

Methacton School District Board of School Directors
Town Hall Meeting
Arcola Intermediate School
October 27, 2016 – 7:00 PM


Mr. Boardman opened the meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Boardman explained the purpose of the meeting with the following points of focus displayed on the screen:

Methacton School Board Town Hall Mtg.

Underlying Assumptions of Importance to Our Community

- Enrollment Projections
- Elementary Capacity Analysis
- Educational Programming
- Special Education Programming
- Facilities Assessment Study
- Potential School Closures
- Process Timeline
- Other

Thursday, October 27 – 7 p.m. 

Mr. Boardman explained that discussion will revolve around the key decision points in each of the areas and what underlying assumptions do we want to make sure we adhere to in each of these steps. Discussion will be among the board members first and then the floor will be opened to the public to share any questions or comments.

Enrollment Projections

Mr. Boardman explained the history/process of selecting new vendor – Milone and MacBroom so that can come to an agreement and be confident in the numbers and understand the long-term impact. Historically our enrollment has been declining and the study will help us decide if that trend will continue or change in the future. Declining enrollment can result in excess classroom space in our schools. Need to look at the long-term trend of the enrollment projections. Need to focus on total enrollment for the District and also the individual schools. Need to see how the trends play out and make decisions around those trends.

Ms. Aubrey-Larcinese commented on the history of Methacton and asked when the last time we had 4 elementary schools open in the District and what did the enrollment look like then, adding that it is a good jumping off point. She expressed concern if we fall in the in between or gray area of needing more than 4 schools but less than 5 and making a decision that does not compromise class size and education but doesn't leave us with underutilized space and inefficiency that is counterproductive to our educational goals. Having that information would help frame our decisions.

Mr. Dorn commented that the data is the data and we will all be able to move it in different ways adding that it would be helpful to compare from an analytical perspective the data from M&M with the data from the previous study. He agreed with Kim in that there will be a gray area and guesses that is where we will be. Initially it makes sense to make sure we are all comfortable with the numbers and then shift to configuring the numbers and maybe it's a hybrid solution adding that we want to make sure we are not fitting the numbers into a box prematurely.

Mr. Winters commented on validating the assumptions from M&M – the assumptions we asked for in the study is what we received so we can move on with a second opinion. We need to accept the two studies to be close enough for a directional perspective.

Mr. Ryan commented in agreement with Mr. Dorn and the comparisons of the two studies. We have to be comfortable and are we making a decision for now, 5 years down the road, or 10 years adding that we have to make a decision that is best for us now and not in 10 years. Need to clarify class size and are we shooting for the class size target or the class size maximum.

Ms. Hackett commented in agreement with Ms. Aubrey-Larcinese in knowing the history of openings and closures in the District. Important to know that education has changed dramatically adding that we have a much larger population of special needs children. We need to know exactly what our needs are at this moment and perhaps a projection based on the students that we have and the direction of our future educational needs.

Mr. Boardman commented in theory we could have declining enrollment but an increase in capacity to the point of special education and we need to look at that carefully. When we look at the numbers, we do have some excess space in the District. If the numbers show a continued declining trend in the data to say we have too much space, or we could have a flat trend or a modest up trend in the data. He indicated his lack of faith in the PEL study and even if there were flaws in that study, it doesn't mean we are going to see polar opposite trends in the new study and there may be similarities or significant differences.

Mr. Boardman asked for comments from the public.

Andrew Sandner, Lower Providence, commented in agreement with a lot of the comments made particularly with special needs and will the report include that.

Mr. Boardman confirmed the report should include that.

Mr. Sandner asked if there was excess capacity in the elementary schools or excess capacity overall.

Mr. Boardman responded overall adding that almost every building has some unused space.

Mr. Sandner commented on the committee work in selecting the vendor and requested having more engagement with the committee.

Mr. Boardman responded that he would like input from the committee and would like to provide the study beforehand.

