

## **Ipswich School Committee- WORKSHOP**

Middle/High School Ensemble Room

Tuesday, January 10, 2023

5:00 PM

### **MINUTES**

#### **1. Call to Order**

Ms. Eliot called the meeting to order at 5:10 PM. She said that the workshop format of the meeting would not allow public comments. There was a representative from the Ipswich Educators Association who may interact with the School Committee throughout the meeting.

Members Present:      G. Stevens (GS)              K. Eliot (KE)  
                                 J. Donahue (JD)              P. Kneedler (PK)  
                                 J. Poirier (JP)                E. Cannon (EC)  
                                 D. Freehan (DF)

Also Present:              B. Blake, Superintendent of Schools (BB)

Abbreviations:          Ipswich Educators Association (IEA)  
                                 Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA)  
                                 Statement of Interest (SOI)

Supporting Document: Appendix A- Whiteboard notes indicating potential options for site/configurations

#### **2. Discussion:**

- **Continuation of conversation about the necessity/utility of a ballot questions**
- **What sites are available?**
- **What configurations is the School Committee interested in?**
- **List of available options**

The discussion began with KE stating that at the beginning stages of the school building project(s) conversation this year, the School Committee talked about having ballot questions ready for the community ahead of an SOI submission in April 2023. After a phone call with the MSBA, it was decided that the ballot questions or polling of the community was not necessary ahead of time. There was, however, still a conversation about proceeding with a some form of ballot vote after the Town Meeting.

BB checked with Town Counsel about the legality of ranked choice voting in Ipswich. While legal, it could pose a challenge with the current voting system Ipswich uses. There is the potential to offer separate ballot questions for each different scenario. While not the same as ranked choice, the School Committee could potentially still determine the community's top choices in terms of popularity.

A lengthy discussion followed about the purpose of a ballot vote. DF felt that there was enough information from the listening sessions, surveys, extensive research into the failed project and other MSBA projects across the state to move forward with a recommendation. The School Committee, DF said, needed to demonstrate leadership and plan ahead for a readiness call with the MSBA should an SOI be accepted. PK added that having ballot questions without an accurate estimate on cost associated with the options would not make sense.

Some acknowledged that the listening sessions and surveys brought in too few people. A ballot vote had the potential to reach a larger percentage of the community. At this point, the community has not had the opportunity to weigh in on any semblance of configuration or concrete examples of potential projects. A ballot vote is a way of bringing what has been discussed by the School Committee to the greater community.

It was suggested that the conversation about a ballot vote be moved until later in the meeting. It would be hard to determine ballot questions without knowing if the School Committee could narrow down or come to an agreement on options or configurations. JD disagreed, stating that the last 20 minutes of the previous workshop were the most effective. It was important to establish goals early in this conversation and decide the purpose. Was it to narrow down and define options and if so, for what purpose? Due to the urgency of the matter, DF felt the conversation needed to remain productive and move forward. EC agreed that moving forward was important.

The conversation continued around consensus building and the timing of building that consensus. Most agreed that if the School Committee were to use a ballot question for community feedback, it would be in May. DF was not in support of a ballot vote and felt the School Committee could use the information they have already collected to come up with a framework for a project. GS felt the ballot vote would help the School Committee understand what the taxpayers in town are willing to support. A non-binding vote is just another data set to be used in the decision making process.

There was a concern that a ballot vote would create divisiveness again through town with steering committees and lawn signs in favor of potential options. DF noted that no other town used a non-binding ballot vote and suggested the potential for another survey instead. DF said that because the MSBA would not fund two projects at once and due to the sense of urgency, this is a one project solution. JD and JP disagreed. JP said that the School Committee needs a ballot vote to build confidence in knowing the School Committee is on the right track towards a project the town will support.

The majority of the group wanted to work towards ballot questions. The conversation moved on to potential options.

Mile Lane was discussed. GS spoke with the conservation agent in Ipswich about the potential issues with using that land for a school project. With the setback from the river, wetlands, and significant storm and wastewater mitigation, the conservation agent was not supportive of using the land as a site for a school. The building would need to be placed right against the current parking lot. GS also talked about the significant neighborhood pushback and that, combined with the conservation issues, makes this location less desirable. The school would also need to reinvest in the replacement of fields at this location. GS said the property does not lend itself to a campus style school setting. He suggested removing Mile Lane as a site for any school configuration. KE added that there was consensus during the last project that Mile Lane did not add value as a site over Doyon.

