

**Overview of Minuteman Enrollment of 628. Please refer to the attached spreadsheet entitled "Projections and Revised Projections".**

BASE DATA:

Column A refers to the year of projected 8<sup>th</sup> Graders in the 16 member communities.

Column B is the 2010 MSBA Projection of the 8<sup>th</sup> grade cohort in that year.

Column C is the 2014 NESDEC Projection of the 8<sup>th</sup> grade cohort in that year.

Column D & E is the difference between Col B & C in numbers and percentage respectively.

Column F is the MSBA variable describing the percentage of 8<sup>th</sup> grade applications.

Column G is the projected NUMBER of 8<sup>th</sup> grade applications.

Column H is the revised NUMBER of 8<sup>th</sup> grade applications.

GROWTH ASSUMPTIONS:

Column I projects a 1/10 of 1% increase per year in percentage of 8<sup>th</sup> grade applications, capping out at 5%.

Column J projects a 1% increase in the percentage of female 8<sup>th</sup> grade applications.

Column K describes the statewide average of females enrolled in CVTE programs.

Column L projects the NUMBER of additional female 8<sup>th</sup> grade applications.

FULL SCHOOL ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS:

Column M = sum of Col G + Col L; ANNUAL 8<sup>th</sup> grade applications based on 2010 projections with the additional female applications included.

Column N is the percentage of applications enrolled on Oct 1 (72%). This variable is held constant in the revised projections.

Column O is a simple four year sum of column N. It describes total high school population based on that year's 8<sup>th</sup> grade cohort projection.

Column P describes the total high school population based on that year's 8<sup>th</sup> grade cohort projection with the growth assumptions added, but Col N held constant.

FINDINGS:

Total high school enrollment projections do not diverge significantly until 2019. This Delta is maintained through the last year included in the spreadsheet (2023).

Conservative growth assumptions project a member town enrollment of 550 – 610 in years 2018 – 2023.

## REVIEW OF NESDEC REVISIONS AND 2010 PROJECTED ENROLLMENT

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
1													Growth			
2		2010	Jun-14			MSBA	MSBA	NESDEC	Growth				MSBA	Actual	MSBA	NESDEC
3		MSBA	NESDEC			Avg	Proj	Proj	Proj	Avg	Target	Proj (+)	Total	1-Oct	4 year	4 year
4	1-Oct	8th Gr	8th Gr	Diff	% Diff	% 8th	Apps	Apps	% 8th	Female	Female	Impact	Apps	72%	1-Oct	1-Oct
5																
6	2014	3755	3660	-95	-3%	4.2%	158	154	3.9%	32%	44%	0	158	114	<b>454</b>	<b>411</b>
7	2015	3570	3795	225	6%	4.2%	150	159	4.0%	32%	44%	0	150	108	<b>432</b>	<b>437</b>
8	2016	3690	3615	-75	-2%	4.2%	155	152	4.3%	33%	44%	10	165	119	<b>475</b>	<b>471</b>
9	2017	3727	3724	-3	0%	4.2%	157	156	4.4%	35%	44%	15	172	124	<b>494</b>	<b>515</b>
10	2018	3618	3823	205	6%	4.2%	152	161	4.5%	36%	44%	20	172	124	<b>495</b>	<b>553</b>
11	2019	3317	3751	434	13%	4.2%	139	158	4.6%	37%	44%	20	159	115	<b>459</b>	<b>555</b>
12	2020	3243	3736	493	15%	4.2%	136	157	4.7%	38%	44%	25	161	116	<b>464</b>	<b>578</b>
13	2021	3226	3850	624	19%	4.2%	135	162	4.8%	39%	44%	25	160	116	<b>462</b>	<b>604</b>
14	2022	3695	3842	147	4%	4.2%	155	161	4.9%	40%	44%	25	180	130	<b>519</b>	<b>614</b>
15	2023	3695	3675	-20	-1%	4.2%	155	154	5.0%	41%	44%	25	180	130	<b>519</b>	<b>601</b>
16																



As you may know, the work continues with our member communities to finalize the approval of a revised Regional District Agreement. Although 10 towns have approved the new agreement, I need all 16 to agree. Garnering the support of the remaining member communities is well underway with summer meetings of all stakeholders and indications are the agreement will likely be approved by the remaining towns in special town meetings this fall or in the spring. This scheduling does not impact our timelines within the MSBA process, should our request for an extension to our Feasibility Study agreement be granted.

MSBA's design enrollment projection of 435 students from only member communities has been discussed widely in the district. These projections were developed nearly 4 years ago, during an economic down turn. These projections do not reflect the increasing demand for career and technical education, nor Minuteman's improvement in recruiting student enrollment from member communities. In addition, my largest member communities have reported unexpected increases in K-8 enrollment in their schools.

In an effort to quantify the reports of member community superintendents, I engaged NESDEC to review the enrollment projections. This preliminary revision indicates that Minuteman's member communities could support an enrollment of approximately 550 – 610 students. The District's member communities have expressed an interest in a school of this size PLUS a smaller number of non-member students than what was required in the MSBA design enrollment of 800. On June 17, 2014, the Minuteman School Committee voted 10 – 2 to request approval from MSBA for a revised study enrollment of 628.

In support of that vote, the Chapter 74 Admissions policy of the District will be revised, and submitted to DESE for approval in September 2014. The new policy will prioritize member town student applications. With respect to non-member students, a school of this size would of course have less space for such students. Inter-district agreements with specific non-member communities would be effected in order to provide these applications a secondary level of priority. Non-member applications from cities or towns without an Inter-district agreement would have the lowest priority and, in a smaller school, would likely not be accepted.

As you are aware, and confirmed over (literally) hundreds of meetings in district towns over the last 18 months, member communities will not approve a project where non-member communities do not contribute to the cost of the project. Revisions to Chapter 74 regulations proposed by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) would attach a capital fee to the Chapter 74 vocational tuition of non-member students, thereby nullifying the original purpose of an Inter-district agreement that codifies a contractual obligation to contribute to a capital project by a non-member community. While

this change is not certain, it will shift the utility of an Inter-district agreement from providing capital payments to providing access to career and vocational technical education.

While an improved or new facility is in the best interests of Minuteman students and of utmost importance to the future of the region, developing a final design for such a facility would be enhanced by understanding the interests of nonmember communities. I have reached out to several non-member superintendents and school committees to discuss any interest in maintaining access to Minuteman for their students. I would appreciate any support the MSBA may be able to provide in these discussions.

Regardless of those discussions, I feel that a school of 628 is a project I will be able to gain unanimous member town support for in the Spring of 2016.

I have included a spreadsheet that describes the revisions to the projections based upon the NESDEC information and conservative growth assumptions that I have included. These growth assumptions are based on our actual experience the past 4 years in regards to consistent gains in our enrollment, effective recruitment, and a new information campaign beginning this fall that seeks to connect young women with STE(A)M careers offered at Minuteman. The projections do not include post-graduate students, part time students, collaborative students, nor 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> grade applications received annually at Minuteman.

Thank you

Edward A Bouquillon PhD  
Superintendent/Director