Mr. Sandner commented on the tight timeline in getting the report and the meeting next week.

Mr. Boardman commented that if the Board and community have follow-up questions, we can adjust our timeline if needed.

Howard Jones, Lower Providence, commented on the early 1990's having 5 grade schools, and closing 2 of them, Audubon and Worcester. The student enrollment had been higher and dropped to about 3100 students around that time and that is why they closed the schools. Things to pay attention to from a utilization standpoint, PEL study looked at the District like a jelly bean jar and you have so many things to jam in it – that is not the way you use a school. We have a lot more special education. Anticipates a downward trend in enrollment but looks forward to seeing the study.

Jim Mollick, Worcester, asked if the Board has looked at the study yet.

Mr. Boardman responded that he has seen a draft but not the final study.

Jim Mollick commented that the reason we are here is because Skyview was built. According to the Act 34 Hearing packet, there is an over capacity problem. Enrollment today is 4846 reflecting 2,000 empty seats. Enrollment will go down based on information on the website. Birth rate is an important factor in enrollment projections and birth rates have been declining. Commented on the cost of enrollment projections and waste of money.

Mr. Winters commented that while enrollment has declined, we need to know if that will continue arguing that the projection study is not a waste of money and was done back in the 80's as Mr. Jones commented on the closure of 2 schools.

Jim Mollick responded that the PEL study is correct and the second enrollment study will show that. We wasted a year of time, effort and money on a second study to confirm the PEL study and delayed the process. He questioned if the second study comes back the same as the PEL study, are you going to do anything about it.

Mr. Winters responded that is why we are here. We want to make a decision based on all the facts adding I don't know that if anyone walked around all the schools, would it identify that we have 2100 open spots unless we want to have class sizes of 40.

Jim Mollick stated he went to PDE and got the project voided based on faulty projections that he knew were wrong.

Mr. Winters commented that we don't know they were wrong as we were not around when there was a decision to be made. We are making decisions based on facts and independent viewpoints.

Jim Mollick commented that he believes the PEL study was correct and the process was politicized to delay it and now we have another study delaying the process another year adding that the Board needs to move on and not delay the process anymore.

Mr. Boardman commented that our goal is to come to a conclusion this year for the long-term benefit of the students and community.

John Andrews, Lower Providence, commented K-5 schools peaked 13 years ago in 2003 and since then elementary has been in decline and carries through for the upper grades in the future. This year enrollment increased in K-4 by 20 students from last year. Adding that he sees a

resurgence in jobs in the area and that will result in resurgence in enrollment in our district and the resale of homes.

Suzanne Andrews, Lower Providence, commented on enrollment projections ten years ago and wonders why we are spending so much time on the process when we haven't even seen the report. Commented on all day kindergarten which can impact the capacity. Can we cut to the chase this evening and have you explain how you plan to set up the process, forming committees, etc. and then talk about the issues and gray areas after seeing the report?

Mr. Boardman responded that the idea for tonight's meeting was to talk about the process overall before getting into enrollment and capacity data, whether all day kindergarten makes sense, redistricting, etc. to get opinions on what to look for and what the concerns are so we are more prepared when we look at M&M's study.

Ashley Wilkerson, Audubon, asked if she was correct in remembering there was no breakdown in terms of the geographic areas within the District from PEL for enrollment? Can we look at one area and determine it was a higher enrollment area than another or was it the overall district? The reason for the question is comments about it being a waste of money to repeat the study adding that her recollection of the PEL study was that it was not data used for redistricting if we close a school and this new study will break it down.

Dr. Zerbe responded that the PEL study was an aggregate study of district enrollment over a period of ten years while the M&M study is designed to not only provide that information but to provide information by sending areas of each of the five elementary schools as well.

Ashley Wilkerson asked if we had decided to close a school or redistrict after PEL, we would have needed further data to determine how to divide students among the elementary schools.