JD asked about land usage at Doyon and whether additional land would need to be purchased adjacent to the Doyon property in order to fit a campus style school. She referenced the last project, stating that she thought it was determined there was not enough room. DF said she spoke with someone on the former School Building Committee who shared that theoretically, the new school proposed at Doyon during the last project could have been lower, but there were many reasons it was designed as a three-story school. One significant reason was that spreading the school out would have disrupted the students in school at the time. JP added that the School Committee does not have the information necessary to determine if a campus style would fit on the property.

BB shared that the three-story building was proposed at Doyon so that it could be built in the back of the existing Doyon school, which allowed students to remain in that school during construction. A campus style school at the Doyon site could potentially intrude on the existing building, creating the need to relocate students during construction. It was then suggested by GS that a project of this nature could be done in phases which could potentially allow for students to remain in the existing building during phase one and then move them into the new section during phase two. GS felt that a 17 acre lot at Doyon was big enough for a campus style school, but it would take careful planning to create the least disruptive plan for students during construction.

The group began to discuss the Town Hall location and the feasibility of building a school on the school-owned land on the Town Hall property. JD felt it was important to leave the Town Hall land as an option, while also acknowledging that building one giant school next to a working Town Hall was not going to work. The conversation continued around building off of the existing Town Hall. To use the existing Town Hall in any way for a school project would require support from the Town Manager and Select Board, as well as a  $\frac{2}{3}$  majority vote to change ownership at Town Meeting. A new location for Town Hall would also need to be identified. Some felt that the logistics of getting the necessary support to change ownership of Town Hall would not address the urgency and need of a school project(s).

JD wanted to discuss what a ballot vote would look like. If there were multiple options for school locations and configurations that could be agreed upon, JD felt that a ballot vote was important. She suggested writing out options for locations and configurations to present to the community. DF felt that the School Committee should be able to put forth recommendations without the need for a ballot vote. DF thought there were already certain options being discussed that do not meet need or urgency. GS added that it

was important to convey information about the timing of these projects and that two schools would not be completed simultaneously.

The discussion continued with regard to the ballot vote and the responsibilities of the School Committee to the taxpayers, educators and students of Ipswich. DF questioned whether certain options would be the most fiscally responsible to the town. JD added that educational responsibility was also important, adding that she felt strongly that the best education for elementary students was in smaller schools. JD said that the School Committee should be considering the best educational experience for students at the best price for the town. DF felt that those values could be upheld with a one project solution.

GS worried that it could be misleading to the community to say there could be a potential cost savings for a new school and an addition/renovation. An SOI may not be accepted by the MSBA this year and if not, costs will continue to rise for a school building project, as well as maintenance on the existing systems in the elementary schools. JD added that costs and the need for repairs to current facilities will continue to increase regardless of when an SOI is accepted.

EC asked the group to talk through two school options, stating that two schools still seems to be a popular opinion and is deserving of a conversation to work through whether it would be worth pursuing. PK felt that the only way two schools could work, in light of the last failed project, is if there was a split configuration. JP added that the School Committee should be getting teacher feedback before considering a split configuration.

JD said that based on the listening sessions and survey results, there was evidence that a kindergarten-5 option was preferred. EC added that she heard two kindergarten-5 schools were not producing equal results. JP added that the two elementary principals and teachers stated that the school was equitable in a recent meeting. PK talked about equity and the success of split configuration in another district. This model would allow all elementary students access to the same experiences, specialists, and Title 1.

EC acknowledged that the group could all debate from personal experience, but suggested a refocus on the mechanics. PK started by suggesting that two schools cannot be in a downtown location; one could go at Doyon because the district owns the land and there is already a school currently there. A second school location was discussed; one member identified Winthrop as an option while another said Town Hall.

GS wondered why Town Hall was coming forward for consideration with the significant hurdles it would take to change ownership. JP suggested a small school could be built on the school-owned land at Town Hall. The field was not significantly studied for a small school during the last project because it was already determined that Winthrop or Bialek Park were preferable sites. GS felt the site was not conducive to a school, citing issues with traffic flow, inadequate bussing queues and conservation issues; however, he would defer to the group about keeping the site on the list of potential options.

During the last project, there was concern regarding disruption to students if a large school was built on the Winthrop site. PK wondered if building a small school on the site would be less disruptive to kids in school. DF questioned where the school would be built and if it would mean taking up parking spaces and building close to the street.

