

CHELMSFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
FACILITY ASSESSMENT & EDUCATIONAL VISIONING



Visioning #4 - Outcomes & Findings

May 4th, 2016, 4:00PM – 8:00PM

Purpose

This visioning session was the final visioning session and served to provide an opportunity for participants to react and respond to the district-wide options developed by the design team.

- Welcome and Introductions
- Identified issues & preliminary options
- Options discussion & exercise
- Possible evaluation criteria presentation & exercise
- Key take-aways

ITEM NO.	NOTES	ACTION BY
1	Introduction of the Facilities Working Group (WG) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D&W introduced the team and gave a brief presentation addressing the scope of the comprehensive facilities assessment and timeline. 	
2	Identified issues & preliminary options D&W presented the issues identified through this study process. Key areas of concern include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accommodate Full-day kindergarten • Consider alternate PK location • Overcrowding conditions exist at elementary schools, middle schools, and high school • All schools exhibit missing and/or inappropriate spaces including special education, art, music, and middle school science • Temporary construction exists at South Row ES, Parker MS, and McCarthy MS • Physical building conditions are satisfactory but will need investment 	
3	D&W presented Options for the district moving forward. Participants were asked to respond to options D-H by documenting advantages, disadvantages, and questions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option A - Option A is a <i>de minimus</i> project that addresses immediate capital needs, largely focusing on systems that are at the end of their useful life. It does not address full-day kindergarten, any overcrowding, or the location of pre-kindergarten. • Option B - Option B adds modular additions to all schools that are experiencing overcrowding and accommodates full-day K. 	

ARCHITECTS
PROJECT MANAGERS

260 Merrimac Street Bldg 7
Newburyport, MA 01950
978.499.2999 ph
978.499.2944 fax

212 Battery Street
Burlington, VT 05401
802.863.1428 ph
802.863.6955

www.doreandwhittier.com

ITEM NO.	NOTES	ACTION BY
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option C - Option C maintains the way the schools are currently operating if full-day K were to be implemented and adds permanent construction additions at schools with overcrowding. Byam, Center, Harrington, South Row, Parker, and McCarthy receive major additions. This option removes existing modular classrooms at South Row, Parker, and McCarthy. Additions would likely trigger code upgrades and require full renovations of all buildings receiving additions. • Option D - Option D builds a new early childhood center for PK and full-day kindergarten students on a site to be determined. Westlands discontinues as a PK center and would be used for Community Ed. Byam, Center, Harrington, and South Row become grades 1-4 elementary schools. The Parker MS becomes a 5-6 middle school to serve all 5-6 students in the District and would require an addition and full school renovation. The McCarthy reconfigures to serve grades 7-8. The high school would remain. <p>Advantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community ed stays at Westlands • No redistricting needed at the elementary level • Puts PK with kindergarten • Eliminates modulars • Eliminates disparity at the middle schools • Likely cost effective – it would be cheaper to build an early childhood center than a new middle school • No new administrators needed • Enrollment numbers fit the space • All families could have access • Opportunity for the Pre-K population to grow • 5/6 is separate from 7/8 • Good spacing/ balance of students throughout the District <p>Disadvantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New building needed for ECC • 2 project solution • Transportation costs • Separates kindergarten from the rest of the elementary grades • Does not address high school issues • Too many transitions • Not aligned with the current curriculum • Large school size • Town is less likely to support an early childhood center • Does not solve the science lab issue at the middle school <p>Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When would all day K be able to be implemented? 	

