

Mount Greylock Regional School District School Committee

Location: Zoom Remote Meeting

Date: Thursday, Jan. 14, 2021

Time: 6:00 pm

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://zoom.us/j/97694688057?pwd=YitHWUJKbmo5NnhVWENieDJKWDINQT09>

Meeting ID: 976 9468 8057

Passcode: 509607

Per Governor Baker's order suspending certain provisions of the Open Meeting Law, M.G.L. c. 30A sec. 20, the public will not be allowed to physically access this School Committee meeting.

Please see our Public Comment Policy for Guidelines regarding Public Comment at Remote Meetings:

<https://z2policy.ctspublish.com/masc/browse/mtgreylockset/mtgreylock/BEDH-R>

Open and Executive Session Agenda

- I. Call to order
- II. MISSION: At Mount Greylock Regional School District, our mission is to create a community of learners working together in a safe and challenging learning environment that encourages restorative based processes, respect, inclusive diversity, courtesy, integrity, and responsibility through high expectations and cooperation resulting in life-long learning and personal growth.
- III. Public Comment
- IV. Approval of December 22, 2020 minutes **VOTE**
- V. Business Administrator Update
 - A. School Council FY22 Budget Priorities by MGRS
- VI. MGRS fields
 - A. Presentation with Perkins Eastman
 - B. Value engineering options to determine scope **VOTE**
 - C. Timeline, responsibilities, and next steps **VOTE**
- VII. Superintendent Updates
 - A. Education Updates
 - B. Student Opportunity Act Plan **VOTE**
- VIII. Finance Subcommittee Report
 - A. Approval for use of WES Renewal Fund (HVAC Project) **VOTE**

- IX.** Upcoming Meetings
 - A. MASC workshop, January 16th
 - B. Finance Subcommittee, January 28th
 - C. School Committee, February 11th
- X.** Other business not anticipated by the Chair within 48 hours of meeting
- XI.** Motion to move into Executive Session with no intent to return to Open Session per M.G.L. Chapter 30A, Section 21(a)(3) discuss strategy with respect to collective bargaining with Mount Greylock Educators Association (all units)

This meeting will be broadcast on WilliNet TV Channel 1302 in Williamstown. It will be posted on the MGRSD YouTube page within 24 hours of the meeting.

<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCLR0nrLhpZHlyPFUhaMxPSg>

Mount Greylock Regional School District School Committee

Location: Zoom Remote

Meeting Date: Tuesday, December 22, 2020

Time: 6:00 pm

Special Open and Executive Session Agenda

- I. Call to order
- II. MISSION: At Mount Greylock Regional School District, our mission is to create a community of learners working together in a safe and challenging learning environment that encourages restorative based processes, respect, inclusive diversity, courtesy, integrity, and responsibility through high expectations and cooperation resulting in life-long learning and personal growth.
- III. Public Comment
- IV. Approval of minutes A. December 8, 2020 VOTE B. December 14, 2020 (public comment session) VOTE C. December 14, 2020 (presentation/questions session) VOTE
- V. Student Representative Update
- VI. Athletic Director Updates
- VII. Principal Updates
 - a. Lanesborough Elementary School
 - b. Williamstown Elementary School
 - c. Mount Greylock Regional School
- VIII. Acting Director of Pupil Services Update
- IX. Director of Curriculum and Instruction and Director of Academic Technology Updates
- X. Superintendent Updates
 - a. Flu Vaccine update
 - b. Grounds update c
 - c. Student Learning Time regulations
- XI. Business Administrator Update
- XII. Finance Subcommittee Update
 - a. Approval for use of WES Renewal Fund (HVAC Project) VOTE
 - b. MGRS Fields Perkins Eastman Proposal VOTE
 - c. MGRS Renewal Fund VOTE
- XIII. School Committee workshop date discussion (Jan. 9 or Jan. 16)
- XIV. Other business not anticipated by the Chair within 48 hours of the meeting
- XV. Motion to move into Executive Session with no intent to return to Open Session per M.G.L. Chapter 30A, Section 21(a)(3) to discuss strategy with respect to collective bargaining with Mount Greylock Educators Association (all units) This meeting will be broadcast on WilliNet TV channel 1302 in Williamstown

Called to order at 6:01pm

Present: Christina, Carrie, Steve, Curtis, Michelle, Jose, Julia

Also present: Jake

I. Call to order

6:01pm

II. MISSION: At Mount Greylock Regional School District, our mission is to create a community of learners working together in a safe and challenging learning environment that encourages restorative based processes, respect, inclusive diversity, courtesy, integrity, and responsibility through high expectations and cooperation resulting in life-long learning and personal growth.

III. Public Comment

First: Steve Dravis:

Dear School Committee,

Please reconsider the district's practice of not posting supporting material for the committee's deliberations (i.e., the "packet") until after a meeting has occurred. As you know, district policy requires members of the public who wish to speak to submit comments two hours before a virtual meeting or to sign up to comment at an in-person meeting before it begins.

Denying people the ability to make informed comments serves no public purpose.

When packets were printed on paper, it made sense to limit pre-meeting distribution to the committee members. It is 2020, and you have the capability to publish non-sensitive materials online well in advance of meetings.

The only possible reason not to do so is to prevent robust public discourse. That may be the goal of some School Committee members. I am not sure it is a goal shared by your constituents.

Respectfully,

Stephen Dravis

Williamstown resident

Second: Cathy Keating:

Comment on Agenda item XV: Reiterate support to in-person learning, as soon as possible. Feel covid-19 numbers in our community do not necessitate remote learning. If review numbers From research around the country a 5% positive test rate seems a reasonable number, only one week where the number in a town was above 5%. For Williamstown when had high numbers was due to one incident at the Pine Cobble school and one incident at the Williamstown Commons; neither really affects our teachers and schools. Would like an explanation as to why a majority of our children are doing remote learning. Children and

families are suffering the consequences of this. Imagine would be many teachers supporting in-person learning, hear an exceedingly hard task to teach remote. Fear, anxiety, political pressures should not be where guidelines come from. Should come from public health experts. Making crisis worse by doing remote.

	17-Dec	10-Dec	3-Dec	27-Nov	19-Nov	12-Nov	5-Nov	29-Oct	22-Oct	14-Oct	7-Oct	30-Sep	23-Sep	16-Sep
Lanesborough	2.2	3.26	5.63	4.05	2.77	3.11	1.11	0.61	0.64	0	0	0	0	0
Williamstown	1.27	0.42	0.21	0.13	0.004	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.12	0.12	0.05

Ali Carter:

Dear School Committee,

As a child, the sports field was where I learned some of life’s greatest skills: teamwork, leadership, decision-making, commitment, determination, communication, self-confidence.

As a community member and parent, I hear so many stories about our athletic programs and the life-skill-building and joy they bring to our students - and also how our current infrastructure is insufficient for Mt Greylock’s athletics needs.

This is why previous subcommittees prioritized a new playing field, on top of the improvements necessary to bring current facilities into compliance with Title IX and ADA requirements. And the analyses conducted by the Phase 2 subcommittee led them to favor a Brockfill turf field over a new grass field for a number of specific reasons, including that a grass field is likely more expensive than a turf field over the turf’s lifespan.

Thanks to the gift from Williams College, the School Committee is in a position to not only provide our students with increased opportunities for athletics and the learning experiences that come with them, but also set aside \$1,000,000 in a renewal fund to help offset costs of major school needs in the future, reducing the burden on our towns and taxpayers.

How amazing is that? What an incredible opportunity for our children, the district, and our communities.

I encourage you to support the efforts of the Phase 2 subcommittee and move forward with the bidding process for a Brockfill field, with the knowledge that your support will positively impact the lives of our students for years to come.

Sincerely,

Ali Carter

Williamstown parent of three and 2018-2020 School Committee member

IV. Approval of minutes A. December 8, 2020 VOTE B. December 14, 2020 (public comment session) VOTE C. December 14, 2020 (presentation/questions session) VOTE

Dec 8th minutes: moved by Curtis, seconded by Michelle, passes unanimously.

Julia: at the last meeting, under educational update: didn't ask about creative ways to involve students, was in response to comment from Cathy Keating on how to engage. Superintendent responded saying looking at potential resources for mental health, wanted these efforts noted.

December 14th: 5pm Session: Public Comment: Moved by Julia, seconded by Curtis, passes unanimously.

December 14th: 7pm Session: Moved by Michelle, seconded by Julia, passes unanimously.

V. Student Representative Update

Charlie McWeeny: Thanks to all for the work this year. First order was to have elections (didn't have last spring due to covid). Now have 20 student council members and 3 others representing student perspectives. One issue spent time on recently was web access on school issued chromebooks. Met with Ms Kaatz, want to make sure students have access to all sites they need.

Students spending a lot of time on screens, eye strain, mental health issues. Many students are doing really well and thriving in remote environment. Also many who are really struggling to stay engaged in classes, struggling with impacts of being isolated, struggling with keeping up with work when not directly in contact with teachers. Lot of things can do to address. School council met with principal, talked about ideas (breaks in classes to look away from screens, lesson HW done on computer, break in days). Hope of many students to return to hybrid / in-person as soon as safely can. Hope committee will look at the metrics, hopefully in the next few months teachers and others will get vaccines.

Organized ugly sweater day, great participation, students sent in pictures, sent to faculty panel of judges. Students engaged / interested in, happy to continue.

Lot of thought went in to snow day policy, hope for some snow days after February break, lot of students / teachers expressed remorse over loss of snow days, especially in a year as challenging as this one. With possibility of return to in-person learning would rather take a day in June than have it at home on computer and play outside safely socially distancing now. Some teachers with tech issues teaching from home, absent teachers, or with kids. Amazing that can do but not something should have to do. One teacher had to drive to school for internet access.

Steve: last year were looking at changing the start time, is that going to be discussed again this year? I know not on the front-burner now....

Charlie: Yes, not top priority now, but now that some students are back in school to some levels, hoping to find time / space / energy to discuss. Given sleep deprivation.... Thanks for bringing up.

VI. Athletic Director Updates

Had students involved in fall activities. Great job (virtually) with clips creating a Shakespeare show. Pen-pal program up and running, pairing WES/LES with MtG kids, the MtG kids will write letters.... Hope to get a big sib / little sib, hope to meet in the spring if possible.

Started practices on Monday, given that still in remote learning added some more modifications, spread out more, focused on individual work. Had 63 Nordic skiers, didn't really impact much, hold off on races as that would involve passing. Have 48 basketball players, each group twice a week, 12 in a gym at a time, going incredibly well, have about 2 kids per hoop: dribble, shoot, conditioning. No scrimmaging. No game situations. Each goes in for about 90minutes.

Michelle: question on fitness program. Is that happening?

Lindsey: want it to, contingent on kids in building, if hybrid cohort A meets after school on Mondays/Tuesdays, cohort B on Thursdays/Fridays. Hope to start after new year if in building.

VII. Principal Updates

a. Lanesborough Elementary School

Nolan: Parent / teacher conferences ended Dec 2nd. Great turnout, only missing a few families. Report cards going out soon. End of trimester was the 11th. Still doing wyverns of the week, have had about 24-25, and one faculty of the week. Had first meeting of a committee yet to be named, looks at culture / climate of the school, make sure everyone feels welcome. Last Friday did loco for cocoa: mugs given out to people who purchased mugs, teachers dressed up, kids got gifts. Universal screener coming out next week. Tomorrow at 6/630 doing winter jam: cozy in jammies and cocoa, read books to kick break off.