EC questioned whether building a new school at one location and then rehabbing the other building would be an option to address need and urgency. The buildings are falling apart, EC said, and it may not be practical to wait for two new schools. PK shared her concern for wanting schools that are built for today's education. PK felt that rehabbing a current school will not provide students with the best for today's educational purposes. EC suggested that this plan could work for a split configuration, stating that the current two kindergarten-5 schools are bursting at the seams.

KE suggested the possibility of a larger, new school at the Doyon site and then a smaller downtown school at Winthrop that could also include a centralized location for programs like the Extended Day Program and Birth to Three. The idea would be a split configuration for the schools, keeping the youngest learners together in a smaller school setting. JD liked the idea of a central location for programs like the Extended Day Program. A central location could also allow families to transport their children more easily to other downtown programs.

While KE was still in support of one school, she thought a split configuration option with a new school and addition/renovation at the other school was a viable option. JP questioned a centrally located Extended Day Program. JP also suggested having the older students in a downtown location.

There was a brief discussion about a member's concern for more gym space in town.

DF felt that doing two core projects would not meet the need of urgency, although she liked the idea of a centralized location for programs like the Extended Day Program. DF thought it was an idea that the town could be excited about.

EC asked for clarification about whether the group was looking into rehabbing Winthrop School and not an addition/renovation. KE asked what the difference between a rehab and an addition/renovation would be.

EC asked if there were two school options that take urgency into consideration. GS added that the accelerated repair program would not address educational needs. The only way to rehab the building, or get it up to code, would be through the accelerated repair format or have the town pay for the repairs out of pocket.

JD did not like the suggestion that an addition/renovation would take away from the sense of urgency. She said everyone understands the sense of urgency and that sometimes doing the right thing by children is doing the hard thing. She said building one school outside of town is the easier choice and that it was unfair to write off a downtown school because it doesn't meet some people's sense of urgency. PK felt that JD's thoughts on one school being the easier option was her opinion and not necessarily accurate. PK talked about her own positive experience at a large school and felt that a larger school did not equate to a poor educational experience for children. JD talked about the data she found that shows that elementary school kids are more successful in a school with under 500 students. JD asked that options that could be seen as the best long term solution for students not be ruled out under the guise of the solution not meeting a sense of urgency.

EC asked that the group refrain from using words that create one "right" side and one "wrong" side. She said a sense of urgency is just as valid as other concerns.

The discussion continued as the group considered other split configuration options. EC felt that it did not make sense to split the configuration in a way that keeps the same number of students at each of the schools. To have the same number of students in the buildings raises the same logistical concerns as having two kindergarten-5 schools.

It was clarified that while the MSBA will only consider kindergarten-5, for the purpose of these discussions, the School Committee will include preschool.

The question was raised about the logistics of getting two projects completed given the issues of times. The current schools cannot meet the educational needs of students due to the enrollment and space requirements. It was suggested that the school population be reduced at the school receiving rehab. JP added that the district would need one new school and an addition/renovation. This idea would mean two buildings in the queue at the MSBA or one of the schools would need to be town-funded if done simultaneously. The town would need a  $\frac{2}{3}$  majority approval at Town Meeting and a majority ballot vote for one of the schools. The district would pay for all studies and plans out of pocket and then the community would need to be convinced to foot the entire cost of a second school.

There was a discussion about the state of each school and whether one could outlast the other. Both schools were identified as being in rough shape.

JP suggested that a new building could be built behind Doyon while the Doyon students remained in the current building. When the new school was completed, Doyon students would relocate to the new building and Winthrop students would move to the old Doyon school while work was done at Winthrop. DF highlighted the significant years of construction and how for many, the entirety of their elementary school years would be surrounded by construction.

PK and GS talked about concerns over funding and the difficulty of asking the town to support a town-funded school. A simultaneous build of two schools is not an option. Two schools would require a two-step process. JP referenced Holyoke which worked on a plan that spread the tax burden out overtime.

There was a discussion about what would happen if the buildings do not last until the completion of a new school. At some point, BB said, the district could be in a crisis situation and would need to look for accelerated repair through the MSBA. In doing so, the MSBA would be less likely to look at funding a new building. JP asked for clarification on whether the MSBA would not fund

a new project or if they would reduce the funding of a new project. JP's understanding is that the MSBA would reduce funding for a project if the school already received funding for an accelerated repair.