Dr. Zerbe responded that is accurate. He also clarified that when we engaged Milone & MacBroom, we requested they provide a draft report prior to a final report planned for dissemination with a presentation on November 1. While the report was not complete on September 20, this draft report did reflect that enrollment is likely to decline which perpetuated a request to the Board to consider moving forward with a meeting such as this. Just to clear the air, while the Board and I have not seen the final report, a draft report was provided indicating that stagnant or declining enrollment is likely to continue over the next ten years.

Elementary Capacity Analysis

Ms. Rees commented on being careful using the word "excess" with reference to Audubon. She commented on concerns with Jim Thompson's reference on the use of teaching pods adding that we need to look at capacity from a teacher/student standpoint. If our goal is to educate students as efficiently as possible that may mean redistricting unless our goal is to save money adding that we need to figure out what our goal is. She commented in agreement with Ms. Hackett's comments about how education has changed and capacity needs may be greater in some areas and less in others. Capacity in education, educational programming and special education programming are all encompassing and we need to keep our eye on the goal.

Mr. Boardman commented that in terms of capacity, we have guidelines at each level and asked if we have been below that at the elementary level.

Dr. Zerbe responded that class size varies at the elementary level due to several variables, some could be a little higher capacity and some much lower adding that is reflected on the enrollment reports shared with the education committee.

Mr. Boardman questioned if the three newer buildings have a more permanent footprint than the other two having add on trailers.

Dr. Zerbe responded that Audubon and Arcola have modulars and Arrowhead uses modular spaces for homeroom and/or typical classroom spaces. In Audubon the modulars are used for itinerant or reading specialist services.

Mr. Boardman asked if M&M are doing the capacity study with and without modulars.

Dr. Zerbe confirmed adding the direction given to them was to make considerations with the understanding that we would either include or not include modulars in the determination.

Mr. Dorn commented that the Board should decide if we are going to use the modulars and determine if we need that capacity, do we redo modulars or add bricks and mortar to capacity. He added that it would be helpful prior to or along with the M&M study making the Board and public aware of what our capacity levels per grade are so everyone is working on the same assumptions as far as classroom capacity. Should have a fact sheet to use by school, age, capacity, current number of grade levels in each, etc. Important for the Board to work from the same base line to establish our analytics.

Mr. Boardman asked if anyone had any concerns with setting the guidance that if we redistrict or reduce the number of buildings, let's focus on getting rid of the modulars.

Mr. Rothe commented that he does have concerns on getting rid of the modulars adding that we used to have a lot more of them prior to Skyview. In the case of Arrowhead, those modulars are actually integral parts of the building now and you just want to chop them off because they are called modulars. We'll spend upwards of \$100,000 to remove them, retrofit the building, HVAC, electrical, plumbing, etc. adding that he is not sure of the condition of the modulars at Audubon but just to get rid of space because they are called something is foolish and unwise. You could look at that space as not classroom teacher space but enrichment space or something more apt for smaller, quiet areas. He also commented that the modulars are part of the facilities study as far as repair, etc. and he would not be in favor of removing them.

Ms. Rees commented on modulars not being ideal but a reality and should we decide to close a building, we may need them. We need to look at modulars as not necessarily a solution, but certainly not as a negative.

Mr. Boardman commented that should we redistrict; we can look at the schools on a case by case basis regarding modulars.

Mr. Dorn commented that we have to look at the end of the life cycles for the modulars and once we have that information, make the decision if we need to replace that capacity. When we might be at life cycle for the asset should be part of the discussion.

Mr. Winters commented in agreement with Mr. Rothe and Mr. Dorn on the modulars and it should be included in the footprint, although not ideal, we need to include that in the equation at least for short term utilization availability. He also commented on looking at capacity from a

scheduling perspective and using classrooms 6 periods out of 6 instead of 3 out of 6. He added that from a math perspective, we have a choice to make regarding class size, using Worcester as an example, if you have 92 students, do we have 4 classes of 23 or 5 classes of 18 and 19; we can't just assume that everything breaks out evenly in buckets of 22 and 25. When making these decisions we will have some variability, but it should be on both sides.