Jose: Curious about the committee, can you say more?

Nolan: grass roots, ground up, reached out to community / staff, want every student to show up and feel that they belong.

Carrie: Following up, is this connected to a school improvement goal?

Nolan: Yes.

Julia: Love this topic. Is there a way to measure growth? Which are having the greatest impact?

Jake: Have applied to work with Deep. Want to develop some solid measurements that we can continue to use. From work in another district, family / student surveys are good ways to collect, need to be measurable so can see making progress.

Carrie: What is a good way for those of us who are not parents at a particular school to stay in touch with life at that school? Are there newsletters? What would you suggest?

Nolan: weekly update, can send to school committee. Instagram, PTO page. (Similar at other schools).

School committee will be put on all the lists.

b. Williamstown Elementary School

Kristen: we did it, continue to move forward. Had a school council meeting, great conversation on the school improvement plan. Moved students to remote, some bumps but nothing couldn't problem solve. Lot of teamwork. Big shout-out to WYC, been our right hand / wingman; absolutely critical / crucial in getting our students some support during these remote times. Teachers have been able to go over there and talk to students. Have had material distribution dates, have in gym, parents pull up in bus lane and distribute. Have gotten very good at sending.

Another new staff member: Jill on staff as reading specialist. Lucky to have her on staff, been in building a few times, hit the ground running.

Pushed out today (from Cindy): online collaboration tool for teachers. What are your solutions to the challenges? End of trimester reflection.

Went around building with Cindy in elf pajamas, bringing cheer.

Jose: Thanks. Are you contact with LES team? How do we hear about how the remote academy is?

Kristen: Absolutely; Nolan, Cindy and I have daily phone calls, multiple times a day. The Elementary Curriculum Team. Streamline, same across the board as meet up at MtG, want to make sure all have same opportunities.

Jake: Second part: Will touch on later. Remote academy interesting creature almost as a third school. As hit end of first trimester seeing some things not expecting as newish region. Some challenges working thru. Still a very good option for families with certain concerns.

Jose: Who is the point of contact?

Jake: In Jan will bring a proposal to name someone on staff as principal. About 60 kids in program.

Michelle: How are we monitoring progress of remote students?

Jake: Right now struggling with issues of WES/LES having two different ways of reporting student progress to families. Technical issues related to powerschool.

Nolan: think doing track my progress. (Joelle / Elea affirming).

Michelle: parents being willing to contact you directly is a credit to you, have enjoyed the shift in approachability of the district.

c. Mount Greylock Regional School

JakeS: Student support center / life skills operating MTuThF, serving about 25 students, supported by about 10 staff, room for up to 60. Thank all the staff to keep students safe and fed. All meals are free till the rest of the year.

Lunch: families who may qualify for free or reduced lunch should go to our website and apply; won't make a difference this year as all are free, but will receive next round of cards with benefits, details will go out tomorrow, likely that this benefit will be extended. If not sure if qualify recommend go and fill out.

Now including teletherapy in our responses, ink still wet, controlled by our student support team.

Additional planning for direct instruction on social / emotional. Pilot program will focus on middle school, continue second step curriculum (already in LES/WES).

Julia: How is this implemented?

JakeS: Every student takes wellness at some point, can take out for 2 weeks and cycle thru a mini-program. In beta phases of planning.

Michelle: Agree with Julia, not everyone takes enrichment (band). Free and reduced lunch: confidential.

JakeS: Some schools have so many people on free and reduced that no need to apply. Here step you have to take to be eligible.

VIII. Acting Director of Pupil Services Update

Patrick:

Extension for self-assessment from last year extended, submitted in fall.

ELLs, Opt-Out students, FELs, ELs with Disabilities, parents who need translation or interpreter services

Circuit breaker funds submitted in June, have to disburse this fall.

Have submitted for 274 grant, 298 (early childhood).

Speech and language pathologist at MtG, started last Monday.

Covid-19 learning plans went out, took while to put together, hoping to host a parents' right to know. Might coordinate.

Carrie: question on circuit breaker. Can you talk about that?

Patrick: spent above threshold, can ask about reimbursement. Only affects about 10 kids in the district.

IX. Director of Curriculum and Instruction and Director of Academic Technology Updates

Joelle:

Have 12 new teachers spread across schools, each assigned a mentor. Based on Dept of Education. Teachers meet on own with mentors for all kinds of reasons from building based practices to doing report cards to troubleshooting issues with students. Then all meet once a month. We love it when in person, working fine virtually. Different topic each month. Met full day in summer and introduced to district staff. Had guest speakers come in: Adam Dupere on special ed. Workshop on data driven instruction with Ben Klompus.

Will talk on social / emotional learning, will read Stamped. Different opportunities thru year for reflection / problem solving. Nice to have such a variety of new teachers ranging from special ed to music and everywhere in between. Don't always have such a nice mix b/w buildings.

Student Opportunity Act Plan: due mid-Jan. Talked about last year, extension, little more than originally planned, exciting. Focusing on early literacy programs in early grades, goal is to increase proficiency in reading in elementary schools, try to catch before grade three. Use funds to align curricula b/w LES and WES, specifically purchase foundation material (used in WES for years). Looking at Hegarty program that many across the state are using. Another goal is a district wide writing program for WES/LES. Consider new core reading period; using reading street right now, purchased many years ago, becoming out-dated, research on it not as great as before. Talking around \$30,000, will build stipends. Due in mid-Jan.

Final item: have launched a bi-monthly newsletter on teachers and tech in MtG. We know teachers are very busy, trying to keep eyes on great practices, find good podcasts, speakers, ... that we can share and push out twice a month to all three schools. One recently was on holidays and how we can be inclusive of celebrations not at the expense of celebrating nothing. Have done 4-5. Great collaboration, lot of overlap b/w curriculum and technology.

Michelle: Are you looking to replace reading street with another core program?

Joelle: Open for discussion, perhaps yes. Our reading scores (benchmark, MCAS) have been pretty flat, main goal will be to boost tier 1 instruction. We want to increase the capacity for teachers presenting material to all students, regardless of special needs / intervention. Focus is knowing if doing all we can might decrease need for interventions.

Jose: Genuine concern about the effectiveness of the asynchronous portion of hybrid model. Article in Atlantic that K-2, K-3 could be 22 months behind where they should be; pandemic is not just stalling but possibly regressing. Any data on how doing in our district?

Joelle: Great question, everyone worried about this. Not prepared to go in depth, have some data. Meeting with WES/LES principals. Looking at benchmark data. Temperature checks to see how kids doing (track my progress – use that 3 times a year). Use divels next, tool for reading fluency. These can be a red flag for other issues in reading. Then meet with principals, teachers, specialists, make determinations, do interventions. Was expecting fall benchmark to be abysmal and show real serious gaps. Looking at what a typical grade would be, not

seeing much of a difference which is great. Looking at 2nd grade this year (was 1st grade last year), more pronounced in some grades, in general outlook much better than thought. Everyone I've spoken with shares your concern. Conversations on asynchronous learning. Aware may not be using asynchronous time as well as possible. Teachers / administrators share the student concerns.

Jose: Are there plans to dive deeper into the data to see how we are doing as a district?

Joelle: Plan is to continue to use the tools we have, use the grant to supplement what we are doing. Zero complacency.

Jose: Concern about the remote learning model we are in, with synchronous and asynchronous. Is the part synchronous / part asynchronous more or less effective than what we started with?

Joelle: Will defer to Jake. Have heard comments, trying to foster independence in learners, will have great payoffs later. Issue in the state, discussion with commissioner of education. Discussion with MGEA on this.

Jake: Will get deeper into that in a presentation later tonight.

Elea: Teaching and Tech newsletter (on Tuesdays, triple T). Organic, checking in, seeing what is going on with our teachers and seeing what they need. Might scrap a plan we have based on what needs are shared.

Big project moving forward: mobile device management. Manually updating ipads for special ed students, cumbersome. Inventory updating, checking compliance on chromebooks. Some of the chromebooks are too far behind to receive some automatic updates, shoring up some systems. Finalizing single signing system in elementary schools. Thought was ready but a few small things, haven't pushed out to families yet. Pushing out mental health screener PK-12 at three schools. Parents will receive a form straight from Pearson next week at LES and MG, done at WES. Have parent, teacher, student form for grades 5-12, can look at the data and see how much support need to provide, are students struggling that we're not seeing. Telemental -health program to be finalized. Might be cost issues for families. Finalizing partnerships, reviewing referrals.

Lastly parents / students using help desk: helpdesk @ school domain. System has worked really well; email tech desk and funnels.

Jose: heard many teachers are struggling with broadband connection.

Elea: In spring inventoried teachers regarding hardware, internet, software, provided hotspots / whatever needed and set people up. If having a hard time have reached out to me, if new concerns addressing with individual teacher. Some education regarding what can overwhelm bandwidth speed is important. Don't realize that if they have too many processes on computer, far from router, if 3 in house are zooming – these can bog down speed. Lot of individual troubleshooting as situations different.

Carrie: how do we sign up for teaching and tech newsletter?

Joelle: will add.

Michelle: how many kids / teachers had issues with tech during snow day?

Elea: had some, but nothing super drastic, not an atypical day.

X. Superintendent Updates (see packet for presentation slides)

- a. **Flu Vaccine update:** students expected to have received a vaccine unless have an exemption. Deadline has been extended thru Feb 28, 2021. Will comply with updated state immunization, part of our guidelines in policy manual. While school committee could set a new deadline, neither I nor school attorneys suggest do this.

Carrie: What percent have submitted proof /

- b. **Grounds update:** The bleachers and press box will be dismantled and taken for disposal by district staff beginning any day now. Just an FYI. This work will be done in ways that protect the skiing space as much as possible.
- c. **Student Learning Time regulations:** Union implications. Different type of planning. Some families appreciate having smaller groups to teach and learn, cutting time in half for some / cohort size positive experience for some. (Michelle: lose a lot of learning time managing with students online, harder when more remote at same time.)

Jose: part synchronous / part asynchronous doesn't necessarily mean less screen time. Are we in a position as a district to say something about the cost of the pandemic (academic, social / emotional). Lost hours of live instruction, what are the long-term consequences? Are we willing / planning on assessing the situation on how our kids are performing / developing / glowing? If accumulating lots of lost hours of instruction, summer school model to recoup some of the lost hours?

Jake: Whether local conversations with colleagues or county wide, all thinking about the summer / 2021-2022 school year look like. Extended school day for some? Vacation programs? Harm being done from situation, impacts families in different ways. Mental wellness harder to measure, rolling things out. Cost of not having in-person school is higher than coming down with virus that may/may not have severe impact on kids: easier scenario to measure. Damages being done that we / pediatricians can see, others won't see for a long time.

Jose: Soon have to go to towns for budget. Are we planning for summer where will need some resources to address these issues?

Jake: In process of thinking about this. Hope this is a good way to spend additional federal funds. Treat as fund for compensatory education. Could pay Williams students to help tutor. Run small groups with tiered responses for students with similar gaps. Could be traditional summer classes.

Michelle: assuming live, in-person in hybrid is math / English, other subjects asynchronous. How much loss do we have in science / social studies. Guess approximately where we were last year.

Jake: Yes, about to do Winter benchmarks. Maybe fun science camp, work with community partners.

Jose: Do you see a needs-based approach to help families with demonstrated need to access such programs?