DF suggested that the group run through each scenario discussed and see if they meet or address the previously agreed upon points from the last workshop.

GS, again, discussed concerns over funding and the overall cost. By staggering the projects and potentially waiting upwards of 5-7 years, the cost will increase significantly. This will be an issue for taxpayers. GS discussed whether one school makes sense financially, especially with the potential need for another override in the coming years.

DF talked about a one project solution with messaging to the community on how it will address the values and concerns identified through the listening sessions and survey. EC countered, asking what if the feasibility study determines that the one school and location would not work. There needs to be consideration made for other options, knowing that the feasibility study may require a change in plans. DF recommended that the group come to consensus on a single project and let the feasibility study determine the location.

The group continued by using the list of agreed upon items they developed during the last workshop to see how/if their proposed sites, locations and configurations matched with those agreed upon items. The agreed upon items were:

1. April 2023 SOI, addressing need and urgency
2. Bringing forward a project the School Committee is confident can pass
3. Educational equity
4. Consideration of costs
5. Importance of "green" building
6. Building(s) serve as a hub/community service
7. Small feel/community
8. Property not needing to go through the Chapter 97 process
9. Eliminating the "gray zone"

EC felt that almost all nine agreed upon points were addressed somewhere with all options discussed (SEE APPENDIX A). EC said that Option 1, of the options listed on the whiteboard, may not address equity concerns. EC thought there were some Special Education concerns about a large building that could impact some students. Those concerns would need to be addressed in the design phase.

It was mentioned that a new building will always be "greener" than a renovation. Options 1 and 2 would eliminate the "gray zone". Option 3 could potentially eliminate the "gray zone" if one of the schools was larger.

There was a question as to whether two schools were practical. While some members felt it was not, JP thought the idea was viable if presenting ideas on a ballot for the community. JP felt it was important to gauge what the community was willing to support- one big project at once or two smaller projects over time. The discussion continued about the need and practicality. JP said that both elementary buildings are in need, but even with a one building solution, a new building could take 5-7 years to open. Repairs will still need to be made on the existing building in that time. He felt that taking any options off the table now would be premature.

GS talked about the need to convey the timing of a two school option and stress that the two school projects would not be done simultaneously. JP added that it is important to note that a second project may be MSBA funded or town funded.

PK again expressed concern over not including the cost of these projects on the ballot. PK said that without a price tag, or at least a rough estimate of cost, people would only be choosing an option they love and not what is practical.

At the second round of listening session, BB shared information that it could cost \$12 million for repairs at one school. It was suggested that there was a lot of popularity around the idea of spending \$12 million to fix/repair one of the elementary schools and then build a new school. EC asked if that was the same idea as Option 2- spend \$12 million to rehab Winthrop School and then build a new school at Doyon.

The discussion continued on what the suggested \$12 million in repairs cover. Would that make one school last longer while another new school is built? Would the idea be to then go back to the MSBA for a second new school? GS expressed concern that the taxpayers would be paying the \$12 million in repairs and then be asked to fund a new school that already had \$12 million put into it. EC felt that this type of plan could work if the town says they would prefer two small schools. JD added that maybe the \$12 million, or whatever the cost of a rehab would be, could get a school to where it needs to be for the next 20 years.

There was expressed concern from some members that while the \$12 million spent on repair would address system upgrades, it would not address educational needs. BB questioned how the town would react to some children getting a brand new school, while other children may not see a new school for 10+ years. JD thought there was a significant population in town that did not care so much for a new, modern building as long as their kids were receiving an excellent education. DF disagreed and said that teachers feel differently.

PK felt that Option 3 should be removed because of the three-step process. This process leaves one elementary school in a “dumpy” building, while the other elementary school will be in a new building. If looking at a two school option, PK felt that a split configuration would be most equitable. All elementary school students would experience an older school and a new school.

JD liked the idea of putting these options to a non-binding ballot vote and also acknowledged that a feasibility study was still necessary. It will be helpful to see what is feasible among the options that the community was in support of. DF felt that the public had already expressed what they were interested in and that it was the School Committee’s job, as elected officials, to make a recommendation.

EC asked if the group was comfortable removing a preschool-2 and 3-5 split configuration. She asked if the preference for two new schools would be preschool-5. KE thought the group was in support of split configuration and asked that the option not be removed. EC clarified that she was asked about an option that included two new schools. BB suggested that if a focus is on educational equity, then the split configuration should be left as an option.

