stinchfield

Jefferson Center

Doug Nethercut	Executive Director
Amy Gagstetter	Project Director
Wallace Rogers	Senior Associate
Lynette Uetz	Administrator
Keiko Veasey	Project Manager

Advisory Committee

Colleen Allen	Community Representative
Loren Barnes	Community Representative
Joe Chase	Community Representative
Dave Dudek	Community Representative
Don French	Community Representative
Karen Greenslade	Community Representative
Betty Johnson	Community Representative
Dean Narveson	Community Representative
Kathy Schellhamer	Member, Chatfield Board of Education

WITNESSES

Amy Anshus	Community Member
Rich Elias	Architect TSP Architects
LuAnn Hare	Director of Community Education Chatfield Community Education
Vernae Hasbargen	Executive Director Minnesota Rural Education Association
Robert Heim	Community Member
Arlyne Jacobson	Principal Chatfield Elementary School
Chuck Kohlmeyer	Community Member
Kathy McKay	Director of Special Education Root River Education District
Donna Meyer	Board Chair Chatfield Board of Education
Gayle Miller	Community Member
Jeff Miller	Superintendent Chatfield Public Schools
Gary Olsen	Financial Advisor Ehlers and Associates
Randy Paulson	Principal Chatfield High School
Hazel Reinhardt	Independent Demographer Hazel Reinhardt Consulting Services
Joel Sutter	Financial Advisor Ehlers and Associates
Joel Young	City Clerk City of Chatfield

AGENDA

Day 1

Thursday September 16

- 8:30 Introduction and Welcome to Jurors
- Welcome to jurors
 - Introduction to staff
 - Brief history of the Jefferson Center and the Citizens Jury process
 - Review rules of procedure for jurors, witnesses, and public
 - Review handbook, Charge and Agenda for the week
- Jefferson Center & Moderators***

- 9:00 Jurors get acquainted
- Moderator led exercise
- Moderators***

- 9:30 Project overview
- Why and how the Jefferson Center was contacted for this project
 - Why and how the District came to this point
 - What is the current situation in the District
- Jeff Miller (Superintendent) and Donna Meyer (Board Chair)***

10:00 Tour Schools

Jurors tour current buildings in the District and a building in a neighboring District

	10:00 – 11:00	11:00 – 12:00	12:00 – 1:00	1:15 – 2:15
Group 1	Chatfield Elementary (Arlyne Jacobson)	Chatfield High School (Randy Paulson)	Former AFC Building (LUANN HARE)	Dover/Eyota
Group 2	Chatfield High School (Randy Paulson)	Chatfield Elementary (Arlyne Jacobson)	Former AFC Building (LUANN HARE)	Dover/Eyota

- 2:30 Tour Debrief
- What did you see, what did you learn?
- Moderators***

- 3:15 Juror Value Discussion
- As residents, what qualities are important for the Chatfield School District to possess? Which are most important?
- Moderators***

- 4:30 Juror Check In/Adjourn

Day 2
Friday September 17

- 8:30** Review Agenda for the Day
- 8:45** Demographics of Chatfield
- Past, present, and future
Joel Young – City Clerk
 - What does that mean for District
Hazel Reinhardt - Demographer
- 10:20** Background Information on K-12 funding General information on how public education is funded
Vernae Hasbargen – Executive Director, Minnesota Rural Education Association
- 10:55** Break
- 11:10** Changes in education over the last 20 years
Arlyne Jacobson ,Elementary Principal
- 11:45** Lunch
- 12:30** Mandates
- What are school mandates
 - Title 9, safety, playground, air quality, physical space
Jeff Miller (Superintendent)
 - What are special education mandates
 - Services and mandates that the District has to provide
Kathy McKay (Special Education Director)
- 1:15** Property Tax Overview
- Overview of property tax and current school situation
 - Explanation of bonds and referendums
 - Difference in property tax rates for homes, businesses, farms, and farms with homesteads
Joel Sutter & Gary Olsen – Financial Advisors Ehlers & Associates
- 2:15** Break
- 2:30** Witness Presentation on Question 1(needs) of the Charge
- What are the facility needs of the District
 - Question and Answer session with jury and presenters
School Officials
- 4:30** Jurors Discuss Needs/Juror Check In/Adjourn