Mr. Ryan commented that he still needs to see what our utilization and capacity in every school looks like now. The Thompson report did it for the high school, Skyview and Arcola but not for the elementary schools. Then we do the "then" conversation, if we close one school, what does the "then" look like adding that maybe some larger classrooms can be divided and teachers can help us with that information.

Ms. Rees questioned if M&M went in every building adding there needs to be some real analysis on the current use. She gave an example of the need for computer labs and with our technology in most classrooms, do we still need computer labs.

Dr. Zerbe commented that our building administrators work with teachers and staff to best utilize the space and if we were to close a building, they would do the same. To paint a picture of exactly how a building should look is just an estimate and depends on student needs such as ESL services, reading services, special education services, etc. The utilization space will be something that the building principal and their team would work toward the best outcome for utilization adding that our building principals are masters at that and will work with their staff to best utilize that space.

Mr. Boardman commented in terms of redistricting or building closure, the individual building administration will have the final say on what goes on their building so if redistricting says Eagleville can hold another 150 students, that is just a recommendation, the staff at Eagleville has to look at that and confirm.

Dr. Zerbe agreed adding that our building administrators have been very involved in the process and as leaders set the stage in terms of engagement and effective usage in their buildings and have done an excellent job in the past, currently and moving forward. The utilization of space will ultimately come down to the building principal and their work with their team.

Ms. Aubrey-Larcinese commented that capacity is not something to be dictated by the facility itself. It's more about the policy and we decide what the class size is even if the size of the room can fit 50 students, we have to decide as a Board what the capacity is in how many students we want in the classroom and then figure out the best way to make that happen given the facilities we have.

Mr. Boardman agreed to a certain extent but it will depend on the needs of the students which is why we need to rely on the school administrators. Also, when we look at redistricting, the math may work out but we don't want to end up with an elementary school of all boys so we have to balance it.

Unknown Speaker: Appreciates the opportunity for tonight's discussion reiterating Dr. Zerbe's comments about what we want our elementary schools to look like; we want to look at class size and account for special education, etc. We want the education of our students, including elementary, to be the best it can be adding that the mapping out and discussions will result in community support.

Frank Gills, Audubon, commented on being transparent and open.

Andrew Sandner commented on having the capacity building by building and grade by grade. Getting teachers involved may give you a more honest answer than just building administrators. Board should visit each of the schools adding that Dr. Mollick mentions extra seats and where are those seats – you can't close the high school.

Mr. Boardman commented that all new board members took tours of the schools.

John Ferraro commented on the complexity of a capacity study and suggested having discussions on what fundamentally the decision comes down to. Frame up the discussion with scenario A and B, how much we are paying vs. educational quality – student/teacher ratio.

Mr. Boardman commented on capacity and extra capacity in needing a buffer and not filling the schools to maximum capacity.

John Andrews commented on the skewed class size in the PEL study and using closets, hallways and stages for 100% utilization.

Mr. Rothe disagreed with Mr. Andrews stating that special education classes are not meeting in closets adding that filling a school to capacity means filling each classroom with whatever class size we decide it to be, not filling closets and stage areas.

Mr. Boardman echoed Mr. Rothe's comments and in speaking on behalf of the Board, they are not going to use closets and hallways or have class sizes of 35 students.

Mr. Andrews commented on 45 classrooms for special education pull-outs with 50 special education teachers in the elementary schools adding that there is a problem with capacity and utilization in regular classrooms and special education classrooms. Capacity is lower at Skyview and Arcola. Closing Audubon seems impossible and is leery on how Milone and MacBroom addresses capacity of special education rooms.

Sandy Fischer, kindergarten teacher at Arrowhead, asked the Board to reconsider their ratio of elementary students to teachers. She has 22 students to 1 adding that with 5 and 7 year olds, it is a lot of students. Would like to see the numbers go from 22 to 18 or 19. Would like to have discussion on full day kindergarten and invited board members to visit the kindergarten classrooms to see them teach a full day curriculum into a half day adding that she wants her students to be successful.

