

AGENDA



**Addison Central School District
Facilities Committee
Committee Meeting
Wednesday, September 23, 2020, 7:00 pm - 9:00 pm
Virtual Connection**

You are invited to a Zoom webinar.

When: Sep 23, 2020 07:00 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Topic: ACSD Facilities Committee Meeting

Please click the link below to join the webinar:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84581256575?pwd=MEpsQnpEd3BNNEJYMjNmQitka0dCZz09>

Passcode: 8e4YCK

Or iPhone one-tap :

US: [19292056099](tel:19292056099),,[84581256575](tel:184581256575)#,,,,,,0#,,[444674](tel:1444674)# or

[13126266799](tel:13126266799),,[84581256575](tel:184581256575)#,,,,,,0#,,[444674](tel:1444674)#

Or Telephone:

Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

US: [1 929 205 6099](tel:19292056099) or [1 312 626 6799](tel:13126266799) or [1 301 715 8592](tel:13017158592) or [1 346 248 7799](tel:13462487799) or [1 669 900 6833](tel:16699006833) or [1 253 215 8782](tel:12532158782)

Webinar ID: 845 8125 6575

Passcode: 444674

International numbers available: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84581256575?pwd=MEpsQnpEd3BNNEJYMjNmQitka0dCZz09>

- A. Call to Order Upon Reaching a Quorum
- B. Introductions - Board Members, Administration and Staff
- C. Approve Agenda
- D. Public Comment
- E. Recommendation to Approve Minutes of August 11, 2020
- F. Discussion: Facilities Master Plan Update and Next Steps
- G. Discussion: ACSD Design Team Work
- H. Next Meeting Date
- I. Adjournment

MINUTES

Addison Central School District
ACSD Board
Facilities Committee Meeting
Tuesday, August 11, 2020 12:00pm – 2:00pm
Virtual Connection

In Attendance:

James Malcolm, Victoria Jette, Jori Jacobeit, Mary Cullinane, Peter Burrows, Brittany Gilman

A. Call to Order

Meeting was called to order at 12:00pm by Victoria Jette.

B. Introductions – Board Members, Administration & Staff

Administration & Staff: Peter Burrows, Brittany Gilman

Board Members: James Malcolm, Victoria Jette, Mary Cullinane, Jori Jacobeit

David Epstein from TruExCullins

C. Approve Agenda

Agenda approved.

D. Public Comment

Barb Wilson commented on frustration expressed at yesterday's board retreat and frustration in the community around active listening and validation of community concerns. She emphasized the need for action to ensure equity in the facilities master planning process. Barb noted Shoreham's population growth in recent years and asked about the role it will play in the decision-making process.

Tanya Scuteri referenced the TruExCullins report and the findings around the Shoreham School's potential for expansion. Mary suggested that Tanya submit her questions for David Epstein to answer via an e-chat.

E. Approve Minutes from 6-18 Facilities Committee Meeting

Minutes approved.

F. Discussion: Facilities Master Plan Update and Next Steps

1. Three and Four School Model with David Epstein

Victoria provided context on the evolution of the facilities master plan and shared topics discussed at yesterday's board retreat. She acknowledged the board's concerns around Covid-19 and all the uncertainty brought about by the pandemic. She emphasized the Board's unanimous desire to continue the facilities master plan conversation and modeling given the budget impacts that are coming. She shared a vision for community that extends beyond town lines and that creates schools with diverse student populations and full-time student supports. She alluded to the fact that community engagement will likely look different than it has in the past, noting forthcoming e-chats, porch conversations, and website improvements.

Peter recapped David Epstein's March presentation which included 1-school, 2-school and 3-school models. He explained the board's decision to add a 4-school model for comparison purposes in staffing, facilities needs, and elementary school principals' perspectives on programming and other considerations.

Brittany shared financial projections for the 3 and 4-school models. Her theoretical model of a 3-school option assumes enrollment of 80 per grade at Mary Hogan and 20 at both Salisbury and Bridport, with total student enrollment of 480 at Mary Hogan and 120 at both Salisbury and Bridport.