Jake: Would see those as appropriate expenditures of dollars, something should consider anyway on providing rich experiences to bring kids together.

XI. Business Administrator Update

Joe: How do we harness this year's education so better prepared for next year? Hit after budgets prepared. Next year will be different. Lot of items from this year (remote academy) up in air for next year. How do we manage for next year? Local / state / federal budgets have never been this up in the air. Entering third and final year of contract with union, about 2/3^{ds} of budget comes from here. With all of these lot of uncertainty.

June 8 / May 18: town meetings, vote on budget.

March 4th: school committee votes on budget. Before give sense to finance committees where things are going.

Late Jan/Feb: set tuition rates for towns tuitioning in.

Jose: more information about process.

Joe: Work with finance committee, present to school committee.

Carrie: Add date of 45 days before town meeting (May 4th) when vote, if not ready will schedule special meetings (embedded in regional agreement).

XII. Finance Subcommittee Update

a. Approval for use of WES Renewal Fund (HVAC Project) VOTE

Carrie: FinComm met last week on Dec 17th for 90minutes. Overall report: draft minutes in school committee packet, number of related documents, reviewed warrants, discussed items here. All three listed here as votes, only first coming with a recommendation. Joe and I had a brief conversation about HVAC, would like to postpone vote as waiting for document that has more detail.

In discussion on WES renewal fund looked at agreement, looked at funds available. About \$1,625,918 in renewal fund in principal, \$51,000 or so in spending. Expect HVAC to come in around \$21,000, within spending account amount.

Discussed proposal from Perkins-Eastman. Vote attached to this in case school committee ready to move forward. In packet, with historical documents. Include 2016 proposal outlining

early thinking on gift, docs on gift, listing of schools with artificial turf. Did not take a position, members felt it should be a full school committee discussion. Did not take a position on MtG renewal fund for same reason. Investment doc produced by Joe on how much different amounts would have grown from 2000. Talked about big ticket items that will need to be dealt with in next 10-20 years (roofs, windows). Supplements detailed notes from Steve.

Questions raised in FinComm on process, proposal, turn over to Joe. Vote in favor would move process forward. Inheriting vote from previous school committee in Oct that brought us here. What would it take to create bid documents so can put out to bid if choose to do so? Committee is bound to process but only to the point of next vote. If vote doesn't favor putting proposal forward need to regroup. If vote in favor then we are moving forward with the synthetic turf, ADA and title IX compliance and value engineering process, and track as an add-alternate. I'm on the record of having voted in favor of moving forward in Oct, I would like to see us put in a turf field and a track and have a million set aside to grow over next decade. That's my position. Think would be better to hear from Joe.

b. MGRS Fields Perkins Eastman Proposal VOTE

Joe: Direct and targeted response from P-E on how to get us thru value engineered process, look at all options laid out by Traverse after last bid, how to weigh options and make decisions; this is part I. Part II is update detailed design, over a year old, numerous engineering aspects / design aspects. Quote of \$44,000 to walk thru that and rebid. All the way thru construction Asking for additional work in middle of overall process. Try to bid in Jan/Feb/early March. This is what P-E put forward, stands here tonight.

Carrie: timing: taking 6-8 weeks for this process before the documents hit the street for bidding, then a month when bids come in. Construction potentially over summer, goal to have work done prior to start of next year. Need to meet deadlines for ADA / title IX.

Julia: Helpful for Joe to describe middle chunk; does this mean we have a contract in place for bidding / managing / construction management afterwards if this moves forward? What costs coming down pike?

Joe: original 2018 that still remains is construction administration portion for fields related work. That is the part that they are still under contract for.

Julia: in minutes: part of conversation in meeting of bringing in a third party to help with planning. How long would that take, knowing on a tight time frame?

Joe: would impact timeline for sure. If district wanted to do some type of long term capital planning, look at what was done in 2016, evaluate options, whittle down to a finite set, take advantage of all the work done, build case from ground up, could go outside to a third party viewed as knowledgeable on all can do with a campus like ours, help survey community, interactions with school committee, options on what things would cost. P-E/Traverse would not do. Typically higher education institutions use, our space of 120 acres sizeable, pretty blank, discussion in meeting was how would we do (internally ask someone to steward, would we use a third party that P-E could refer to us, ...?).

Julia: Sense of how long this takes?

Joe: Depends on what we want that process to be. If a lightweight one to be quick, probably what I know of it, want to look at all the different options, get community feedback. Realistically 4-8-12 weeks.

Julia: point not lost on me: would not make sense / might not make sense to separate projects, if go forward with just ADA / title IX while thinking about what we want strategically might have to undo decisions, could do double work.

Joe: Yes and no. Can we think of campus where do baseball / softball / accessibility to John Allen field first? Yes. Conceivable. No – not sure to what extent impacts overall cost.

Carrie: always an option. Do we want to start over? Or do we have faith that the processes the school committee has put in over the past four years were well thought out? Perfect, no, nothing is. Were they public meetings that were all recorded and available? Yes. Have documents for all of it. I personally have faith in the process, that did put in the time / energy to get us where we are today.

Julia: Several people walked me thru what has happened. Wish I could see bigger picture but know lot of discussions. I personally still struggle to understand how it fits into a broader plan / strategic plan for athletics over time with declining enrollment. Can get over this. Two sides. It is 9pm, been here for 3 hours with important conversations, seeing tremendous and important work district is doing, budgeting. Big questions need to focus on. Continuing a conversation on turf seems like could take a lot of time when some of the most important work is becoming evident. Don't want us to spend so much time on this issue that has been going on so long. Even if the best process has already happened we know the world is very different now than in 2016, how do we take into account the new situation we find ourselves in? I don't have answers, curious how others feel.

Steve: Biggest since 2016 is started remote but kids could be in fields. Have been on 3-4 committees that have discussed this.

Carrie: Not committing the school committees / towns to a turf field if move forward. Committing ourselves to maintaining a turf field and after the life of the turf field, 10-15 years, need to decide if want to purchase another or revert to grass. I believe, Joe might know more, the infrastructure that we put in would be similar to a grass field without irrigation (turf doesn't need irrigation), can convert. This is buying a piece of equipment. We know it will be used (when my kids ask for something first question is will it be used?). We know that we should be planning for either a replacement or for a conversion. All committed to making sure we don't use all the funds left, about \$3.6 million, if can do for \$3.6 million or less can have a good amount to save. There are companies that reuse turf fields, is it even possible that we can reuse / repurpose? Companies that could take and repurpose (tent flooring?). Lot of things can talk about. One of the reasons this was left to the end of year was there were other things we needed to discuss, cannot keep discussing, I feel confident it is worthy of our support, if majority feels otherwise should make that decision and move on. If we vote against the proposal then we are probably looking at just compliance, about \$750,000.

Christina: I hear both of the points from Carrie, from Steve, from Julia. In October I voted against. While I appreciate that I would love our school committee meetings to be primarily focused on the first three hours than turf, I wonder if there is a way to remove the conversation from the school committee. Been on two years, I still have questions, still have questions on financial outlook and impact. I am uncomfortable spending money and hope in ten years can cycle grass. What about infrastructure on other fields? If other fields have poor soil need to address drainage, wells, Haven't addressed in cost of this. We need title IX and ADA.

Jose: Thanking all of you who have been part of this conversation for so long. ADA and Title IX top priority. Understand and convinced that playing field is a problem (football / lacrosse / soccer). Lack of track an issue. Why does one have higher priority? Approach in phases. First phase ADA / Title IX compliance, down the line decide what to do about turf conversation. My concern about the turf, even if go to BrockFill and trust environmentally sound, believe probably true, still issue with artificial grass / leaves that contain substances, unclear how these impact health, don't know enough. By committing to the turf we are committing to exposing our kid to these substances, an issue for me.

Michelle: Given Steve's detailed minutes clear where I stand. I like Christina have concerns on costs. I fear something else will come up, to renew turf field the costs passed on to towns. If didn't have this gift and sent to towns for funding, could be shot down. For me as a representative of Lanesborough, concerned about the financial impacts. Not a single project has come in on budget, even if close to \$2.2 million will still come over budget eventually. Gift to be used for capital projects not paid by state. Admin building doesn't benefit students; exactly what capital gift is for, probably had that and parking lot in mind. These are concerns, why I am hesitant. I'm with Julia – this is taking up a very large volume of time when we have bigger fish to fry.

Julia: Clarifying question: confused about what work is in progress already for other fields and what may be needed.

Joe: Last December had contractor look at existing fields. All of our fields were judged as poor. District started process last year to add nutrients to fields, build up, create soft, durable natural grass. Ongoing, continuing this year. That should build up those fields to a significant level. Does leave two major issues: location of current game field (John Allen, probably worse location in terms of drainage, naturally becomes a pond, very difficult to remediate without digging all up and putting in a new drainage). This is what new field proposal is, layer in plenty of drainage in new location so old could be playable but new field in good spot, more maintainable from a drainage. Irrigation is other topic. Currently none for existing fields. Need to go thru two step process: initial engineering work to evaluate possible well sites, then drill and run the water supply lines and installing. This is necessary as current drinking wells are not sized to support that amount of water flowing out.

Julia: how do we pay for this?

Joe: aware of, not a natural part of a rebid.

Julia: why was this not part of the process before? Lot of fields that are sub-par, if not fixing the ones that we have?

Carrie: School committee did vote to allocate funding on an annual basis.

Steve: Did vote for allocating money for fields, and thought part of the appeal of turf was to relieve demand on the other fields and give more time to recover and get into good shape.

Curtis: Hard to wrap mind around all this effort when have no students in building, and looking at spending this much money from a gift. More unknowns than knowns about what is coming down the pipeline, feels crazy. Have to address field condition, unplayable and downright dangerous, hard time wrapping head around moving forward. At the same time when listening to all the community feedback, I don't feel like I have enough information.

Carrie: Need to vote on this, if fails as looks like it might need a plan B.

Jose: Can get plans to improve accessibility, irrigation.

Carrie: looking at the pie chart see about \$750,000 just for compliance. Does not include irrigation and other studies.

Jose: thinking out loud: assuming money left over and well managed, less we spend the more can have in the future to address.

Carrie: no expectation that the gift should cover all the costs from building.

Curtis: in terms of turf: I support having that at our school, looked at environmental / injury, where located in terms of run-off. I think right to be moving towards that. Not sure about doing that when putting in with issues in other fields. Sitting on this for another two years to let funds grow. Think makes more sense to treat the vast majority of grass fields, make compliant at a far lower sum and sit on money and think idea is to move forward eventually with turf.

Julia: to echo Curtis: everyone who has been so patient with us as new members.... Not opposed to turf. If the issue is playability, I get why turf is the answer. I do think if we haven't first solved for the other fields I have a hard time understanding why add another.

Carrie: echo what Steve and Joe have said: turf field is key to the health of the existing fields. We cannot remedy the existing fields without another field that allows them to rest. In terms of not having kids at the school, our hope is to be back in person next year and field ready then. Cost will probably be lower now as no one else is putting this kind of bids out.

Curtis: would like to see a range of possible projections of range in bids now and in a few years, versus how endowment expected to grow.

Julia: Talk of a cost estimator, did the committee discuss using?

Carrie: comes in designing bid documents.

Julia: Appreciate patience of all who have been on this for so many years. Issues with electrical wiring for cross country ski?

Carrie: did vote to support another building for cross country ski, issue resolved.