Dawn Montare, librarian at Audubon and Arrowhead, commented on the history of the District and what it was like to have a building beyond capacity. Same thing is happening at Audubon and there is no available classroom space. Expressed concern with closing a school taking us back to overcrowded schools without any wiggle room adding her request to keep Audubon open.

Ashley Wilkerson, Audubon, commented on looking at evidence based education. Studies show that 18 is the best number for class size and we should come close to that. We should plan for the bubble class adding that no matter what happens we need to be prepared. Just as important as making the right decision, is getting the public onboard and suggested a chart showing classrooms and teachers. Special education services should be shown on a separate chart

including art, music, etc. If the information is put out there in an easy to understand way, you will have the support of the community.

Jim Mollick, commented on class size not being the most important in learning adding that studies show that parents are the most important. Old Board should have entertained increasing capacity at each of the elementary schools. The problem is the extra capacity at Skyview, adding that Audubon is the largest at no capacity. Two options are to redistrict students at Audubon or close the school. If you don't act soon, you won't make referendum and then you'll be cutting programs.

Candy Allebach, Eagleville, questioned what the difference is between this town hall meeting and a meeting held previously.

Ms. Aubrey-Larcinese responded that the previous meeting was not a town hall meeting.

Candy Allebach commented the same discussion was held and things have not changed adding that previous board members are owed an apology for being vilified when discussion was held about closing a school. Clearly things have not changed and you are discussing the same things they did. We are discussing enrollment without the enrollment numbers. How much is it going to cost taxpayers?

Jo Orsin, commented on the difference being we now have a school board that has the best interest of students at heart and they are doing their best to be transparent.

Educational Programming

Ms. Rees commented that this was the time to discuss full day kindergarten. The strategic plan talks about the whole child and kindergarten is no longer kindergarten when you squeeze it into 2 ½ hours. It has to be part of the picture.

Mr. Ryan questioned in terms of the timeline, where are we with the results of Dr. Katona's presentation.

Dr. Zerbe responded that Dr. Katona's intent is to bring information to the Education Committee this month and overall to make sure the Board receives whatever information they need in order to make decision.

Ms. Aubrey-Larcinese commented that it goes without saying that no one wants to see dramatic changes in the educational programming unless it means the schools will get better. It goes back to class size and policy. Determine how we want class sizes to look and what we have to do to make that happen.

Mr. Boardman commented that we either do full day kindergarten now or not in the future. Questioned if we have good benchmarks as to what other districts look like in terms of class size and structure of full day kindergarten.

Dr. Zerbe responded that Dr. Katona is working on that in her report.

Mr. Rothe questioned if Dr. Katona's report will show costs including staffing, bussing, etc. and not just curriculum costs.

Dr. Zerbe responded that the direction was to include staffing and materials but transportation would likely be a reduction in eliminating the mid-day run, adding that there are other implementations of full-day kindergarten.

Mr. Rothe would like to see a plan on how to introduce full day such as phase-in and enrollment caps and questioned how the cost can be formulated with so many unknowns. Need to find out our true capacities with enrollment projections and then the impact of full-day kindergarten with phasing-in and/or enrollment caps.

Mr. Boardman questioned if M&M was considering the scenario of full-day kindergarten.

Dr. Zerbe confirmed.

Mr. Boardman commented that if we can identify local districts that have recently done this, we can put more definitive numbers around everything.

Dr. Zerbe responded that once we see the enrollment report we can use those numbers of what the likely staffing would be which is the bulk of the cost of that type of program. Primarily the issue with implementing full-day kindergarten are the texts and staffing associated with it.

Ms. Hackett commented that while we are addressing capacity at this time, she doesn't think full-day kindergarten should be based on capacity, adding that it should be the other way around. Full-day kindergarten should have its own study to determine what the value of that is to the District independent of the current capacity.