Brittany explained that we're comparing models of K-5 schools due to the sixth grade move happening in the fall of 2021. She continued with a staffing model for all three schools, noting that principals weren't sure that the two smaller schools would require a 1.0FTE for all positions. For the purpose of this model, 0.5 FTE has been set as a minimum for each staffing position. Brittany identified the added benefit of a full-time licensed social worker at each school along with increased student access to interventionists. The 4-school model brings projected enrollment to 18 per grade in the three smaller schools while keeping the minimum of 0.5 FTE for staffing.

Brittany provided a breakdown of current enrollment figures and staffing for each elementary school from the 2019-2020 school year.

Her key takeaways include an estimated \$3.3 million in savings (in staffing) in the first year of operation with the 3-school model. She estimated cumulative savings over the first 10 years of nearly \$41.5 million with the 3-school model.

The transportation modeling includes a directive to cap all student bus rides to under an hour.

Peter spoke about the national landscape of education budget reductions. He does not anticipate that Vermont will be immune from the need to potentially cut school budgets in

the coming years due to a projected significant drop in revenue. Jori noted that the 3-school model, while providing substantial savings, does not sacrifice programming, and keeps bus ride lengths and class sizes reasonable. David observed that the 3-school model seems like a good compromise.

David elaborated on the 3-school option and noted Bridport's adequate space for classrooms but limited spaces for student supports. His 3-school option cost model includes two variations: deferred maintenance only and deferred maintenance plus additions.

Mary asked Peter and Brittany to share their perspectives from a financial, operational angle. Peter mentioned the excess spending threshold and revenue shortfalls as additional considerations as we decide how to prioritize deferred maintenance, noting that deferred maintenance cannot be covered by our yearly budget. Brittany added that the savings from the three-school models may free up some funds to allocate toward maintenance. Peter suggested considering using part of the ed reserve to start to chip away at deferred maintenance costs.

Mary asked how each building will support the resources outlined within the 3-school model and how that will be communicated to the community. Jori asked about how urgent a bond would be within the 3-school model. David noted the Shoreham roof is the only issue he recalls as urgently needed. He added that the savings from operational and staffing costs might also be reinvested into the system, both in facilities and programming. A phased approach might begin with students repopulating the schools for a time before determining specific needs and bonding requirements. He explained that work can be phased on schools while they are operational, including construction during summer vacation.

Mary reminded us that any savings may disappear quickly if we have to cut a substantial percentage of our budget.

David referenced the can-do attitude of educators and their ability to make the most of limited resources. Jori noted that investing in facilities = investing in kids and that the facilities we provide for our children communicate what we value as a community.

David Epstein asked for a planning horizon for this study. He suggested syncing up timelines with Brittany, using 20 years to model impact of only investing in deferred maintenance versus a bond. Everyone agreed that a 10-year plan seemed most relevant.

Chip spoke about equity as a driver in this process and asked how our 3-school model will ensure equitable distribution of socioeconomic backgrounds at each school. Victoria affirmed that boundary drawings must include not only geographical considerations but also the socioeconomic makeup of each town. Peter referenced the socioeconomic diversity and disparities within our district, with free and reduced lunch rates varying widely from town to town.

Mary emphasized the importance of the process of determining school boundaries and the way that the process is communicated. Victoria noted that she'd like to see more information about how the 3-school model would actually accommodate our needs.

Mary shared that a forthcoming e-chat will speak to the vision as it relates to educational and social benefits for students within the proposed models.

In discussing the next round of a facilities meeting, David suggested using our guiding principles to contrast the status quo and the 3-school option. Victoria emphasized the need to spend more time communicating the positive impacts that the new model could have for our students.

Peter and Brittany will continue to examine how offerings and support services would fit into 3 schools. What would it look like on the ground? What might a plan to address deferred maintenance look like? How do we envision a process of setting boundaries for schools? What factors would be considered in determining who goes where? What opportunities of scale for educational benefits exist within each model?

G. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 1:48 pm by Victoria Jette.