

District Enrollment and School Size Committee  
Minutes of January 22, 1998 Meeting  
at R.M.H.S Media Center

ATTENDANCE

Committee members in attendance were: Richard Davidson, Beth Klepeis, Michael Shea, Gail Phillips-Spence, Roger Sanstad, Margaret Donnelly-Moran, Donna Fallon, Laura Moriarty, Paul Guerrette, Lisa Pittella, Karen Callan, Gary Nihan, Anne Coneeney, Sally Mucica, Pam Girouard, Jane Hand, Deidre Reilly, Ed Callahan, Carol Sheehan, Susan Cotter and Katherine McKie.

Absent were: Dianne Giglio, Roberta Carnes, George Hines, Larry Penta, Mark Dwyer, Peg Russell

**The Meeting came to order at 7:02 PM**

PUBLIC INPUT:

•Gene Broadway stated that in anticipation of this being the last meeting he wanted to let the committee know that he will miss meeting and discussing the issues surrounding the enrollment crisis with all.

•Alex McCray stated that he is concerned with the fiscal reality of some of these projects and would like to recommend that we only present plans to the school committee that are a fiscal reality.

COMMITTEE REACTIONS / COMMENTS ON PUBLIC INPUT:

•Paul Guerrette stated that he felt strongly that we must present all proposals regardless of the fiscal impact. He further stated that proposed capital plan of \$7.5 million may not provide the long range answer to the enrollment crisis. He felt that it was the responsibility of this committee to bring forward all recommended proposals despite their fiscal impact, as long as they provide a solid educational response to the problem.

REVIEW / COMMENTS ON PUBLIC CORRESPONDENCE:

•Gail Phillips Spence stated that she had received many phone calls that supported a plan that included a Centralized Kindergarten Center in connection with an addition to Barrows School as suggested by committee member Gary Nihan. •Karen Callan indicated that this concept was closely looked at by the Centralized Kdg. Committee but that at this time it was not feasible from a financial and logistics standpoint. A detailed statement to that effect will be included in the final report that is presented to the School Committee.

REVIEW OF MINUTES FROM 1/20/98 MEETING:

•Gail Phillips Spence made corrections regarding comments contributed to her. Karen Callan (Secretary for 1/20/98 meeting) stated that she will make corrections for the final copy.

DISCUSSION ON PROPOSED MATRIX PLAN TO CLARIFY FINAL RECOMMENDATION REPORT:

•Richard Davidson explained his thoughts regarding the use of the matrix to help to clarify our four recommendations to the School Committee. • Gail Phillip Spence reminded the ESS Committee that we already have a prior established weighting system. (This system was developed by our first sub-committee.) Gail suggested that we backtrack and refer to this system when we develop the matrix.

•Richard Davidson announced that we will not be meeting with the School Committee on Feb. 5th, as scheduled, to present our final report. There was a conflict with two members of the SC and he would notify the members of ESSC when we would meet. Richard strongly suggested that all members of the ESSC, if possible, be present at this meeting. Richard also recommended that members of the ESSC, other than the four School Administrators, make the presentation to the SC. •Ed Callahan suggested that all proposals have a breakdown of overall costs, of a project, and the net cost to the town after SBAB reimbursement. He also expressed a desire to have the year of project completion attached to the report.

• Beth Klepeis cautioned that the actual start dates may be unrealistic based on the necessary requirements that must occur before submittal to the SBAB. • Gary Nihan suggested a time frame that only included the anticipated duration of the project in lieu of a completion date. The ESSC agreed that we would follow this format. •Gary Nihan asked if it was realistic for the ESSC to attach a specific % of anticipated students that would be redistricted in each plan. He felt that there could be several solutions

that could vary significantly from our % estimate. Gary also questioned whether or not that the redistricting task was our charge. •Paul Guerrette suggested we use a percentile range. • Ed Callahan proposed we use the terms **minimum**, **moderate** and **maximum** to describe the range. It was also suggested that we use these terms to describe the impact on bussing. The ESSC agreed on these proposals. •Paul Guerrette commented that the matrix left out the impact of **future programming needs**. It was agreed that this aspect be included. •Richard Davidson felt that other areas needed to be addressed and clarified such as **safety to students during project** and the **impact on safety with regards to traffic**. It was agreed by the ESSC that these were two separate items and to place these as separate headings on the matrix in order to give a more complete picture of each specific proposal.

DEVELOPMENT OF MATRIX BY ESS COMMITTEE AT LARGE: See actual Matrix for detail

**a. Build a New Elementary School** • Paul Guerrette led this discussion. The three solutions of this proposal- Maximum Solution, Moderate Solution and a Minimum Solution were each reviewed and placed in the matrix.

**b. Build a Centralized Kindergarten** • Karen Callan led this discussion along with input from this sub-committee. The ESSC was reminded by Karen that the final report of this sub-committee recommended the exclusion of this proposal to the SC because of the cost and the improbable logistics of this proposal. The sub-committee felt that to make this plan viable it would be necessary to combine it with another proposal such as an addition to Barrows. It was agreed that the ESSC final report to the SC address this proposal by including a statement that summarized the issues surrounding the exclusion of this potential solution. It was determined that a statement that recommended that this plan be reviewed further if a site become available that met the necessary criteria for a Centralized Kindergarten Center.

**c. Addition / Renovation to Barrows and Killam and Addition to Birch Meadow** • Beth Klepeis led discussion on this proposal. Corrections were made to the sq. footage calculations in this proposal to maintain consistency with the other reports. Discussion also focused on the actual cost of this project and appropriate revisions were made. Additional discussion was held on the formula used in this proposal to determine class size and range. It was determined that this proposal was consistent with the other reports and would not be adjusted.

MEETING CLOSURE:

•Margaret Donnelly Moran stated it was unlikely that at this late hour we would complete the matrix and draw up our final statement. Margaret recommended that we adjourn for the evening and meet at a later date. After much discussion it agreed that the ESSC meet on 1/26/98 at %:00PM in the RMHS Media Center to conclude our agenda.

PUBLIC INPUT:

•Alex McGray suggested that the ESSC look closed at the actual costs which would include additional administrative start up costs of each proposal. •Jackie Mandell stated that the ESSC take a close look at the lack of sidewalks at some of the proposed solutions. •Gene Broadway felt that the calculations used to determine class size were not accurate.

**Meeting Adjourned at 10:38 PM**

Respectfully submitted,

Gary M. Nihan