

**HHU Parent Advisory Committee to School Committee
Meeting 2
November 18, 2015
High School Library 1938 Room**

The second meeting of the HHU Parent Advisory Committee convened at approximately 7 pm.

In attendance: Facilitator Lisa Hicks; Town Counsel Tom Harrington; School Committee Chair Matt Kelley, Vice Chair Wendy Paul, Secretary Sharon Gray and members Patti Quigley and Tony Bent; Superintendent David Lussier; Assistant Superintendent Judy Belliveau; Karen Briggs and Tam Kennedy from Bates; Jessica Graham from Fiske; Maria Davis and Ingrid Houghton from Hardy; Michael Batka from Hunnewell; Kristen Whitaker and Beth Willett from Upham; Meghan LeBlanc from PAWS; Jackie Hogle and Julie Crafton from Schofield; Brook Rosenbaum and Mike Rodman from Sprague. Absent: Lou Madge, Jenn Fallon, Sarah Kulka

INTRODUCTIONS

David Lussier introduced Lisa Hicks as the facilitator for the remainder of the meetings. He also recognized Patti Quigley, School Committee member, who served as facilitator at first meeting. The School Committee wanted to bring in a third party in order to allow all School Committee members to fully participate.

Matt Kelley discussed process, makeup of the group and the requirement to have separate approval processes for each committee (SC and PAC) to vote.

Motion was made by Mr. Kelley that Lisa Hicks be appointed as chair of the HHU advisory committee and to subcommittee. Ms. Paul seconded. It was voted unanimously.

Lisa Hicks formally opened the HHU parent advisory committee at 7:10pm

Introduction of each member of committee:

Mr. Kelley moved that the School Committee appoint each member (each name read aloud by Ms. Paul) to the HHU parent advisory committee. It was seconded by Ms. Gray and was voted unanimously.

OPEN MEETING/ETHICS LAW REVIEW

Tom Harrington – Town Counsel (TC)

The Ethics Law is largely involved in financial interest of a citizen participating on a board/committee. The HHU PAC was formed by an invitation to participate whether or not there may be a financial interest. To avoid any possible future questions, if there may appear to be a financial interest resulting from the decisions of the committee, TC will provide an "Appearance of a Conflict" form to be filled out and TC will review and file it. The second Ethics law concern is that an individual cannot have two contracts with the town. For example, an employee of the town could not typically serve on the committee. Since there is no actual conflict in this case, the concern is resolved by filing the "Appearance of a Conflict" form.

Open meeting law requires that all committee deliberations be made in public. Emailing can only be used for logistics - setting time, place, agenda for a meeting. If a quorum participates on a serial email chain, this is an open meeting law violation.

Emails are public records. In order to separate private emails from public PAC emails, TC suggests setting up a separate email account for the PAC group.

Send any Ethics questions to TC. All other questions to Lisa then to Matt Kelley.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – October 27, 2015

Ms. Gray made a motion to approve the minutes for School Committee; Ms Quigley seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Ms. Hicks made a motion to approve the minutes for the PAC; Jessica Graham seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

REVIEW PROPOSED PROCESS

Presentation:

Meeting Norms and School Committee Guidelines from the Oct 27, 2015 meeting were reviewed.

Charge & Deliverable:

Provide a recommendation to the School Committee for a comprehensive town-wide solution to facility needs at Hardy, Hunnewell and Upham based on School Committee guidelines and previous School Facilities Committee work.

Proposed Structure of meeting work and Available Resources:

Meetings 2 & 3: Create a Level playing field

Town building process

Key reports & assumptions

Factors influencing SFC decisions

Deep dive: make information transparent

Meeting 4: Assess proposed and potential solutions

Consider additional data and relevant information

Gather PAC input

Make SFC assumptions and data accessible and transparent

Meeting 5: Draft summary of feedback and recommendation to SC;

Meeting 6: Finalize summary of feedback and recommendation to SC

Question on Final PAC recommendation to School Committee:

Process is for PAC to examine closely the SFC recommendation and provide feedback

School Committee will consider the recommendations from SFC and PAC and make informed decision

Q: What will happen if additional feasibility will be required after School Committee receives PAC recommendation?

A: SFC has budget remaining (approx. \$25k) if PAC has proposal to do additional work

Process for Agenda Development/ Potential Roles

Ms. Hicks will draft the agenda from input received via email or suggestions received at previous meeting, then will distribute the draft agenda via email and incorporate adjustments as possible {amended at 11-23-15 meeting}. PAC is comfortable with the process suggested.

Tonight's suggestions for the next meeting:

(1) Additional meetings and/or longer meetings – may cause constraints on bringing to ATM 2016

(2) Citizen Speak- addition to meeting– open at end of each meeting for 5 minutes- It was also suggested that the PAC members solicit info/questions from each of their constituent school communities.