KE asked if the group wanted to continue to consider two preschool-5 options. DF asked which option matched the most agreed upon points. While some agreed that all options met almost all of the agreed upon criteria, DF questioned whether they all met a sense of urgency. JP clarified that the sense of urgency was with regard to submitting an SOI by April 2023.

The discussion continued about the likelihood of these options passing a town vote. Option 1 was for one school, while Option 2 and 3 would require multiple votes and the potential for multiple funding sources. All options would require a feasibility study. EC clarified that Option 1 would require less votes, unless it includes the use of Town Hall.

EC suggested the remainder of time be used to discuss how to frame the ballot questions. KE said she wanted to discuss which of the options were viable and practical. Like DF, KE wanted to see which options satisfied the list of agreements and whether there was any project that did not. GS said that the more he considered it, Option 3 would require too many votes and had too many uncertainties in terms of cost. EC asked if Option 2B would also require too many votes.

To KE, site matters. KE felt that adding Town Hall to the mix, makes the option less practical in terms of steps, logistics, moves and votes. She felt the community would be more amenable to options if they were limited to the existing Doyon and Winthrop sites.

JD asked if the group agreed that Mile Lane was not an option for a combined school or small school. JP agreed. DF asked if the group needed to be that specific at this point. DF thought the feasibility study, done by the MSBA, would determine the site. DF then suggested that she would support one school at a site that would support that one school. KE added that the MSBA suggested the School Committee work to put parameters on sites to look at. It would be the School Committee’s decision whether to look at a site like Mile Lane or not. KE felt that Mile Lane was an easy choice not to pursue now.

JD felt that there should be sites included in the options on the ballot. JD was comfortable taking Mile Lane off the list as a potential site and moving Town Hall over to Options 2 and 3. JD felt that if people were going to vote on options, Town Hall should remain as an in-town, downtown location for a two school option and not a combined school. JP agreed.

When asked whether Mile Lane should be added as a site consideration for Option 2 or Option 3, most agreed that it was not a preferred site.

The discussion continued around Town Hall and options at that could include Town Hall, such as:

- Building a small school on school-owned property next to Town Hall, while leaving the existing Town Hall in place and operational
- Using the existing Town Hall as part of a school project
- Completely removing Town Hall as an option

EC said that if a small school was built on the school-owned property at Town Hall, the options seem to be an addition/renovation of the existing building or adding another structure to the site next to Town Hall. She asked if the group thought any options at Town Hall could be eliminated. DF did not like any of the options at Town Hall. GS felt that any renovations to the existing Town Hall had a low likelihood of passing and therefore, that option should be removed from the list.

EC then asked if the group was in support of only putting a new structure on the Town Hall property. GS, KE, and JP agreed. JP suggested that adding a smaller school on the property would be okay, but only if Winthrop is deemed not a viable option. JD agreed that Winthrop would be a better option for a new, smaller school. All agreed that it was not favorable to take over the Town Hall structure for a small school. JD added that if one of the schools were to have serious, critical needs, then the use of Town Hall as a school should be considered.

The discussion moved on to the potential ballot questions.

JP asked with regard to writing ballot questions, whether the group would give the parameters discussed tonight to George Hall (Town Counsel) to write the questions. The group would then have an opportunity to review the questions and provide feedback.

DF asked if anyone else in the group felt the School Committee should not move forward with a ballot vote. KE said that the School Committee is not going to make a decision solely based on a ballot vote, but rather, they will use it as a means to get consensus. GS added that this vote will help the future School Committee know what the community wanted in a school building project. JP said that this vote would help answer questions about what is needed for a project the School Committee can be confident will pass.

The School Committee has more information than the last project and different concerns. A non-binding ballot vote would just be another source of information to use moving forward. This information could help guide the feasibility study, GS said. During that feasibility study phase, the preferred sites identified through the ballot vote could be explored to see what makes sense and what may be ruled out.

DF said the MSBA would look at the schools first and then look at all options/sites. PK asked if it was possible to hold off on a ballot vote until the School Committee was able to get more accurate numbers on size and cost from the MSBA. DF continued that she did not see the utility of a non-binding vote and questioned what the School Committee would do with the information ahead of a feasibility study. EC suggested that the group let George Hall draft the ballot questions and then they can decide if they will serve a purpose.

