

**LEXINGTON SCHOOL COMMITTEE**  
**Tuesday, October 27, 2015**  
**School Administration Building, Lower Level Room 2**  
**146 Maple Street**

**PRESENT:** Jessie Steigerwald, William Hurley, Margaret Coppe, Judy Crocker

**ABSENT:** Alessandro Alessandrini

**Also present:** Alex Gentile, Minuteman; Elaine Ashton, Precinct 1

The Minutes were taken by Jessie Steigerwald.

Call to Order and Welcome: The meeting convened at 1:13 p.m.

Ms. Steigerwald called the meeting to order, and introduced committee members.

Public Comment

There were no public comments at the beginning of the meeting. Later in the meeting Ms. Elaine Ashton, Precinct 1, asked to be recognized with a question. Mr. Gentile also asked clarification question later in the meeting.

**Agenda: Special Town Meeting Preparation – Review of Presentation Material**

Ms. Steigerwald distributed updated copies of the draft memo that was a work in process to answer questions from the Capital Expenditure Committee (“CEC”) and Appropriation Committee (“AC”). Mr. Rod Cole, CEC and Mr. Andrei Radelescu-Banu, AC, had gathered questions from their committees and compiled them. Mr. Cole and Mr. Radelescu-Banu are working on writing the reports for Special Town Meeting and there is limited time to provide them with information to have things as accurate as possible before the report is finished. In addition, Ms. Colburn (AC) and Ms. Hai (CEC) had posed questions. Some questions raised had not been answered by the full Committee in prior meetings and the purpose of today’s meeting was to allow discussion by members so the report would reflect the Committee’s view.

The draft document referred to by members during the meeting was titled “School Committee Memo to Rod Cole and Andrei Radelescu-Banu, 10.27.15 / Draft.”

Ms. Steigerwald asked members to address specific more general policy matters first – and that if any members could remain to review the document more closely, it would be helpful. The priority was determining what the committee wished to do on specific topics so that the view of the committee could be captured in the document: Pelham, Lexington High School (“LHS”), elementary class size for planning purposes, middle school team numbers and sizes, Plan B if the projects did not gain support from Town meeting, potential impacts and alternatives.

Ms. Steigerwald updated members about meeting earlier in the week, on Monday October 26, 2015, with Jill Hai (CEC Chair), Dr. Czajkowski, Maureen Kavanaugh, Ms. Crocker and Ms. McDonough. Questions raised in this meeting and in the email from Mr. Cole, Mr. Radelescu-Banu and Ms. Colburn were reviewed with members.

One key question from CEC was around the elementary class size that would be the unit of measure for planning purposes. CEC wondered why the 21.5 was used by DiNisco, whether an earlier 21 and fraction was significant, or if the change was purposeful, and whether a rounded number of 21 or 22 could be useful. In the Monday meeting, several questions were generated that required further confirmation (number of teams, size of teams, impact of different class size units for planning) and Dr. Czajkowski said Ms. Steigerwald should get in touch with Mr. Goddard, Ms. Sugita and Ms. Kavanaugh for answers in preparation for today's meeting. Ms. Steigerwald shared the updated information with members. There had been one question about teams at Clarke and Ms. Monaco had confirmed that information. Ms. Sugita reviewed needs for special education space at Harrington if Lexington Children's Place re-located. Mr. Goddard said he would be available after 3:00 p.m. if the Committee had further questions.

**Pelham:**

Members discussed the potential uses for Pelham. Mr. Goddard provided DiNisco's evaluation for members to review. There was a question raised about whether if Pelham were purchased, would it require a special vote of School Committee or Town Meeting to take the property for use by the school system, or would it immediately be permitted. This would need more information from the Selectmen.

Other questions about Pelham:

1. If the building permits ten classes, and if two pre-fabricated spaces were added, would they be for classroom use, or specialists?
2. Could the building be in use by August 2017?
3. What would a Plan B be if the building could not be used by that date?
4. What were the construction costs? One estimate had been \$12.9 million, another was \$15 million. What did this range cover? (Members agreed to pass these questions to Mr. Goddard.)

Other comments and discussion points:

From earlier estimates, the Fiske addition project was estimated at \$14.3 million and would provide 3 classroom spaces plus other spaces. Members compared and discussed the \$12.9 million or \$15 million estimate for 12 classrooms and other spaces at Pelham on a per classroom basis, vs. as a whole project. Members discussed. Another area discussed was the time frame for the proposed projects at Pelham. Would the estimated costs enable the facility to last for five years as a school? Longer?

Question for Mr. Goddard: if pre-fabricated units at Bridge and Bowman could yield six classrooms, would it be 4 classrooms + 2 art/music spaces? Suggestion to ask administration to confirm, and if accurate, to prepare slide to show \$12.98 cost at Pelham would include pre-fabricated units plus site work and technology and security.

Ongoing Capital Projects: 10.27.15.4 "Deferred FY2016 and Proposed FY2017 to FY2020 Capital Requests." The CEC recommended we note capital projects that were already being carried as part of the 5-year plan. Mr. Goddard sent a document for today that lists these projects. Members reviewed the list and had some questions and comments.