Day 3
Saturday September 18

- | | |
|--------------|---|
| 8:30 | Review previous day and current day's agenda
Moderators |
| 8:45 | Jurors Discuss Needs and Prioritize from previous day
Moderators |
| 10:15 | Break |
| 10:30 | Community Perspectives on needs and solutions
Amy Anshus, Chuck Kohlmeyer, Robert Heim, Gayle Miller |
| 11:30 | Lunch |
| 12:30 | Factors that affect solutions <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Jurors discuss factors that may affect how the Chatfield School District might address facility needs. Moderators |
| 1:15 | Witness Presentations on Question 2 of the Charge <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What are possible ways to meet the needs addressed on day 2• Strengths and Weaknesses of High School solutions• How do different solution ideas affect costs• Question and answer sessions with witnesses Architect, School Staff |
| 3:15 | Jurors work on answering question 2 (solutions) of the Charge
Moderators |
| 4:15 | Juror Check In <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Homework Assignment |
| 4:30 | Adjourn |

Day 4
Friday September 24th

- 8:30 Review the Charge and Agenda
 Moderators
- 8:45 Information Debrief
- Jurors receive information that was asked for the previous week
 - Jurors discuss findings of Homework assignment
- Jurors and Moderators**
- 10:00 Break
- 10:15 Jurors Review and Confirm Prioritization of Needs
- Question 1 of Charge
- 11:00 Discuss Facility Options
- Question 2 of Charge
 - **Jury discussion**
 - **Architect and School Officials present for clarification if needed**
- 12:00 Lunch
- 12:45 Continue Facilities discussion
- 2:00 Juror Discussion on Next Steps for District and Community
- 4:30 Adjourn

Day 5
Saturday September 25th

- 8:30 Begin review and Final Edit of Initial Report
- 11:30 Lunch
- 12:30 Finish editing of the Initial Report
 Juror Evaluations and Comments
 Juror debrief of project and process
- 2:00 Jury Presents Initial Report to the Public and Press
- 4:00 Finish and Adjourn

The Jefferson Center

Citizen Input — Real Results

The Jefferson Center is a non-profit, non-partisan organization located in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Established in 1974, the Center is committed to generating thoughtful citizen input on issues of public significance. The principal activity of the Center is promoting and managing the **Citizens Jury Process**. The process features a randomly selected and demographically representative panel of citizens who meet for several days to closely examine important public policy issues and develop and present their findings to decision-makers and the public. To date, the Jefferson Center has conducted 28 Citizens Jury projects on a wide range of local, state and national issues.

To complement the **Citizens Jury Process**, the Jefferson Center has developed additional products and services to assist public decision-makers with generating thoughtful citizen input. Two of them are:

- **Feedback Panels:** a group of randomly selected citizens or clients who meet one or two days and examine a public agency or private organization or a service it provides and make recommendations about how it can better serve its client base.
- **Public Participation Workshops:** helping public agencies and other organizations expand and enhance their citizen participation initiatives, sharing ways to make citizen input more worthwhile for everybody involved.

In addition to the Citizens Jury on Chatfield Public Schools, recent projects conducted by the Jefferson Center include juries about the Orono Public Schools and the Dakota County Comprehensive Plan. The jury in Orono examined the needs facing the school district and recommended ways they thought those needs could be best addressed. The Jury's recommendations were made part of a property tax referendum that the community passed in September 1998. The jury in Dakota County examined the county's Comprehensive Plan and developed recommendations that were incorporated into the update of the Plan. During the summer of 1999, the Jefferson Center conducted a Citizens Jury on Minnesota Property Tax Reform with the Minnesota Department of Revenue. This jury examined the current property tax system and developed recommended improvements.

For further information about the Jefferson Center, the Citizens Jury process, or other products and services the Center provides, please call the Center at 612-926-3292 or visit the Center's web site at www.jefferson-center.org.