Joe: have since solved, shouldn't speak for Nordic ski team, from what I've heard found a number of overhead outlets, will deploy, at least 80% solution. Would need to reach out and confirm.

Julia: to me part of the big picture, what are the other ways we need to shore up what we have.

Michelle: Approved a new building, would that also come from the gift.

Joe: roughly \$100,000.

Jake: Need to provide kids appropriate places to do the things they do. My guess is most of our happy memories did not involve taking a test, most of our recollection of life-long learning not in filling in bubbles, it is spending times with an art teacher, or a coach. Need high quality space, not sure what the right answer is. Insistence is that we do it and do it right for two years to twenty years. In 16 years as a superintendent will spend hours and hours on all kinds of important work, social / emotional / budget. This particular topic is worth the time. I don't have any great answers.

Steve: Hear both sides. We have the funds available, for playability / PhysEd have heard that the turf solves our problem, agree about the amount of time spent on this, but the problem is that we keep not making decisions so it stays on the radar, and I worry if we do ADA / title IX we may not be spending the money as well as possible. Answers to many of these questions are in the submitted information. Support the field and setting aside \$1 million. Good time to bid, if the bid comes back too high do not have to do.

Joe: adding new wells / irrigation to the bigger project: that could be done as part of a detailed design before going to bid, could be an add alternate, remember they are layers of an onion, cannot accept alternate 3 unless take 1 and 2. Determine what you want so bid documents detail what want and in what order, cannot use as a buffet to decide later.

Carrie: To clarify: irrigation and drainage could be added to the project for additional cost.

Joe: Could also go to a local engineer and at a lower level. How fancy an irrigation set-up do we want? Want someone who is knowledgeable guide the committee.

Carrie: and how environmentally sound?

Michelle: Uncomfortable prioritizing turf over track, can we put in track not as add-on, do we have a guesstimate for irrigating existing field?

Joe: I have not seen such an estimate.

Curtis: To clarify, if vote to move ahead with bid, we still have the opportunity on seeing the final bid of saying yea or nay, makes sense to me to move forward with the bid rather than starting over from scratch, and see what it comes at. I know almost the exact opposite of what I said, but since have yea/nay....

Carrie: there is also value engineering. Can say to P-E that would like to bid the track and synthetic turf and ADA and title IX. Not have the track an add-alternate. Can say that. Put it all together anyone who bids then bids on entire package. List of value engineered items already exists. Vote on the document.

Steve: Strongly support moving the track up.

Julia: If we move forward with P-E then that is a pricey contract, so we would be in it, we don't have to take a bid that is way out of our budget, but it is a big step. Second thing is if we pull the track in and go out for all this and cannot afford, then we are back to ground zero just for ADA and Title IX.

Carrie: that is where the estimator comes in, if we know what we want to spend, then we use the value engineering and we do this BEFORE it goes to the street, so if say do not want to spend more than \$X we value engineer before anyone bids, could say track more important than

Do we have a motion?

Curtis: I move that we vote on this.

Carrie: Accept P-E but adding track as part of the bid.

Curtis: Yes.

Michelle: Irrigation as an add alternate? Want to see ADA, Title IX, artificial turf, track and then add alternate irrigation to existing fields. Covers all the issues with the athletic fields.

Carrie: Would we want to include as part of this project or do with local people?

Curtis: since irrigation is separate, makes sense to move forward with those components as Michelle said but if possible to ask them to give us a ballpark, seems to make sense to treat separately from this project for implementation (not irrigating track / turf).

Carrie: need a second to discuss.

Julia: I'll second the motion. Appreciate trying to work locally on irrigation, not sure about multiple projects simultaneously conflicting.

Christina: Yes, and might not be just irrigation, might also be bring in more soil. My concern is feel we are missing the total picture of the athletic infrastructure as a whole years from now. Playability, student population is declining, how many going to use the fields. Very uncomfortable with this process saying let's just spend the \$44,000 as if bid comes back high we haven't solved the problem.

Jose: I'll second Christina. I hear the concerns and frustrations.

Carrie: We've heard from the folks on Phase II, folks from the first process in 2017, that athletic infrastructure has been strategically discussed, would hate to go thru another strategic planning and end up here again. In six months, two years.... Of course would have more money to spend, but two more years without relieving existing fields.

Steve: We would have had one bid that would have been fine last time if they had not misinterpreted and had an artificial turf on the softball as well. In terms of the bid coming too high, as remarked this is the advantage of drawing up our priorities.

Curtis: Small tangential question: lot of people bring up snow removal from turf field and what that does, was that ever addressed?

Carrie: Plan is to not use during winter, have not budgeted for special equipment, don't use in November if snow.

Jake: Was going to say what you said. Minutes that reflect not going to use 365 days a year. Thinking about irrigation and installing: for an appropriate installation to happen will lose the use of that field for some time. Could make the case to have an imminently playable field in place and then irrigate the rest.

Julia: This conversation is linked to renewal fund and how much we want to include in the bid. On the agenda as the next item. Can we embed in this conversation? Big difference between a million and a 1.5 million.

Carrie: Previous iteration had put numbers on vote for a bid. Was deemed not legal.... If say want to put a million aside and that leaves 2.6 million, we don't want to include those numbers in a vote as then telling people what to bid.

Christina: We can set a number on what we set for the endowment but we cannot set a number for what we want to bid.

Carrie: We can talk and say do not want to pay more than.... What is the expectation in the community? Should we be needing to have 6 million in so many years?

Julia: It's not close to 6 million in 20 years if tapping in to it along the years. I am a proponent of more than a million, I would like to start at 1.5 million. We will need to tap into it if we do a turf, want to know a replacement / grass comes out of this fund, that's an earlier draw down. What is the long term capital plan, what would this be responsible for? I get we do not have all the information, what really feels important from me, heard from towns to make sure we set aside \$1.25 to \$1.5 million. Not their decision, we're our own governing body, but towns are our partners.

Carrie: Joe, any thoughts?

Joe: If any questions outstanding happy to answer.

Jose: motion and was seconded. I would welcome a vote on this.

Carrie: Motion is to accept the proposal from Perkins-Eastman to move forward with the process but to include the track in the project and not as an add alternate. Moved by Curtis, seconded by Julia.

Joe: Basic services lump sum, not for irrigation.

Julia: we do not need to define what is in the base bid now.

Carrie: giving guidance, tell architect what we want,

Steve: Architect can give us a sense of the prices.

Vote: Julia: Aye. Christina: No. Jose: No. Curtis: Aye. Carrie: Aye. Michelle: No. Steve: Aye.
Passes 4-3.

c. MGRS Renewal Fund VOTE

Jose: asked briefly at a previous meeting: how should the process go to determine what to set aside? Would help me figure out what the number should be.

Carrie: Joe do you want to respond?

Joe: We have just taken a quick look at floors / windows / roofs, three biggest items. If we were to dive into a process with Tim Sears / outside experts, use best practices, that would take significantly longer to do in detail. Should be done district wide. Helps avoid big hits to the district.

Carrie: regional agreement: towns own WES/LES, lease to us for \$1, responsible for repairs exceeding \$5000 per project.

Julia: Move to set aside \$1.5 million, seconded by Christina.

Steve: Worth remembering that if we vote to set aside a certain amount now, can always set aside additional amounts later.

Jose: tendency is to be conservative in preparing for costs, number feels a bit arbitrary, would like to hear from Finance Committee as to what the number should be and why.

Carrie: the numbers we proposed: Steve was under a million, I and Michelle were comfortable with a million.

Michelle: I started at 1.5, that's my preference, I would not want to sacrifice the track for .5. I would like to have the money available, if the project comes in well under we can add additional money as Steve says. Joe did a nice sheet with \$1, \$1.5 and \$1.25 million going forward, I was comfortable with a million and no less.

Carrie: I agree with Michelle, track estimated at about \$450,000.

Steve: Arguments convinced me to move up to \$1 million and possibly add more later.

Vote: Julia: Aye, Christina: Aye. Jose: Abstain. Curtis: No. Carrie No. Michelle No. Steve No.

Steve moves to set aside \$1 million for the endowment, Curtis seconds.

Joe: Not past performance does not promise future performance.

Carrie: will never cover all the costs of the building, set aside some money to alleviate cost of towns, this is more than some money.

Julia: Language – can we add more?

Steve: happy to add language about this is possible to supplement later, but need a specific number to tell towns.

Carrie: might need to designate money as a renewal fund, talk to counsel. Right now just saying not going to use it, if the roof caves in we are under no obligation to not touch the money. Nor is any other school committee. Right now no structure around that, right now it is just an intention.

Joe: Only way would be to ask the college to amend the agreement, with current committee asking the college to say take a million from the gift and make it eligible for use in future ways.

Vote: Julia: Aye. Christina: Aye. Jose: Abstain. Curtis: Aye. Carrie: Aye. Michelle: Aye. Steve: Aye. Passes.

XIII. School Committee workshop date discussion (Jan. 9 or Jan. 16)

Couple of items came up to tack on, such as packet publishing, number of meetings in a month. 16th worked better for all.

XIV. Other business not anticipated by the Chair within 48 hours of the meeting

None.

XV. Motion to move into Executive Session with no intent to return to Open Session per M.G.L. Chapter 30A, Section 21(a)(3) to discuss strategy with respect to collective bargaining with Mount Greylock Educators Association (all units) This meeting will be broadcast on WilliNet TV channel 1302 in Williamstown

Moved by Julia, seconded by Curtis. Passes unanimously at 10:26pm

Inviting Jake (superintendent), Joe (business manager) and Adam (counsel) to join.

Video online at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AWhXtpxybgI>

Minutes taken by Secretary Steven Miller.

MGRS School Council Update

January 14, 2021

Budget Considerations for Anticipated MGRS School Improvement Plan AY2022



School Improvement Plan (SIP) AY2022 Builds on Goals from AY2021

Anticipated Goals for SIP AY2022

- ✓ Academic Achievement
- ✓ Social Emotional Wellness/Social Emotional Learning (SEW/SEL)
- ✓ Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Belonging (DEI&B)
- ✓ Enhancing and Promoting the Arts
- ✓ Core Competencies for Data Analysis

The Greylock Way ~ Integrity, Responsibility, Perseverance



Additional Resources Will Be Needed to Address SEW/SEL Needs in AY2021

- SEW / SEL needs have escalated due to the pandemic
- The School Council identified a range of mechanisms to address these growing needs:
 - ✓ Increase opportunities for students to interact with Social Workers and wellness staff in clinical and non-clinical settings
 - Increase professional hours available
 - Introduce new SEW/SEL courses and curricula, including course(s) taught by SW(s)
 - ✓ Expand opportunities for faculty, staff, and students to participate in SEL
 - Optimize use of new virtual programs to increase reach and frequency of programming
 - Increase opportunities for guided student discourse following school-wide presentations
 - Introduce a school-wide Mental Health Awareness Day
 - ✓ Collect guided reflections from students quarterly to assess SEW/SEL impact of each class
 - ✓ Increase information provided to families regarding SEW/SEL programming and services
- Success will require additional professional hours (SW and Wellness Staff)

The Greylock Way ~ Integrity, Responsibility, Perseverance



Resources Also Needed to Better Utilize Data Across the Middle/High School

- **Skills, competencies, and processes are needed to measure MGRS's progress against school improvement and strategic goals**
- **Resources needed include:**
 - ✓ Professional hours to identify scope of data requirements, and to implement data collection and analysis activities
 - ✓ Research-backed survey instruments to collect quantitative and qualitative data in critical areas where data is not regularly collected by MA or DESE (e.g., school climate and culture, SEW indicators, etc)
 - ✓ Training of school personnel in collaborative evidence-based analysis using quantitative and qualitative data (e.g., Harvard's datawise process) across all data sources
- **Success will require dedicated resources and expertise**



