

## Minutes of Joint School Building Committee/School Committee

April 1, 2010

In attendance:

SBC: Terri Tsagaris, KC Kato, Bella Wong, Josh Frank, Chris Ketchen, John Moran, Rob Shupe, Geoff Witheford, Peter Corey

SC: Ilissa Povich, KC Kato, Suzy Littlefield, Suzi Newman, Steve Burt

Others: Frank Locker, Educational Consultant; Ruth Quinn Berdell

### Overview

Frank Locker made a presentation on classroom utilization and scheduling at the middle school. He began by summarizing the “middle school model” used at the WMS:

- House and cluster system for 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> grades, respectively
- Model is relationship building
- Grade-based
- Common planning time drives the linkage between teachers and cross-curriculum collaboration
- Basically operating three schools within one
- No sharing of spaces across grade which drives scheduling and optimization

### Options

Frank reviewed five options to determine if spaces could be captured within the middle school without any renovation. The options considered and analyzed are attached. Questions to be asked for each option:

- Have we honored the middle school model?
- What are the consequences to the program if begin to change the model?

Two of the five options yielded a net gain of classrooms.

**Option 2:** All 6 language teachers sharing spaces with others throughout the school as space is available per current schedules. **Net gain of four spaces.** The

impact to students is the potential loss of teaching time due to teachers travelling from classroom to classroom with no home base possibly taking longer than the four minutes allotted between periods, and loss of teaching time as a result of necessary set up time for each class. Additionally, you may have 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> graders travelling outside of their house/cluster system in order to reach those classrooms.

Option 3: All 6 language teachers sharing spaces with others throughout the school as space is available, but attempting to organize so language teachers might be able to teach two classes in a row in the same classroom. **Net gain of two spaces.** Difficulty is although gain three teaching spaces, one is lost to common teacher planning space. Same impact to students as Option 2.

Peter Corey asked about another option which would basically combine Options 2 and 3. This will be analyzed. By opening up 8<sup>th</sup> grade further so that they are travelling throughout the building to unused spaces, this erodes the house/cluster model by integrating 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> graders, which the model does not favor. Frank believes that additional net gain may result in another two spaces at best.

### **Timing of Space Needs**

KC presented a time line for when the spaces are needed: 7 spaces in FY12, 4 spaces in FY13 and 4 spaces in FY14. She also reviewed the various internal renovation options that exist:

- Convert Fitness Center to Science Lab; cost of \$287,000
- Convert METCO office spaces to SpEd space; cost of \$15,000
- Convert Fitness Center to classroom; no cost
- Practice rooms converted to SpEd space; cost of \$90,000

Preliminary estimates for modulars:

- 6 classrooms and 2 science labs; cost of \$2,500,000
- 7 classrooms and 2 science lab; cost of \$2,400,000

### **Other options suggested at meeting:**

- Look at 4<sup>th</sup> floor practice rooms that aren't being used at all because spaces do not meet building and fire codes. This is approximately 500 square feet and the Committee will determine the cost for converting this space to teacher planning space or learning center. Too small for classroom.
- Are there any spaces in Central Administration that might be captured by moving Facilities Maintenance out of space? Approximately 325 square feet; possible use as teacher planning space but will need some renovation to separate from Central Administration.
- Can we "made do" with the Science Labs we have by sharing among all grades? The Committee will look at this.
- Is there a number of modulares that can be leased rather than purchased if they will be needed for a shorter period of time? Will this save money? Rob Shupe's preliminary response is that there will be a problem with this because the leased modulares will likely be more like trailers and the neighbors will not be in favor of this. Additionally, the site preparation work is the same whether modulares are in place for three, five or eight years. Finally, Terri spoke with Kathy Mullaney of the PBC and she indicated this is a decision for the PBC during the design phase. This will be discussed with PBC.

The Committee concluded that while there may be some flexibility in terms of spaces that can be captured depending upon scheduling and utilization optimization, it will not be possible to capture the 15 spaces needed by FY14. Additionally, the most cost-effective option for adding spaces (other than through utilization and scheduling) is modular construction. The question is how many modulares will be needed to get through the enrollment bubble. Given that modulares will be needed, the Committee voted 7-0 (2 not present) to move forward with design and permitting funds at ATM, and ask for full construction funding at a STM in the fall of 2010 so that the necessary spaces will be ready for the FY12 school year (September 1, 2011).

The Committee will endeavor to respond to the questions raised on different options prior to the Advisory Committee meeting scheduled for Monday, April 5 at 6:15 pm.