Dr. Zerbe responded that the reason to consider full-day kindergarten is to make certain that whatever decision is made we don't regret not considering the potential need for full-day kindergarten. I agree with you on the purpose of whether or not to have full-day kindergarten being a separate study, but we should consider it from a capacity standpoint. It doesn't necessarily have to coincide with redistricting or a potential school closure, but it could be considered and available to us in the future.

Mr. Winters commented on a demographic change in ESL learners in our district and the need to consider that as well, besides special education.

Special Education Programming

Mr. Boardman commented on the growing trend of autism and looking at those needs in our district.

Ms. Rees added that not only the needs of autism but also the needs of ADHD students and the increase in anxiety in children and the need for time and space and the sharing of space.

Mr. Ryan commented on the importance of considering current students in terms of the space needed to see what it will look like.

Mr. Winters echoed Mr. Ryan's comments and the need for transparency in the decision making adding that the principals will make it work, but is that the preference. We need to find a way to make sure we have the before and after clearly defined.

Andrew Sandner commented on the importance of programming and the importance of special education needs.

Mr. Boardman asked Mr. Sandner, based on his experience, is there always available space for the needs of special education students in terms of a time out?

Mr. Sandner responded that there is space at Arrowhead and it may be an empty room but it is made available for those purposes. We need to know what the rooms are being utilized for now and what is our student/teacher ratio. He stressed the importance of student/teacher ratio and using rooms for purposes that we may not have had years ago.

Erica Sabinske, Audubon, commented in favor of a full-day kindergarten program and determining enrollment could start with the number of kindergartners last year and the number of first graders this year. The importance of having a space for students to calm down or decompress from anxiety issues when the counselor's room cannot be used due to speech therapy or other services that the counselor's room is used for. Sharing space issues may not work out for these reasons. Related capacity to buying clothes that fit.

Mr. Boardman reiterated the importance of these types of discussions.

Janice Conger, resident and Skyview librarian, commented on the difference in the maturity of some of the students in the absence of T-1. Full-day kindergarten could alleviate some of the problems that we now see.

Julie Sterndoff, Lower Providence, commented in support of full-day kindergarten from a parent and physician perspective.

Jennifer Zaveritnik, Lower Providence and school psychologist, commented in support of full-day kindergarten now that T-1 is not available. Perfect time to review the class size policy and look at the bigger picture and not just cost. Lower student to teacher ratio results in higher student achievement based on many studies.

John Andrews commented on enrollment projections and its significance on educational programming in terms of students attending private schools. Special education needs and classroom space. Full-day kindergarten should be a lengthy discussion on its own and we should be very cautious as to the long-term benefit of full-day kindergarten.

Jim Mollick, commented in regard to special education affecting capacity and need to realize law mandates for special education classes adding that full-day kindergarten cuts capacity in half for those kindergarten students.

Mr. Boardman commented that we are getting numbers with and without full-day kindergarten.

Jim Mollick commented that it won't really matter because we have so much extra capacity adding that current education cost per pupil is \$20,000.

Mr. Boardman commented on the budget impact for every \$1,000.

Jim Mollick commented that \$20,000 is a lot of money for our senior citizens and students get a decent education at Methacton adding that if you start dropping class sizes, you are dealing with high numbers.

Facilities Assessment

Mr. Dorn commented that the study has been made public and shows Arrowhead and Audubon with the biggest numbers for elementary and depending on these gray areas, we need to decide what the best investment is. Whether we bring 5 schools up to date or maybe we don't need 5 schools. We need to get the capacities and enrollment piece correct first.

Mr. Winters commented on having an open mind from a facilities perspective with Farina being the oldest building and perhaps we move Farina to Skyview or something, adding that he is just throwing random ideas out. There are ways to potentially save on facilities.