Mount Greylock Regional School - Athletics

CD Estimate

1/14/21

			TOTAL
A.	Site Prep & Demolition		
	Site Prep & Demolition		\$86,200
	Earthwork		
	1. Softball		\$61,150
	2. Multi-purpose Field		\$89,182
	Erosion Control		\$43,000
B.	Site Improvements		
	Paving		
	1. Concrete Sidewalk		\$44,091
	2. Stone Dust Walkway		\$38,544
	3. Bituminous Paving - Road & Parking		\$37,734
	4. Gravel Roadway		\$31,314
	Artificial Turf Field (Brockfill)		\$872,231
	Softball Infield Improvements		\$142,871
	Fencing		\$77,500
	Athletic Equipment		\$334,110
	Landscaping Outside Field Work		\$106,705
C.	Site Utilities		
	Drainage / Civil		\$136,973
	Electrical		\$77,522
C.	TOTAL TRADE COST		\$2,179,127
	General Conditions	5.0%	\$108,956
	Bonds	1.0%	\$22,881
	Insurance	1.9%	\$43,908
	Permit		\$12,000
	Overhead & Fee	3.0%	\$71,006
E.	TOTAL GENERAL CONTRACTOR'S COST		\$2,437,879
	Bidding Contingency	2.0%	\$48,758
F.	TOTAL ESTIMATED BID		\$2,486,636
	Construction Contingency	6.0%	\$149,198
G.	TOTAL ESTIMATED CONSTRUCTION COST		\$2,635,834



Bid Documents Estimate

Mount Greylock Regional High School Athletic Field Improvements

1781 Cold Springs Road
Williamstown, MA

PM&C LLC
20 Downer Avenue, Suite 5
Hingham, MA 02043
(T) 781-740-8007
(F) 781-740-1012

Prepared for:
Perkins Eastman
50 Ashburn Place, floor 8
Boston, MA 02108

January 13, 2021



Mount Greylock Regional High School
 Athletic Field Improvements
 Williamstown, MA

13-Jan-21

Bid Documents Estimate

MAIN CONSTRUCTION COST SUMMARY

	Construction Start	Estimated Construction Cost
SITE IMPROVEMENTS		
	Apr-21	
SITWORK		\$2,179,127
TRACK		See Alternates
FIELD TESTING ALLOWANCE PER BID FORM		\$10,000
<hr/>		
SUB-TOTAL		\$2,189,127
ESCALATION TO START - (assumed 5% PA)		Included
DESIGN AND PRICING CONTINGENCY	0%	\$0
<hr/>		
SUB-TOTAL		\$2,189,127
GENERAL CONDITIONS	5.00%	\$109,456
BONDS	1.00%	\$21,891
INSURANCE	1.90%	\$41,593
PERMIT	0.00%	NIC
OVERHEAD AND FEE	3.00%	\$65,674
CONSTRUCTION CONTINGENCY	0.0%	By Owner
<hr/>		
TOTAL OF ALL CONSTRUCTION		\$2,427,741

Alternate 1.1	Sports lighting	ADD	\$361,534
Alternate 1.2	Fencing	ADD	\$29,000
Alternate 1.3	Seed in lieu of sod	DEDUCT	(\$17,901)
Alternate 1.4	Dugout equipment	ADD	\$37,706
Alternate 1.5	Netting height	DEDUCT	(\$29,278)
Alternate 1.6	Netting length	DEDUCT	(\$27,392)
Alternate 1.7	Portable players benches	ADD	\$11,090
Alternate 1.8	Portable bleachers	ADD	\$44,360
Alternate 1.9	Bituminous in lieu of concrete	DEDUCT	(\$22,324)
Alternate 1.10	Scoreboard	ADD	\$33,270
Alternate 1.11	PA system	ADD	\$27,725
Alternate 1.11A	PA system stands	ADD	\$1,663
Alternate 1.12	Pressbox and bleacher	ADD	\$137,516
Alternate 1.13	Softball underdrains	ADD	\$82,765
Alternate 1.14	Track	ADD	\$684,300
Alternate 1.15	Warning track and foul lines	DEDUCT	(\$11,747)



Mount Greylock Regional High School

Athletic Field Improvements

Williamstown, MA

13-Jan-21

Bid Documents Estimate

This Bid Documents cost estimate was produced from drawings prepared by Perkins Eastman, Inc. and their design team dated August 28th 2019. Design and engineering changes occurring subsequent to the issue of these documents have not been incorporated in this estimate.

This estimate includes all direct construction costs, General Contractor's overhead, fee and design contingency. Cost escalation assumes start dates indicated.

Bidding conditions are expected to be public bidding under Massachusetts General Law 40(b) to a general contractor, and open specifications for materials and manufactures.

The estimate is based on prevailing wage rates for construction in this market and represents a reasonable opinion of cost. It is not a prediction of the successful bid from a contractor as bids will vary due to fluctuating market conditions, errors and omissions, proprietary specifications, lack or surplus of bidders, perception of risk, etc. Consequently the estimate is expected to fall within the range of bids from a number of competitive contractors or subcontractors, however we do not warrant that bids or negotiated prices will not vary from the final construction cost estimate.

ITEMS NOT CONSIDERED IN THIS ESTIMATE

Items not included in this estimate are:

- Land acquisition, feasibility, and financing costs
- All professional fees and insurance
- Site or existing conditions surveys investigations costs, including to determine subsoil conditions
- Items identified in the design as Not In Contract (NIC)
- Items identified in the design as by others
- Owner supplied and/or installed items as indicated in the estimate
- Utility company back charges, including work required off-site
- Work to City streets and sidewalks, (except as noted in this estimate)
- Construction contingency



Bid Documents Estimate

CSI CODE	DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	UNIT COST	EST'D COST	SUB TOTAL	TOTAL COST
----------	-------------	-----	------	-----------	------------	-----------	------------

SITWORK - Athletic Field Improvements

CSI CODE	DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	UNIT COST	EST'D COST	SUB TOTAL	TOTAL COST
G	SITWORK						
G10	SITE PREPARATION & DEMOLITION						
311000	<u>SITE PREPARATION & DEMOLITION</u>						
	Site construction fence - not shown - allow	3,600	lf	8.00	28,800		
	Construction entrance - not shown detail only	1	loc	10,000.00	10,000		
	Misc. site demolition not shown	237,000	sf	0.20	47,400		
312000	<u>EARTHWORK</u>						
	<u>Softball Field</u>						
	Strip topsoil & stockpile; assumed 6" deep	2,100	cy	8.00	16,800		
	Cut	2,300	cy	6.00	13,800		
	Fill	1,400	cy	8.00	11,200		
	Segregate/load excess soils for disposal	900	cy	5.00	4,500		
	Less than RCS-1 site disposal- 1.65x	1,485	tn	10.00	14,850		
	<u>Multi-Purpose Field</u>						
	Strip topsoil & stockpile;	0	cy	8.00	NR		
	Cut	2,000	cy	6.00	12,000		
	Fill	625	cy	8.00	5,000		
	Segregate/load excess soils for disposal	1,375	cy	5.00	6,875		
	Less than RCS-1 site disposal- 1.65x	2,269	tn	10.00	22,690		
	Fine grading	18,941	sy	2.25	42,617		
	Rock removal				NIC		
	Dispose/treat contaminated soils				NIC		
312500	<u>EROSION CONTROL</u>						
	Silt fence barrier - not shown detail only - allow	3,600	lf	10.00	36,000		
	Filter sacks for grated inlets - not shown - allow	10	ea	200.00	2,000		
	Silt fence maintenance and monitoring	1	ls	5,000.00	5,000		
	SUBTOTAL					279,532	
G20	SITE IMPROVEMENTS						
320000	<u>PAVING</u>						
	<u>Concrete sidewalks - no detail provided</u>	3,575	sf				
	Gravel base; 8" thick - assume	89	cy	36.00	3,204		
	Concrete; 5" thick - assume	3,575	sf	9.00	32,175		
	<u>Concrete sidewalks - no detail provided</u>	880	sf				
	Gravel base; 8" thick - assume	22	cy	36.00	792		
	Concrete; 5" thick - assume	880	sf	9.00	7,920		
	<u>Stone dust walkway</u>	9,125	sf				
	gravel base; 6" thick	169	cy	36.00	6,084		
	stone dust 4" thick - non-stabilized	184	tn	75.00	13,800		
	Steel edging	1,555	lf	12.00	18,660		
	<u>Bituminous concrete paving - parking lot/road</u>	7,760	sf				
	gravel base; 12" thick	287	cy	36.00	10,332		
	Crushed stone 6" thick	144	cy	38.00	5,472		
	asphalt top; 1.25" thick	61	tns	120.00	7,320		
	asphalt binder; 2.25" thick	109	tns	110.00	11,990		
	Bituminous berm curbing	140	lf	8.00	1,120		
	Parking spot ADA	6	spcs	250.00	1,500		
	<u>Gravel roadway</u>	15,375	sf				
	dense grade base; 6" thick	285	cy	38.00	10,830		
	gravel base; 12" thick	569	cy	36.00	20,484		
320000	<u>Fields</u>						



Bid Documents Estimate

CSI CODE	DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	UNIT COST	EST'D COST	SUB TOTAL	TOTAL COST
SITEWORK - Athletic Field Improvements							
59	<u>Artificial turf field</u>	91,830	sf				
60	2" Woven synthetic turf system with Brockfill - 1lb of brockfill and 4lbs of sand per sf	91,830	sf	4.95	454,559		
61	Resilient underlayment (Brock YSR)	91,830	sf	1.60	146,928		
62	Painted field lines - allowance	1	loc	5,000.00	5,000		
63	Field top stone; 2" thick	898	tn	40.00	35,920		
64	Field base stone; 8" thick	3,704	tn	35.00	129,640		
65	Geotextile underlayment below base stone	10,203	sy	3.00	30,609		
66	12" Turf anchor curbing	1,265	lf	55.00	69,575		
67	<u>Softball infield</u>	14,660	sf				
68	Infield mix	296	tn	150.00	44,400		
69	Sand gravel fill; 8" thick	358	cy	36.00	12,888		
70	Bullpen curbing	285	lf	30.00	8,550		
71	<u>Softball outfield</u>	23,060	sf				
72	Compacted dense sand; 8" thick	930	tn	42.00	In alternate		
73	Sandy loam; 6" thick	427	cy	60.00	25,620		
74	Sod	23,060	sf	1.25	28,825		
75	<u>Softball warning track and foul lines</u>	5,085	sf				
76	Sand gravel fill; 6" thick	94	cy	36.00	3,384		
77	Geotextile underlayment	5,085	sf	0.75	3,814		
78	3" Duratrax warning track mix	78	tn	125.00	9,750		
79	Warning track metal edging	470	lf	12.00	5,640		
80	<u>Fencing</u>						
81	Black vinyl CLF - 4'	465	lf	50.00	In alternate		
82	Black vinyl CLF - 6'	655	lf	70.00	45,850		
83	Black vinyl CLF - 8'	240	lf	90.00	21,600		
84	Black vinyl CLF - 5' single access gate	9	loc	850.00	7,650		
85	Black vinyl CLF - 10' double swing gate	2	loc	1,200.00	2,400		
86							
87	320000 <u>ATHLETIC EQUIPMENT</u>						
88	Enclosed dugout w/ 6' storage closet	2	loc	42,000.00	84,000		
89	32' Ht. softball backstop	90	loc	390.00	35,100		
90	32' Ht. baseball backstop	224	loc	390.00	87,360		
91	Sports netting; 20'	330	lf	190.00	62,700		
92	Sports netting cart allowance	1	ls	500.00	500		
93	Softball base set	1	sts	1,200.00	1,200		
94	Softball pitcher's rubber/reinforcing	3	loc	3,500.00	10,500		
95	Softball home plates and batters box reinforcing	3	loc	5,000.00	15,000		
96	Corner flags	1	ea	350.00	350		
97	Foul poles	2	ea	3,600.00	7,200		
98	Football goalposts	2	ea	10,600.00	21,200		
99	Soccer goals	1	sts	9,000.00	9,000		
100							
101	329000 <u>LANDSCAPING</u>						
102	Screen topsoil	2100	cy	7.50	15,750		
103	Export tailings from screening process - assume clean rock	630	cy	8.50	5,355		
104	Amend/Place for new seeded area & at plantings	1470	cy	20.00	29,400		
105	Imported loam; additional required - swell 25%	438	cy	50.00	21,900		
106	Fine grade and seed	98,000	sf	0.35	34,300		
107	<u>Irrigation</u>						
108	Allowance for softball irrigation	23,060	sf	1.25	NIC		
109	SUBTOTAL					1,685,100	
110							
111	G30 CIVIL MECHANICAL UTILITIES						
112							
113	334000 <u>STORM DRAINAGE UTILITIES</u>						