ITEM NO.	NOTES	ACTION BY
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is a new building dedicated to younger kids as attractive to townspeople as a building for older students? • Will Parker need temporary modular classrooms to accommodate all of grades 5 & 6? • Can central offices go to the Westlands? • Will the modulars be taken down at South Row? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option E - Option E builds a new upper elementary school for all grade 3-5 students in the District. Westlands discontinues as a PK center and would be used for Community Ed. Byam and Harrington reconfigure to become PK-2 elementary schools and Center and South Row become K-2 elementary schools. The Parker and McCarthy Middle Schools reconfigure to serve grades 6-8. Chelmsford High School would remain. <p>Advantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town would be more likely to support a project that benefits the older grades who depend more on technology. • All students in the District would get to experience the new school • Maintains feeder school patterns • Keeps kindergarten with the elementary grades • Pk-2 grade configuration • Removes modulars • Integrated PK at elementary schools/ anchors PK to elementary school • One project solution • Opportunities for teamed teacher collaboration <p>Disadvantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too large • Pre-K would be split up • Need for more administrators, nurse, etc. • Does not address inequities with Parker and McCarthy • Likely increase in transportation costs • Does not address issues at the high school • Westlands does not get used • Does this increase operational costs? • Does not solve the science issues at the middle schools • Extra transition for some PK kids to kindergarten • Students transition from small elementary school to large upper elementary, to smaller middle school, to larger high school • Students are together for 3-5 then split up for 6-8. <p>Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What happens to the Westlands? Could this be central offices? 	

ITEM NO.	NOTES	ACTION BY
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How many houses or schools would the new ES be broken into? • When does full day K start? <p>• Option F - Option F reconfigures grades at the elementary and middle schools. Westlands discontinues as a PK center and could serve community ed. Byam and Harrington become PK-2 elementary schools and Center and South Row become K-2 elementary schools. Parker becomes a 3-5 upper-elementary and McCarthy becomes a 6-8 middle school. Both the Parker and McCarthy require major additions and full school renovations. Chelmsford High School remains.</p> <p>Advantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade Configuration • All students are together from grade 3 • Meets identified needs • Long term solution • Aligns with the curriculum • Opportunities for teams of teachers to collaborate • No duplication of programs • Only 1 set of MS science labs • No new big project (2 smaller ones) <p>Disadvantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phasing/ where do kids go during construction? • May need more staff • More kids outside of a 2 mi. bus radius • Pre-k is split into two locations • 3-5 and 6-8 seem too big as one school • No consideration to the high school • Transportation costs • More transitions • Small school to a larger school • 2 building projects • Will MSBA fund 2 additions? And which would be funded first? • Potential extra transition for some PK students to kindergarten • McCarthy science rooms would still be a potential issue • Cannot transition to this model until both projects are complete <p>Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are 4 transitions between schools too many? • What do you do with the Westlands? Central Offices? • Would the 3-5 or 6-8 schools be broken up into houses? 	

ITEM NO.	NOTES	ACTION BY
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How could the transition work? • Do you have to wait for both additions to be complete before initiating full day K? • Would the MSBA fund 2 schools? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option G - Option G reconfigures grades at the elementary and middle schools. PK remains at Westlands. Harrington, Center, and South Row become K-2 elementary schools. Byam and Parker become 3-5 upper-elementary schools. McCarthy becomes a 6-8 middle school. McCarthy requires a major addition and full school renovations. Chelmsford High School remains. <p>Advantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade Configuration • All students are together from grade 3 • Meets identified needs • Natural splits at developmental breaks • Keeps PK together <p>Disadvantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phasing/ where do kids go during construction? • May need more staff • More kids outside of a 2 mi. bus radius • Pre-k is split into two locations • 3-5 and 6-8 seem too big as one school • No consideration to the high school • Transportation costs • 3 major building projects • Inequity between upper elementary populations • 5 transitions • Which project would come first? • Cost • Doesn't cover all identified needs • Requires at least one additional administrator • Physical access is lacking for PK • No room for CHIPS to expand <p>Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are 4 transitions between schools too many? • What do you do with the Westlands? • Would the 3-5 or 6-8 schools be broken up into houses? • How could the transition work? • Do you have to wait for both additions to be complete before initiating full day K? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option H - Option H builds a new 6-8 middle school and reconfigures grades at the elementary level. Westlands discontinues as PK and 	