It was agreed to note the cost of these projects was already anticipated. The science classrooms are one example.

General approach to addressing K-12 facilities and Lexington High School:

Members considered how to comment on LHS facility as it also is in need of additional space and more significant work. Mr. Hurley noted that when he was on CEC Estabrook and Lexington High School were the top two priorities. Ms. Crocker stated that in 2002 when the Harrington and Fiske schools replacement plans were being developed, the order for: (1) Harrington and Fiske; (2) Estabrook and Bowman; (3) Hastings and Bridge. Mr. Hurley suggested possibly in fall 2020 future School Committee could re-evaluate LHS after elementary and middle school projects are complete.

Middle School teams:

In the 10/20/15 DiNisco report it said Clarke had nine teams now. In a different report Clarke was noted as having ten teams. By email Ms. Monaco confirmed there were ten teams at Clarke this year but that it was a combination of 9 full teams and 1 half team. There are 3.5 teams for grade 6, 3.0 teams for grade 7, 3.0 teams for grade 8. Mr. Goddard confirmed by email that they had tested Clarke enrollment up to 862 and Diamond up to 968 for a total of 1830, the mid-point of the Enrollment Working Group (“EWG”) forecast. He also confirmed that Clarke was currently at 864 students, with 91 students per team. The administration was discussing an average team size of 85.

Elementary Class Size:

On elementary class size, several charts were distributed to members (listed at the end of these minutes in “Materials”), including materials prepared by Ms. Kavanaugh to show the average class size during the 2014-2015 academic year, projections and capacity figures. SMMA, MSBA and DiNisco all have different approaches. MSBA’s guideline is 23. DiNisco used 21.6 at one point.

Members reviewed a chart comparing two possible scenarios for elementary enrollment and how the class size used for planning purposes impacted the total number of classrooms required. These figures are imperfect as the numbers look across the system at all six elementary schools and actual enrollments may differ, so there is no way to know whether an individual school might have a “bubble” year within the student population and the need for an additional classroom (or the converse, a school where one grade had a lower distribution and did not require a 4<sup>th</sup> section in a particular grade). There was further discussion and consensus was reached on using 22, slightly higher than 21.5, but lower than MSBA guidelines.

If total number of elementary students is:	and the target class size is ...	we anticipate need # classrooms...	... round to ...
3,100	22	140.9	141
3,100	21.6	143.5	143 or 144
3,100	21.5	144	

If total number of elementary students is:	and the target class size is ...	we anticipate need # classrooms...	... round to ...
3,192	22	145	145

3,192	21.6	147.7	148
3,192	21.5	148.46	148 or 149

If Town Meeting does not support plan, what would be next steps or a “Plan B”?

At elementary, we could pursue leasing additional standard modular spaces. Higher class sizes. Loss of dedicated specialist space. At middle schools, for Clarke, consider fitting some number of leased spaces. For Diamond, same – fit some number of leased spaces to ease the overcrowding or provide specialist spaces. In summary, reconsider leasing temporary spaces for short-term relief. Would ask Dr. Czajkowski for her priorities and principals’ priorities for where spaces are most needed for general education, special education and specialists in this scenario.

At 2:36 Ms. Coppe left the meeting.

The rest of the meeting was a paragraph by paragraph review of the draft document to incorporate comments and updates based on the earlier discussion.

There was a recess from 3:05 to 3:29.

Some changes noted were: Page 1: Note address LHS 2019 or 2020; Page 3: Harrington 528 – 570; Page 3: Confirmation of the figures in charts; Page 7: If only 10 classrooms are ready, a lower number of students will be redistributed to that school. Updated draft will be circulated with watermark “pending admin. review”.

At 4:21 Mr. Hurley moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Crocker seconded the motion. At 4:21 the meeting was adjourned.

*Meeting Materials: Agenda; -HO.10.27.15.1 K-5 Capacity Analysis FY16 to FY20 as of 10/26/15, prepared by Ms. Kavanaugh; “Draft Potential Costs for Multiple School Projects” prepared by Pat Goddard, Director of Facilities” dated 10/27/15; “School Committee Memo to Rod Cole and Andrei Radelescu-Banu, 10.27.15 / Draft” Prepared by Jessie Steigerwald; HO 10.27.15.4 “Deferred FY2016 and Proposed FY2017 to FY2020 Capital Requests”; Materials handed out at October 20, 2015 School Committee meeting were also referenced by some members during the meeting, as were email messages from Mr. Goddard, Ms. Kavanaugh and Ms. Monaco (sent to Ms. Steigerwald): -K-5 Capacity Analysis FY16 to FY20 as of 10/20/15, prepared by Maureen Kavanaugh -10/20/15 Memo from Maureen Kavanaugh to School Committee, Dr. Czajkowski - Lexington Public Schools FY16 Snapshot of Enrollment as of October 1, 2015- Untitled chart prepared by administration depicting number of students from 2008 – projection for 2020, listing range of number of required classrooms- 10/20/15 “School Committee Multiple Schools Construction Project” presentation Prepared by DiNisco Design*

Place on Consent Agenda 2.23.16

Voted Approved by the School Committee 2.23.16