Bid Documents Estimate

CSI CODE	DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	UNIT COST	EST'D COST	SUB TOTAL	TOTAL COST
SITEWORK - Athletic Field Improvements							
114	NYLO Area drains	2	loc	2,500.00	5,000		
115	NYLO Drain CB	1	loc	2,500.00	2,500		
116	NYLO Drain DMH	1	loc	3,000.00	3,000		
117	12" HDPE	895	lf	45.00	40,275		
118	12" Flat drain	4,237	lf	4.00	16,948		
119	12" Flat drain at softball	1,823	lf	4.00	In alternate		
120	12" collector at softball field	325	lf	50.00	In alternate		
121	12" collector at turf field	985	lf	50.00	49,250		
122	Connect to existing DMH	4	loc	5,000.00	20,000		
123	SUBTOTAL					136,973	
124	G40 ELECTRICAL UTILITIES						
125	260000 ELECTRICAL UTILITIES						
126	<u>Musco sports lighting system</u>						
127	<u>Musco sports lighting package 4-pole - 50FC (standard foundations no rock) augur/assemble & stand poles</u>						
128		4	loc	79,500.00	In alternate		
129	Rock coring premium adder on boring B-3	1	ea	8,000.00	In alternate		
130	<u>Conduits and wiring</u>						
131	2" Sch 40 PVC conduits;	2,088	lf	7.75	16,182		
132	3" Sch 40 PVC conduits;	1,044	lf	10.00	10,440		
133	Excavation & backfill of conduit	1,000	lf	15.00	15,000		
134	Pull boxes - one per pole	4	ea	850.00	3,400		
135	Pull boxes - large at proposed musco cabinet location	1	ea	2,500.00	2,500		
136	Sawcut and patch roadway allowance	1	ls	5,000.00	5,000		
137	Connection within school allowance	1	ls	25,000.00	25,000		
138	SUBTOTAL					77,522	
139	TOTAL - SITE DEVELOPMENT						\$2,179,127
140							
141							



99% Construction Documents Estimate

CSI CODE	DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	UNIT COST	EST'D COST	SUB TOTAL	TOTAL COST
----------	-------------	-----	------	-----------	------------	-----------	------------

ALTERNATE #1

G SITEWORK

G20 SITE IMPROVEMENTS

Alternate 1.1

Musco sports lighting system

Musco sports lighting package 4-pole - 50FC (standard foundations <u>no</u> rock) augur/assemble & stand poles	4	ea	79,500.00	318,000	
Rock coring premium adder on boring B-3	1	ea	8,000.00	8,000	
SUBTOTAL					326,000

Alternate 1.2

Black vinyl CLF - 4'	465	lf	50.00	23,250	
Black vinyl CLF - 5' single access gate	2	loc	850.00	1,700	
Black vinyl CLF - 10' double swing gate	1	loc	1,200.00	1,200	
SUBTOTAL					26,150

Alternate 1.3

<u>Softball outfield</u>	23,060	sf			
Sod	23,060	sf	(1.25)	(28,825)	
Seed	23,060	sf	0.55	12,683	
SUBTOTAL					(16,142)

Alternate 1.4

Two tier polyboard bench	6	ea	3,500.00	21,000	
Helmet/Bat rack	2	ea	6,500.00	13,000	
SUBTOTAL					34,000

Alternate 1.5

Sports netting; 20'	330	lf	(190.00)	(62,700)	
Sports netting; 12'	330	lf	110.00	36,300	
SUBTOTAL					(26,400)

Alternate 1.6

Sports netting; 12'	130	lf	(190.00)	(24,700)	
SUBTOTAL					(24,700)

Alternate 1.7

Portable players benches	4	loc	2,500.00	10,000	
SUBTOTAL					10,000

Alternate 1.8

Portable bleachers; assumed 3-row non-elevated	4	loc	10,000.00	40,000	
SUBTOTAL					40,000

Alternate 1.9

<u>Concrete sidewalks - no detail provided</u>	3,355	sf			
Concrete; 5" thick - assume	(3,355)	sf	9.00	(30,195)	
<u>Bituminous sidewalk - no detail</u>	3,355	sf			
Asphalt	3,355	sf	3.00	10,065	
SUBTOTAL					(20,130)

Alternate 1.10

Multisport electronic scoreboard (football / soccer)	1	ea	30,000.00	30,000	
SUBTOTAL					30,000

Alternate 1.11

PA system allowance	1	ea	25,000.00	25,000	
SUBTOTAL					25,000

Alternate 1.11A

PA system stand allowance	1	ea	1,500.00	1,500	
SUBTOTAL					1,500

Alternate 1.12



99% Construction Documents Estimate

CSI CODE	DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	UNIT COST	EST'D COST	SUB TOTAL	TOTAL COST	
ALTERNATE #1								
	Press box; no roof access for filming; 30' without dividers	1	ea	45,000.00	45,000			
	Press box; aluminum ramp structure for access	1	ea	12,000.00	12,000			
	Electrical service to pressbox allowance; conduits and wire	1	ea	15,000.00	15,000			
	Concrete spread footings for pressbox allowance	6	loc	2,000.00	12,000			
	Bleacher 3-row; non-elevated	1	ea	10,000.00	10,000			
	Bleacher 4-row;	2	ea	15,000.00	30,000			
	SUBTOTAL					124,000		
	Alternate 1.13							
	Compacted dense sand; 8" thick	930	tn	42.00	39,060			
	12" Flat drain	1,820	lf	4.00	7,280			
	12" collector at softball field	325	lf	50.00	16,250			
	Segregate/load excess soils for disposal	560	cy	5.00	2,800			
	Less than RCS-1 site disposal- 1.65x	924	tn	10.00	9,240			
	SUBTOTAL					74,630		
	Alternate 1.14							
	See track tab							
	Alternate 1.15							
1	<u>Softball warning track and foul lines</u>	(5,085)	sf					
2	Sand gravel fill; 6" thick	(94)	cy	36.00	(3,384)			
3	Geotextile underlayment	(5,085)	sf	0.75	(3,814)			
4	3" Duratrax warning track mix	(78)	tn	125.00	(9,750)			
5	Warning track metal edging	(470)	lf	12.00	(5,640)			
6	<u>Softball warning track and foul lines - loam and sod</u>	5,085	sf					
7	Sandy loam; 6" thick	94	cy	60.00	5,640			
8	Sod	5,085	sf	1.25	6,356			
	SUBTOTAL					(10,592)		
Total								\$593,316



Schematic Design Estimate

CSI CODE	DESCRIPTION	QTY	UNIT	UNIT COST	EST'D COST	SUB TOTAL	TOTAL COST	
SITework - TRACK ALTERNATE								
1	311000 SITE PREPARATION & DEMOLITION							
2	Site construction fence - not shown - allow	2,000	lf	8.00	16,000			
3	Construction entrance - not shown detail only	1	loc	10,000.00	10,000			
4	Misc. site demolition not shown	170,000	sf	0.10	17,000			
5	SUBTOTAL					43,000		
6								
7	312000 EARTH MOVING							
8	Allowance for cut/fill - no grading provided	1	ls	50,000.00	50,000			
9	Silt fence/erosion control allowance	2,000	lf	10.00	20,000			
10	SUBTOTAL					70,000		
11								
12	<u>SYNTHETIC TRACK</u>							
13	<u>Asphalt Paving; track oval</u>	40,780	sf					
14	gravel base; 8" thick	997	cy	36.00	35,892			
15	asphalt top; 1.5" thick	382	tns	150.00	57,300			
16	asphalt binder; 1.5" thick	382	tns	130.00	49,660			
17	Fine grade	40,780	sf	0.25	10,195			
18	<u>Asphalt Paving; Long jump/triple jump runways & events</u>	9,790	sf					
19	gravel base; 8" thick	239	cy	36.00	8,604			
20	asphalt top; 1.5" thick	92	tns	150.00	13,800			
21	asphalt binder; 1.5" thick	92	tns	130.00	11,960			
22	Fine grade	9,790	sf	0.25	2,448			
23	<u>Synthetic track surfacing</u>	37,000	sf					
24	Complete permeable track surface BSS-100	4,111	sy	44.00	180,884			
25	SUBTOTAL					370,743		
26								
27	<u>WALKWAYS</u>							
28	<u>Concrete walkway connecting track to road</u>	6,240	sf					
29	Gravel base; 8" thick - assume	155	cy	36.00	5,580			
30	Concrete; 5" thick - assume	6,240	sf	9.00	56,160			
31	Fine grade	6,240	sf	0.25	1,560			
32	SUBTOTAL					63,300		
33								
34	<u>EVENTS</u>							
35	Long jump/Triple jump pits_no catchers and painted takeoff boards	2	ea	10,000.00	20,000			
36	Pole vault event incl. concrete pad for landing pad	1	ea	5,000.00	5,000			
37	Discus pad and cage	1	ea	10,000.00	10,000			
38	SUBTOTAL					35,000		
39								
40	<u>LANDSCAPING</u>							
41	Loam and seed allowance around perimeter of track	1	ls	35,000.00	35,000			
42	SUBTOTAL					35,000		
43								
44	TOTAL - TRACK (does not include mark-ups)							\$617,043