ITEM NO.	NOTES	ACTION BY
	<p>Would serve community ed. Byam and Harrington become PK-2 elementary schools and Center and South Row become K-2 elementary schools. Both Parker and McCarthy become 3-5 upper-elementary schools. The District builds a new middle school to serve grades 6-8. Chelmsford High School remains.</p> <p>Advantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aligned with curriculum • Anchors Pre-K -2 to one school building • Helps transitions for younger population • One project • Collaboration opportunities for grade level teachers • Less transitions • Gradual increase in size of school population • New building • Preferred grade configuration • Immediately addresses MS science rooms • Parity for all students grades 6-8 • Least disruptions during construction • All modular are removed • Don't have to bring existing schools up to code • Meets all identified needs • All students benefit from the new building <p>Disadvantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost of construction and operations • Site? • Transportation issues? Possible longer bus rides for younger students • Start times? • More administrators • Pre-K would be in a building that is 2 levels • Too many transitions for PK students that will go to a different K-2 elementary • Splits up PK <p>Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could Central Offices move to the Westlands? • Is there a centrally located place for the new middle school? • Will Lion's Pride and Lion's Den still exist? • Will there be extended day care for pre-school? • Should McCarthy say upper ES and Byam say ES? • Do PK students have to switch schools if their elementary school is not the same as their pre-school? • Do Parker and McCarthy really need to be updated? • Why not build a new High School rather than a new middle 	

ITEM NO.	NOTES	ACTION BY
	school?	
4	<p>Possible evaluation criteria presentation & exercise</p> <p>Table 1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cost 2. Long-term solution 3. Appealing to community and potential residents/ willingness to support the project 4. Least disruptive process during construction 5. Grade configuration 6. Size of building 7. Number of transitions 8. Return on investment 9. Appropriate educational spaces 10. Academic mandates 11. Building codes 12. Suitable site 13. Transportation <p>Table 2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Don't let cost supersede educational standards 2. Address inequities within grade levels and subject matter (designated spaces for science, Sp. Ed., & arts) 3. Site – central and affordable 4. One project one time <p>Table 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cost impact to tax payers <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Construction b. Operational 2. Time to completion 3. Improvement to educational opportunities 4. What gets the most bang for the buck 5. Eliminate modular classrooms 6. Code compliance for all schools 7. MSBA procedures and guidelines <p>Table 4</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The most bang for the buck (meet student, parent, and community needs) 2. Sensitivity to transitions for all 3. Number of children negatively impacted (longer bus rides for youngest students, disparity between new and old buildings) 4. 21st century environment 5. Impact on education during construction 6. Cost 	

ITEM NO.	NOTES	ACTION BY
	<p>Table 5</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Long-term investment/ value 2. Meets identified needs 3. Taxpayer cost & excluded debt/ capital budget costs/ operational expenses 4. Time to completion 5. Parity within each grade level 6. Student transitions 7. Considers long-term flexibility 8. Transportation time/ costs/ grouping 9. Maintain community schools/ participation 10. Minimize disruptions <p>Table 6</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Timely implementation of full-day K 2. Appeal to the voting residents & cost 3. Land? 4. # of children being positively impacted 5. Construction impacting educational needs 6. What will increase property values 7. Transportation costs and time on busses 8. Number of new administrators needed 9. MSBA support <p>Table 7</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cost 2. Optimal use of existing resources – recent construction/ improvements (money already spent) 3. Quality education programs for all students is more important than the buildings they are taught in 4. Providing a safe, clean space to learn is more important than matching idealistic MSBA guidelines 5. Community schools – PTO supports all ES activities today 6. PK needs should be below other grades with regards to space decisions 7. MS science lab parity 8. Full day K is not a priority <p>Table 8</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do the right project the right way 2. Fiscal responsibility 3. Permanent future solutions 4. School size, transitions, and numbers 5. Flexible teaching spaces 6. Site location 7. Collaboration amongst teachers 	

ITEM NO.	NOTES	ACTION BY
5	<p>Participants were asked to vote for their 1st, 2nd, and 3rd choice Options. Results were as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Option H (New MS) 37 votes: 1st=13, 2nd=11, 3rd=132. Option J (New HS) 23 votes: 1st=6, 2nd=7, 3rd=103. Option D (New ECC) – 16 total votes: 1st=7, 2nd=6, 3rd=34. Option F (Reconfigure & add) – 6 total votes: 1st=2, 2nd=2, 3rd=25. Option E (New Upper ES) – 5 total votes: 2nd=3, 3rd=26. Option I (Grade 4-6 Upper ES) – 5 total votes: 1st=2, 2nd=1, 3rd=27. Option G (Conventional MS @ McCarthy) – 1 vote: 1st=1	