DF then asked when the School Committee would be approaching the Select Board and Town Manager about whether they feel a ballot vote is necessary and what approach they suggest moving forward. GS said that the Select Board has asked the School Committee to get a project together that can be supported by the town. The Select Board is asking the School Committee to come to them with a project that can pass. That won't happen until the feasibility study is done.

EC asked what the downside is to a ballot vote. DF was concerned about the divisiveness a ballot vote could create. JD replied to DF, stating that the ballot vote was just another data point to help the School Committee decide on how to move forward. DF felt that information was already collected as part of the listening sessions. DF suggested putting another survey out to the community with more specific questions, rather than a ballot vote. PK added that she was concerned about not including information about the costs associated with these options. PK also added that people may not be paying attention and will choose an option that sounds good, but won't understand that a feasibility study may deem their choice not viable and the project will become something different than what they voted on.

EC felt that doing a non-binding vote would allow the community to see the options the School Committee is considering and provide input. The ballot vote will not determine the ultimate project, but it will get people engaged in the process. The School

Committee needs the buy-in from the community. A ballot vote will get more information in front of the voter, sooner. DF felt that a survey could have similar effects. DF also felt that the School Committee already had a lot of information to work with.

GS talked about the lack of consensus on the School Committee. GS added that a ballot vote gets voters engaged in the process early on. JD added that a ballot vote can help the community understand how decisions have been made. Maybe people vote for one option, but the feasibility determines that option is not viable. The community can then see the steps the School Committee took to get to the decisions they did.

DF, again, shared her concern over the potential divisiveness in town.

A representative from the IEA added that everything the School Committee has done with regard to a building project(s) has been different so far. The IEA is willing to help send information out to their classrooms and school community. The IEA cannot speak to decisions being voted on by the town, but they can share important dates or direct families to the website for more information.

PK acknowledged DF's concerns and said that there is a perception there was a lack of transparency in the last project. The ballot vote can be a way of the School Committee saying to the community that they are approaching the project(s) differently this time, encouraging participation, and showing that the School Committee is listening. This is a step in changing public perception and in making this an open and transparent process.

KE asked the group if they felt another workshop was necessary as they moved towards asking George Hall to draft potential ballot questions.

When talking about the ballot questions, EC felt it was important to be upfront about the options that are being presented. If one option is predominantly chosen, but the feasibility study says it cannot work, then at least the other options were presented. JP added that the wording on the ballot will be important. JP suggested creating an informational booklet to be used as a supplemental document with detailed information about the ballot questions. Having a two paragraph question on the ballot will not be helpful.

The discussion continued on what information would be included in the booklet and where the information would come from. There were some concerns about including detailed numbers at this stage. JP suggested using the information that the School Committee currently has. It was also suggested that the Finance Committee could estimate the potential tax burden. GS made it clear that people should understand that the numbers could change.

Action items moving forward were discussed. EC was going to document the notes from the whiteboard. KE was going to reach out to George Hall to discuss the ballot questions. KE was also going to look into the deadline for publishing an informational pamphlet to send out ahead of the ballot vote.

DF asked if the Select Board should weigh in on the potential ballot vote. GS said the Select Board is supportive of a ballot vote. The ballot vote has been discussed at their public meetings and no member has questioned the purpose. BB and GS were going to attend the upcoming bi-board meeting and offered to mention the ballot vote to them at that time. KE felt that if the Select Board was in support of the ballot vote taking place in February, there would be even more support for it taking place on the actual election day in May.

BB discussed the plan for starting the SOI application process. BB explained that the SOI is a statement of interest expressing why the district/town would like to be part of the MSBA program. The MSBA will want to know logistics and numbers, not necessarily site configurations. The Facilities Director has been asked to update information on the buildings from 2014 to present. The superintendent, Director of Facilities and the building principals will work to draft the SOI. Supplemental information like the report from the Logue Group can be included. The SOI will also need to include information on why the school project failed last time. At this time, the SOI process for this current year has not opened.

There was a question about whether the Elementary Building Project Working Group was going to continue. JP said he was surprised to see there had been another meeting held in December. In light of the School Committee's reorganization, JP felt that the group should look at the make-up of that working group and their charge moving forward. PK clarified that working groups and subcommittees are typically not reorganized in the middle of the year. KE added that the Elementary Building Project Working Group has only discussed a communication plan going forward and community outreach.



### 3. Adjournment

➤ Motion to adjourn the meeting was made by JD and seconded by PK. The motion passed unanimously in favor.

Meeting adjourned at 7:53 PM

### APPENDIX A