MOUNT GREYLOCK ATHLETICS IMPROVEMENTS

1/14/2021

PREVIOUS ESTIMATE \$2,320,300
 BID PRICE 9/20/2019 \$2,847,000
 ESTIMATE 1/14/2021 \$2,886,170
 TARGET \$2,600,000

Add / Deduct Alternate	Original Alt. #	Base Scope	Add / Deduct Scope	Cost - 9/19	Cost - 1/21	Impact from 9/19 memo	Owner Comment	Follow Up Comments 1/21
1.1 Lighting	10.0	Provide 3 conduits from the admin building (4) lighting locations at the Synthetic Turf - include hand-holes	Add - Provide full lighting package @ 50 FC - what is needed to play lacrosse	\$320,000	\$361,534	Inability to play night games but add in the future.	Night games allow for hosting of MIAA events, expanded use of the fields, etc... At the least, we would not want to preclude from adding later as they are very valuable in the long-run and more costly and difficult to add later as we understand it. Is there a spectrum of options for lighting? Instead of "zero lighting" or "best lighting," is there a range? And, if lighting is not done now, do we know the degree to which adding lighting later would be more expensive than doing it now? As the biggest ticket VE item, we'd like to be able to discuss this in detail.	
1.2 Fencing	4.0	All fencing except the 4'-0" tall fences at the long sides of the Synthetic Turf	Add - 4'-0 tall fence and gates at the Synthetic Turf	\$20,000	\$29,000	Change the game with the inability to record home runs. Inability to restrain spectators, etc. from field.	As long as the safety areas are still addressed. For baseball, there should be fencing at least a bit farther than the bases. For softball, we need fencing out to the bases, but *cannot* place fencing farther out than the bases because that would obstruct the cross country course.	
1.3 Sod / Seed	1.0	All new grass fields to be Sod	Deduct - All new grass fields to be seeded	(\$27,000)	(\$17,901)	The field would need three growing seasons to establish vs. one growing season.	A natural grass consultant that the district turned to for its existing fields recommended that we stick with sod and make sure the sod is not laid until mid-August at the earliest. This also brings the topic of irrigation back into the conversation, just FYI (and see the bottom of this for a bigger picture irrigation question for the synthetic turf).	
1.4 Dug-out Equipment	5.0	Provide no dugout Equipment	Add - Dugout equipment as specified	\$7,500	\$37,706	The school would have to provide benches through a separate fund.	We can do this with fundraising or later.	
1.5 End Netting at Synthetic Turf End Zones (Height)	7.0	Provide 20' high	Deduct - Reduce height to 12'	(\$18,000)	(\$29,278)	Reduced protection in endzones	As long as the safety concerns are met. There should be some form of net behind the goals. 200' seems like enough for safety, not sure what it was before. 20' to 12' seems doable.	
1.6 End Netting at Synthetic Turf End Zones (Length)	7.0	Provide LF as shown on drawings	Deduct - Provide 200 LF total	(\$18,000)	(\$27,392)	Reduced protection in endzones	As long as the safety concerns are met. There should be some form of net behind the goals. 200' seems like enough for safety, not sure what it was before. 20' to 12' seems doable.	
1.7 Eliminate Portable benches	8.0	Provide concrete pads and connecting walkway	Add - Provide Portable team benches as specified	(\$5,000)		School will have to reuse or purchase through separate fund.	OK to eliminate and we can use existing benches.	
1.8 Portable Bleacher System	9.0	Provide concrete pads and connecting walkway	Add - portable bleachers as specified	\$48,000	\$11,090	No spectator seating capacity	Could do later and/or find less expensive options and/or separate funding. Could consider this as the first add/alternate for the project? Is there any reason to include it in the scope of the project or is it simply a product that we'd need to procure ourselves (without contractor doing any site work)?	
1.9 Walk Way material	11.0	Concrete walk from access road to field	Deduct - change walk to Bituminous	(\$10,000)	(\$22,324)	Potential for more long-term maintenance	We'd spend significantly more money in the long-run maintaining it than the \$10K saved, so no.	
1.10 Scoreboard		No Scoreboard	Add - Solar powered basic scoreboard		\$33,270			
1.11 PA System		No PA System	Add - head end at Admin building - wiring to 4 ighting towers and speakers at each tower		\$27,725			
1.11A PA system stands		no stands	Add - portable stands if lighting is not done		\$1,664			
1.12 Pressbox and Bleacher at Synthetic Turf Field		No Press box or Bleachers	Add - Press box and bleachers as per drawings sent via email		\$137,516			
1.13 Underdrain at Softball Field outfield	2.0	Regrade the outfield as per the drawings	Add - underdrainage system	(\$70,000)	\$82,765	Would have an impact on drainage of the field specifically in wet conditions like early spring.	If we forego the outfield work for softball, does the design team have any input as to how much more complex a project would be if we did this kind of work in a couple of years using separate funding/project work?	

1.15 - Baseball backstop	6.0	Back-stop and fencing included at Baseball Field	Delete Baseball Backstop and fencing at field	(\$70,000)	Not Priced	Baseball field would remain as is. Safety concern at dugouts. Existing backstop does not meet official distances.	Need to address the safety concern items. Others are OK to VE out.	
1.17 Shockpad	12.0	Shockpad included in base scope	Eliminate Shock Pad under Turf	(\$90,000)	Not Priced	Loss of guarantee on G-Max of 120.	No. No point in having synthetic turf if you don't have the shock pad.	
1.18 Track		Original Add Alternate			\$684,301			
1.16 Irrigation	Not in Original VE list						Do we have water at the Synthetic Turf Field – what's the plan to cool this field down	-We would prefer to have water in a box at the field with a hose bib but, it is not required. Cooling the field with water is not an effective way to cool the field. There are extensive studies through the Penn State Center for Sports Surface Research that show that the effects of cooling a field with water only lasts 20 minutes and that in reality it creates humidity which makes the situation worse for the athlete. We have not added irrigation systems to synthetic turf fields in the last eight years. Brockfill by its nature is cooler than Crumb rubber but, we still recommend that the field is not used on days over 95 degrees. If there are going to be practices on hot days they are held in the morning and the afternoon. Additionally, the MIAA requires that ADs and Coaches use
1.17 - Warning Track	3.0	Eliminate Warning Track	Eliminated due to conflict with X-Country	In Base		Impact on play of the game. If coincided with removing the fence impact would be none	As in the original question here -- please advise on the warning track that you're talking about...	

Mt. Greylock Regional School District School Committee

Superintendent Updates

Thursday, January 14, 2021



Overview

1. Negotiations update regarding COVID-19 Memorandum of Agreement
2. DESE Updates
 - a. Potential for Pool COVID-19 Testing
 - b. ACCESS and MCAS Testing
3. “Behavioral and Emotional Screening System” Screening and Follow Up

Current Memorandum of Understanding

The balance of keeping all members of the school communities safe during a pandemic is *the work* of our current times.

We continue to meet and negotiate the original MOA, and have a proposal for your consideration in executive session tonight.

METRICS

- i. The following metrics will result in remote instructions:
 - a. If guidance from the National Centers for Disease Control (CDC), Massachusetts Department of Public Health (DPH) or the Williamstown Public Health official indicates that the district should move to remote learning.
 - b. Test Positivity Rates of 3% or greater in Berkshire County.
 - c. Test Positivity Rates of 3% or greater in the combined member towns.
 - d. Under the state's new community COVID-19 ranking model (which is determined by the Weekly COVID-19 Public Health Report), a rating of Yellow or Red in either of the member towns of Lanesborough and Williamstown for three (3) consecutive weeks.
 - <http://massgis.maps.arcgis.com/apps/View/index.html?appid=9f5b8ae8d0e24a1b98c55f704aaa24f3>
 - Metric subject to State guidance on map interpretation.
 - e. Under the state's new community COVID-19 ranking model (which is determined by the Weekly COVID-19 Public Health Report), a rating of grey or green in either of the member towns of Lanesborough and Williamstown for three (3) consecutive weeks will result in a return to in-school instruction after school closure due to three (3) consecutive weeks of yellow or red.
 - <http://massgis.maps.arcgis.com/apps/View/index.html?appid=9f5b8ae8d0e24a1b98c55f704aaa24f3>
 - Metric subject to State guidance on map interpretation.
 - f. The Committee agrees to regularly provide any information it received regarding the above-listed metrics.

DESE Updates

Pool COVID-19 Testing

- Abbott BinaxNow antigen test
- From DESE January 8 memo:
 - “Pooled testing involves mixing several test samples together in a ‘batch’ or ‘pool’ and then testing the pooled sample with a PCR test for detection of SARS-CoV-21.”
 - “This approach increases the number of individuals that can be tested using the same amount of resources as a single PCR test.”
 - “The test is performed at least once per week with anterior nasal swab for all students and staff members. Results are delivered within approximately 24-48 hours. If a pooled test result is negative, then all individuals within that pool are presumed negative and may continue to remain in school. If a pooled test result is positive, then all individuals in the pool must quarantine until they are re-tested individually.
 - “The Abbott BinaxNOW rapid point-of-care antigen test will be the primary source of this individual follow-up testing.”
- 6 week model-launch program with an option to fund ourselves (via Covid relief funds) based on a state-contract following the six week trial rollout.

DESE Updates

ACCESS and MCAS Testing

- ACCESS
 - Testing window will be expanded from February until May 20, 2021
- Competency Determination for 2021 Graduates
 - Make-up MCAS has been postponed
 - Modification of CD for English and math will be determined by passing their approved English or math course
 - Make-ups will be offered later this school year for students who desire to take the test
- Shortened test time for grades 3-8
 - Students will take a portion of the usual MCAS test, and serve only as a diagnostic tool
- No new “Underperforming” or “Chronically Underperforming” schools or districts will be named based on 20-21 MCAS scores
- 9th grade biology MCAS will be offered in June, instead of or in addition to February offering

BESS Screening

- Mount Greylock- Screener sent to parents/guardians of students in grade 7-12
- Lanesborough Elementary School- Screener sent to parents/guardians of students grades pk-6
- Williamstown Elementary School- Screener sent to parents/guardians and teachers of students grade pk-6
- All 3 schools: About 60% response rate thus far from guardians
- Students' self-reports in grades 5-12 will be conducted in the next month or so.

Building based student support teams will meet to review the screeners and develop supports as necessary, including:

- meeting with the school psychologist

- meeting with the guidance counselor

- peer groups engaged in SEL work

- individual weekly counseling with an outside provider that the school contracts with (with Gaggle or private LICSW)

Intentionally Left Blank

The presentation on our response to the State's Student Opportunity Act Legislation follows as a separate presentation.

Mt. Greylock and the Student Opportunity Act

The Student Opportunity Act:

New SOA Plan Deadline: Commissioner Riley has extended the deadline for school districts and charter schools to submit Student Opportunity Act (SOA) plans to **Friday, January 15, 2021**.

The [Student Opportunity Act \(SOA\)](#) implements the recommendations of the 2015 Foundation Budget Review Commission and includes other provisions to benefit our public schools.

As part of the SOA, districts are required to submit three-year, evidence-based plans aimed at closing persistent disparities in achievement among student subgroups. Application guidance, samples, and templates are located below.

Districts expected to receive **less than \$1.5 million** in incremental Chapter 70 funds in FY21 will fill out a "short form" template. Districts expected to receive **over \$1.5 million** in incremental Chapter 70 funds in FY21 will fill out a "long form" template that will require additional information, particularly concerning their budgets.

From <https://www.doe.mass.edu/commissioner/spec-advisories/soa.html>

Mt. Greylock and the Student Opportunity Act

There shall be a Twenty-First Century Education Trust Fund that shall be administered by the commissioner of elementary and secondary education in consultation with the Twenty-First Century Education Advisory Council, established in section 16 of chapter 70, for the purpose of addressing persistent disparities in achievement among student subgroups, improving educational opportunities for all students, sharing best practices for improving classroom learning and supporting efficiencies within and across school districts.