Review Town's Overall Building Planning Process

Renovations/Construction of new buildings

Key players:

Building owners

FMD-Facilities Maintenance Department

PBC-Permanent Building Committee

SFC-School Facilities Committee

School Building Committee

Funding:

Appropriations for projects must be voted at Town Meeting

Sponsoring board brings request to Town Meeting

Funds are appropriated to either the sponsoring board or to the PBC

Types: Appropriations under the levy (under 2 ½%)

- Funds borrowed under levy are paid for through the operating budget of the Town
- Funds borrowed outside the levy require a Town Meeting vote and a debt exclusion vote

Phases:

- (1) Feasibility- sponsored by owners, requires an appropriation
- (2) Schematic design- preliminary plans, sponsored by owners, requires an appropriation
- (3) Detailed Design Development- takes schematic design and develops them into detailed construction documents for the bid process; managed by the PBC and sponsored by owners
- (4) Construction – requires an appropriation; managed by PBC with professional team and sponsored by owners. This phase for HHU would be funded by a debt exclusion

Conditions Assessment conducted under FMD with outside consultants was the very first phase in the overall plans for all schools, including Fiske and Schofield that are currently underway.

SFC Decision Points

Highlight assumptions and major issues influencing recommendation

- Conditions of building: SMMA school assessment (all schools except the High School)
- Limitations of renovation: ability to reconfigure for educational programming, life expectancy of the building, efficiencies
- Enrollment planning: enrollment declining, Town historically has been overaggressive in scaling back capacity
- Options/scenarios: North 40 property (decision process lengthy; not best location for a school), 494/496 Washington Street identified for the Senior Center
- Consolidation option: close Hardy or Upham; availability of land at Upham and traffic on Weston Road are drivers
- 3 school options: considered cost, target capacity (2,500 students) and desired school size (# of sections)

Life expectancy of buildings was discussed. After the 2003 renovation of Sprague and the 2004 renovation of Bates, what was the life expectancy of these buildings? The Fiske & Schofield renovations gave the buildings additional 25 year life expectancy.

Enrollment Presentation – David and Judy

WPS Assumptions

History on Neighborhood Schools and Assumptions-

- In 1911- 3 schools; peaked in 1964-75 with 12 schools;
- Over time there have been many configurations of grades in schools

Data on Enrollment Projections (1966 3,500students/ 1986 drop / 2006 2500)

- 1966 enrollment was 3,500 students; precipitous drop in '70s; peaked again in 2006-2008 at 2,500
- Elementary enrollment down by 174 since October, 2008
- CropperGIS hired to analyze and forecast enrollment rates. Factors considered: fertility rates, birth rates, economic trends, new homes, local homeowner demographics, etc.

A question was raised asked about specialized programs and were they taken into account when students not attending the school in the home district was analyzed? Also, what is the percentage of Wellesley students attending private schools? Has it changed? Matt Kelley had the data and between 15% and 30% have attended private school over the last several years.

Redistricting

A committee was formed to consider the disparities in class sizes and declining elementary school enrollment. It was determined in the end that redistricting would not solve the District's problems.

Class Sizes are 18 to 22 in grades K&1; 22 to 24 in grades 2-5

School Size & Capacity Needs

The variability has been within schools at specific grade levels. Ideally schools should be at 80-90% capacity, so a 500 student school would best suit an enrollment of 400-450 students. It's important to distinguish between capacity and student enrollment.

Classroom section configurations are important also. Three to four sections per grade level in a school is optimal for teacher collaboration, student placement, and flexibility of cohort size.

The HHU PAC agreed to extend the meeting to 9:15 to allow for questions.

Q: The predicted enrollment for Upham was 250-260 but only enrolled 225. How accurate is the Cropper model?

A: The CropperGIS model is conservative and we want to avoid not being able to meet enrollment with lack of capacity.

Q: Cost of staffing increasing significantly – how are we paying for the increases? Specifically how are we paying for insurance?

A: Salaries for staff is a school district’s largest expense. They are funded by the Town as part of the annual operating budget. Employee benefits are through the Town, who has made some changes to insurance. Need more clarification on the question.

Review Next Steps

Jessica Graham proposes that the next 2 meetings add an hour and meet from 7:00 – 10:00 pm. 11 voted “Yes” and 2 voted “No”.

5 minute Citizen Speak will be in the middle of the meeting. Guidelines: content and length of time. Citizen Speak is not a time for dialogue

Presentations, agendas, norms, staffing budget presentation to Advisory, etc. will be posted on HHU webpage.

Suggested agenda items for Meeting 3:

- Attending schools topic to continue
- Transparent & clear SFC considerations to recommendations of alternative locations
- Traffic flow and data brought to SFC
- Detail on costs considerations

The committee will have its third meeting on November 23rd at 7:00PM in the High School Library 1938 Room.

Ms. Hicks asked members for comments about the meeting:

<u>Plus</u>	<u>Changes</u>
Structure of meeting	Timing tough
On Topic	More liberal [flexible] around the time
Adding Extra hour	More conversation mixed with presentation
Adding Citizen Speak	
Respectful	

ADJOURNMENT

At approximately 9:25 pm, upon a motion made by Ms. Paul and seconded by Ms. Hoglund, the HHU PAC **VOTED unanimously** to adjourn.

On a motion by Matt Kelley, seconded by Sharon Gray, the School Committee **VOTED unanimously** to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Ball
Administrative Assistant to the
Assistant Superintendent of Finance & Operations