Ms. Rees commented on the possibility of adding on and if we do decide to close a school and then identify a school that we could add on to while we are dealing with the present, adding we need to look toward the future too.

Mr. Boardman commented that we are in a good place from that perspective as we have several elementary buildings that have some ground attached to it.

Mr. Ryan commented on the dollar amounts at Audubon and Arrowhead as compared to the cost of constructing a new building adding that we have to keep every option open and keep an open mind.

Ms. Aubrey-Larcinese commented that instead of building a new building that can house 500 students, maybe we build a new school that houses 550 or 600 giving us extra breathing room if we go from 5 buildings to 4 to give us space for that bubble class, unexpected special education needs, etc. Need to think outside the box.

John Andrews requested an electronic version of the facilities study be made available to the public. Need to tread cautiously, transparently and effectively to get community support.

Jim Mollick questioned the price tag on the facilities assessment study and what school are you considering being built.

Mr. Dorn responded it was \$100 million and is hypothetical. Arrowhead and Audubon are the two oldest schools and if either or both decide to be kept, we need to consider the cost of a new school rather than upgrading two older assets. The Board needs to decide how much of that \$100 million needs to be done adding that money has not been spent to maintain our infrastructures. We have a lot to do, but it behooves us to make sure that as we are looking at enrollment, we are also looking at the best way to update our facilities for the right capabilities, adding that we have to look at the whole picture.

Jim Mollick asked if this assessment study was requested at a public meeting and who set the parameters.

Mr. Dorn responded that it all predated this Board but the cost was approved at a public meeting and parameters were set with an architect.

Mr. Boardman commented they would have to check to see who set the parameters.

Jim Mollick commented that Woodland is fairly new and can't imagine what needs to be done there.

Ms. Aubrey-Larcinese commented that this study projects out 6 to 10 years in the future so at that point you are looking at parts of Woodland being 15 to 20 years old.

Jim Mollick commented on the newness of Eagleville and Worcester. He asked if there was any reason why the assessment study was not made available to the public on the website so it could be reviewed prior to this meeting to prepare for discussion.

Mr. Boardman stated that it was made available to the public at Farina after the Board voted on it.

Mr. Winters questioned if the original document came in electronic form.

Dr. Zerbe commented that while he indicated the document would be made public once the Board accepted it on Tuesday, it was not our intent to post it in advance of this particular meeting two days later, adding that the particulars in the study are not the content for our discussion; it was just a timing matter and we will have an electronic version.

Mr. Winters added there was no intent to keep the information from anybody.

Jim Mollick commented on transparency and it would have been nice to have, adding that \$100 million is ridiculous.

Mr. Ryan commented that this was discussed and the workbook viewed at two public committee meetings, finance and property, so people have had the opportunity to get a feel for the workbook and numbers.

Potential School Closures

Mr. Boardman commented on the possibilities of a reduction in one or two schools or maybe keeping them all, adding that the Board will continue to work on that with continued discussion and transparency.

Process Timeline

Mr. Boardman stated that our goal is to wrap up our decision in January.

Dr. Zerbe confirmed the target is for January.

Mr. Boardman commented on the process in developing the timeline and the flexibility of the timeline as we target January, adding that everyone on the Board is committed to making a decision and moving forward. Any change creates anxiety whether it's redistricting or reducing a school; it's not an easy decision and it's a tough process.

Mr. Boardman thanked everyone for coming out and giving them ideas and more to think about, adding that they will continue this process in more of a town hall meeting rather than taking the time up during regular board meetings.

Mr. Ryan added that a couple things mentioned tonight requires work and is crucial to sticking to our January timeline like Dr. Katona's report on full-day kindergarten and the importance of having that data.

Mr. Boardman agreed.

Ms. Rees asked if the decision in January is made, could it be made for not the next year but the following year or is that not a possibility.

Mr. Boardman responded that our goal is to make the best decision, adding that we need to be confident for it to be effective for the next school year.

The meeting ended at 9:50 p.m.