From: <https://malegislature.gov/Laws/SessionLaws/Acts/2019/Chapter132>

Mt. Greylock and the Student Opportunity Act

To be clear (and I believe this is a good thing), this vision and this legislation are not absolutely aimed at school districts like the MGRSD, but at entire districts where racial, economic, societal, and a host of other factors actively and tacitly impact vast numbers of young people in ways that may forever impact their life's trajectory and in fact the trajectory of their community.

We are unclear how much funding will actually be available for the MGRSD at this point. We are using this legislation and plan as an opportunity to create a mini-version of a district improvement plan. We will focus on one of our greatest areas of disparity, performance between students identified as special needs and students without those specific needs, and also to shore up early literacy among all of our elementary school students.

Mt. Greylock and the Student Opportunity Act

Four Commitments:

Commitment 1: Focusing on Student Subgroups: Which student subgroups will require focused support to ensure all students achieve at high levels in school and are successfully prepared for life?

Research-based early literacy programs will be the priority program focus for the Mount Greylock Regional School District SOA Plan.

Commitment 2: Using Evidence-Based Programs to Close Gaps

What evidence-based programs will your district adopt, depend on, or continue to best support the closure of achievement and opportunity gaps? What resources will you allocate to these programs?

The Mount Greylock RSD Plan will allow for the purchase of materials and the creation of a District team of educational leaders who will review the current curriculum and make recommendations for the purchase of new programs as needed as well as examine student data to plan unified targeted support programs.

Mt. Greylock and the Student Opportunity Act

Commitment 3: Monitoring Success with Outcome Metrics and Targets: What metrics will your district use to monitor success in reducing disparities in achievement among student subgroups? Select from the list of DESE metrics or provide your own. (Please note that targets will be added to this section once SY2020 data is released this fall.)

The metrics used to monitor success in reducing disparities in achievement among our student subgroups will be the DESE metrics of: Student achievement: English language arts achievement and student growth: ELA mean student growth percentile. We will also use data obtained from the DIBELS Next 8th Edition and Track My Progress benchmarking programs as well as teacher input gathered from meetings and surveys.

Mt. Greylock and the Student Opportunity Act

Commitment 4: Engaging All Families: How will your district ensure that all families, particularly those representing the student subgroups most in need of support, have the opportunity to meaningfully engage with the district regarding their students' needs?

The district will strive to create opportunities for engagement in a variety of ways that allow both education and two-way communication between the schools and families.

Reading specialists in the schools will hold family nights providing information and strategies on how they can best create a continuity of learning and support their children at home.

Parent conferences and team meetings will continue to be opportunities for the schools and families to share information about students, monitor progress, and collaboratively plan for additional support as needed.

The district will continue to use surveys as a means of soliciting parent/guardian feedback.

**Mount Greylock Regional Schools District
Student Opportunity Plan: SY 2021-2023**

Commitment 1: Focusing on Student Subgroups

Which student subgroups will require focused support to ensure all students achieve at high levels in school and are successfully prepared for life?

Research-based early literacy programs will be the priority program focus for the Mount Greylock Regional School District SOA Plan.

In 2019, at Williamstown Elementary School (WES) 70% of students in grades 3-8 met or exceeded expectations on the ELA MCAS. At Lanesborough Elementary School (LES) 62% of 3-8 students met or exceeded expectations. Overall, that data points toward an opportunity for improvement, but when one drills down to examine the data of subgroups at each elementary school, the results are even more urgent. In 2019 at WES, only 34% of high needs students met or exceeded expectations in ELA; at LES that number was 39%. We can break that down further to find the following:

	2019 ELA MCAS Data	
	Williamstown Elementary % of Students Meeting/Exceeding Expectations	Lanesborough Elementary % of Students Meeting/Exceeding Expectations
Economically disadvantaged	45	48
Students with disabilities	20	12

Though iterations of MCAS have changed over the past several years and direct comparisons between tests are not possible, overall student success in ELA trends the same; during each of the past three years, only 25 - 45 % of students at our district’s elementary schools have met or exceeded expectations in ELA as measured by the MCAS.

Benchmark testing using the DIBELS Next 8th Edition shows similar read flags.

This SOA Plan seeks to strengthen both Tier I instruction so that teachers are prepared with training and proper research-based tools to deliver instruction for all students. In addition, the Plan will focus on high-needs students to ensure they are receiving targeted instruction and monitor their progress.

Commitment 2: Using Evidence-Based Programs to Close Gaps

What evidence-based programs will your district adopt, depend on, or continue to best support the closure of achievement and opportunity gaps? What resources will you allocate to these programs?

The Mount Greylock RSD Plan will allow for the purchase of materials and the creation of a District team of educational leaders who will review the current curriculum and make recommendations for the purchase of new programs as needed as well as examine student data to plan unified targeted support programs.

Materials Purchase:

- Wilson Program: *Foundations* is currently being used at Williamstown Elementary, but not everyone has all the materials they need. Teachers at Lanesborough Elementary would like to use *Foundations* but do not have materials or current training. This Plan will make needed purchases and provide requisite professional development.
- Heggerty Program: Through participation in DESE-sponsored networking meetings, we have learned that districts across the Commonwealth are finding success with the Heggerty Program, which provides phonemic awareness lessons not covered in Foundations. Our SOA Plan will provide for the immediate purchase and training for the Heggerty.

Creation of a District Literacy Team:

- Year One - Create a team to examine and discuss historic MCAS and benchmark data to support decisions regarding curriculum purchase and adoption.
 - The District Literacy Team will be composed of ten (10) members comprising elementary teachers and reading specialists from both elementary schools, as well as school-based and District administrators. Meetings will occur outside of school hours so students will not miss instructional time with their instructors; a teacher stipend will be provided. In addition to the work of the committee, an added goal of this plan is to develop a core group of teacher-leaders in buildings who may be interested in mentoring and coaching peers in the future; we seek to provide opportunities for leadership development with our district.
 - Both elementary schools currently use the Reading Street program, which research shows to be only moderately effective at best overall. The first task of the literacy committee will be to explore other options for a Tier I ELA program to use in concert with Foundations and Heggerty and to plan for the purchase and implementation of the new program in FY22.
 - Neither elementary school uses a writing program with a cohesive K-6 scope and sequence. The literacy committee will explore and plan for the purchase and implementation of one in FY22.
- Year One and Beyond - Meet quarterly to look at each school's benchmark data, make decisions about instruction, and create systems for regular data analysis within buildings
 - The District Literacy Team will use benchmark data as a means of measuring the effectiveness of core programs. The Team will work to identify patterns in gaps of student understanding and support teachers with appropriate professional development to strengthen those areas of instruction.

- The Team will design a framework/protocol that the Reading Specialists and principals in each of the elementary schools can use with their teachers to regularly review individual student benchmark data to monitor progress and provide effective interventions.

FY21 budget item	Amount	Foundation Category
Purchase of Foundations materials - K, 1, 2	\$14,440	Instructional Materials
Foundations training for staff	\$3500	Professional Development
Purchase of Heggerty phonemic awareness program, including embedded PD	\$4030	Instructional Materials and Professional Development
Stipends for literacy team at \$500pp per year x 3 years	\$15,000	Instructional Leadership
Total	\$36,970	
Evidence-based program identified by DESE:		
SOA program categories:		

Commitment 3: Monitoring Success with Outcome Metrics and Targets

What metrics will your district use to monitor success in reducing disparities in achievement among student subgroups? Select from the list of DESE metrics or provide your own. (Please note that targets will be added to this section once SY2020 data is released this fall.)

The metrics used to monitor success in reducing disparities in achievement among our student subgroups will be the DESE metrics of

1. Student achievement: English language arts achievement
2. Student growth: ELA mean student growth percentile.

We will also use data obtained from the DIBELS Next 8th Edition and Track My Progress benchmarking programs as well as teacher input gathered from meetings and surveys.

Commitment 4: Engaging All Families

How will your district ensure that all families, particularly those representing the student subgroups most in need of support, have the opportunity to meaningfully engage with the district regarding their students' needs?

The district will strive to create opportunities for engagement in a variety of ways that allow both education and two-way communication between the schools and families.

- Reading specialists in the schools will hold family nights providing information and strategies on how they can best create a continuity of learning and support their children at home.
- Parent conferences and team meetings will continue to be opportunities for the schools and families to share information about students, monitor progress, and collaboratively plan for additional support as needed.
- The district will continue to use surveys as a means of soliciting parent/guardian feedback.

Certifications:

- By checking here, I certify that our district has engaged stakeholders in our district in accordance with the Student Opportunity Act.**

Please summarize your stakeholder engagement process including specific groups that were engaged:

The primary vehicle for soliciting input as justification for this SOA Plan was a literacy needs assessment initiated in March 2020. Phase I interviews and surveys were conducted through March and April. A literacy current state analysis was conducted using a variety of qualitative tools. Information was gathered through surveys, focus group interviews, individual interviews and via the *Planning and Evaluation Tool for Effective School-wide Reading Programs – Revised*. Participation in the needs assessment process was voluntary and open to all teachers. In the end, twenty-six teachers, including special education and reading specialists, were interviewed. In addition, the process involved input from the elementary principals, the Director of Curriculum and Instruction, the Director of Academic Technology, and the Superintendent. The founder and Director of The Reading Institute, Janet Stratton, was also utilized as a resource for this SOA Plan.

- By checking here, I certify that our district's school committee voted on our Student Opportunity Plan.**
- **Date of vote:**
 - **Outcome of vote:**



December 22, 2020

Williamstown Elementary School
115 Church Street
Williamstown, MA

RE: ERV-1 Coils Replacement Quote

We appreciate the opportunity of providing you with a proposal to replace the defective coils in ERV-1 at the above location. We propose to furnish all the labor and material needed to install the equipment listed below.

Equipment: Venmar Coils (2) (OEM parts; model #5DX10-39x54x5-10A-RH)
Associated materials (piping/valves/fittings/etc.)

Scope: ERV - 1
Remove & dispose of two (2) defective A/C coils
Install two (2) new OEM coils
Repipe into system (piping & valves)
Test for leaks
Evacuate system for 24hrs then recharge
Start & check unit operation

Cost: **\$21,750.00**

Cost Breakdown

Materials \$15,590.00*

*(coils - \$9,150/ freon & nitrogen - \$4,065/ piping, valves, etc. - \$2,375)

Labor \$ 6,160.00

Electrical: n/a

Calibration: We will adjust the unit as needed to bring to correct operating specification.

Jamrog HVAC Inc
194 Millers Falls Road – Turners Falls, MA 01376
ph. 413-548-9024
www.jamroghvac.com



Notes: We are Massachusetts statewide contractor; Vendor ID #00027073

Prevailing wage rate included

Due to material price changes beyond our control, the above price is valid for thirty (30) days.

Terms & Conditions:

All labor and materials are guaranteed for a period of one year with all applicable manufacturer's warranties in force from the date of installation. All work to be completed in a workman like manner according to standard practices. Any alteration, deviation or unforeseen circumstances from the above specifications involving extra costs will be executed only upon written orders and will become extra charge over and above the estimate as we may agree. All agreements are contingent upon strikes, accidents, or delays beyond our control. Our workers are fully covered by workman's compensation and liability insurance.

Acceptance of Proposal: The above prices, specifications, and conditions are satisfactory and are hereby accepted. You are authorized to do the work as specified.

Date of Acceptance: _____

Customer Signature: _____