



CRITERIA WORKING GROUP REPORT

The Criteria Working Group (CWG) was assembled as a sub-committee of the Hopkinton School Committee in March, 2012 for the purpose of developing and recommending criteria for inclusion in the next Feasibility Study.

June 7, 2012

Table of Contents

CWG Members3

Background4

Process.....5

Ranked Priority Criteria6

Additional Criteria9

CWG Members

The Hopkinton School Committee called for the formation of a fifteen-member Criteria Working Group comprised of Hopkinton residents and Hopkinton Public Schools' staff. In an effort to ensure that the CWG reflected the various voices of the Hopkinton community, identified organizations were asked to nominate their own representatives to serve on the committee, while additional at large slots were reserved for other members of the community to serve. Through this process a diverse representation of the community emerged to serve on this committee.

The following members (listed alphabetically) are acknowledged for their time and commitment in developing this document:

Pat Baratta, Council on Aging Representative

Kim Brennan, Community Representative

Ben Chirco, Ballot Question Committee Representative

Kenneth Clark, Fire Chief, District Safety Committee Representative

Laura Connolly, Sustainable Green Committee Representative

Mary Ann DeMello, Ed.D., Assistant Superintendent

Greg Denon, Community Representative

Ron Foisy, Community Representative

Trina Macchi, Real Estate Agent Representative

Greg Martineau, Hopkins Principal, Elementary School Principal Representative

Erika Maurer, Special Education Advisory Council Representative

Thomas Nealon, Chamber of Commerce Representative

Pam Pendleton, Hopkinton Teachers' Association Representative

Tara Sanda, Educate Hopkinton Representative

Criteria Working Group Background and Process

Background

The Criteria Working Group (CWG) began meeting on March 20, 2012. The CWG was charged by the Hopkinton School Committee to develop and recommend criteria for inclusion in an upcoming Feasibility Study to address the constraints of the Center and Elmwood Schools. The CWG was appointed as a sub-committee of the School Committee, chaired by the Assistant Superintendent, and operated under the requirements of Open Meeting Law. The Hopkinton School Committee requested that the CWG provide a report to be delivered at the June 7, 2012 School Committee meeting.

The CWG was comprised of educators, community members, and representatives from various organizations within Hopkinton. Over the course of eight meetings, this committee met for over twenty hours of volunteer work. Throughout the process, members were charged with the following responsibilities:

- To confer with community members
- To conduct individual exploration of criteria for discussion
- To reference / review various documents in preparation for discussion

The following is a list of documents* provided for reference and/or review to the CWG members over the course of the meetings:

1. Criteria from the *2011 Feasibility Study*
2. *2011 Hopkinton School Committee Elementary School Building Survey*
3. March and Fall 2011 *Forum Responses* collected from three workshops, as well as responses sent via email to the School Committee
4. *Fruit Street School Ballot Exit Poll Report*
5. The *Hopkinton Public Schools Capital Asset Assessment* conducted by Habeeb & Associates Architects, Inc.
6. The *Existing Window Condition Study of the Center Elementary School* conducted by Gale Associates, Inc.
7. The *Prioritization of 31 Criteria for School Building Adequacy* by Glenn Earthman, Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University
8. The *Site Selection Criteria and Evaluation Handbook* by the State of Alaska, Department of Education
9. The *Massachusetts School Building Authority Green Repair Program*
10. The *Massachusetts School Building Authority Model School Program- Savings Through Innovation*
11. The *Massachusetts School Building Authority Model School Task Force*
12. The *Statement of Interest for Center School* submitted to the Massachusetts School Building Authority (January 2012)
13. The *Statement of Interest for Elmwood School* submitted to the Massachusetts School Building Authority (January 2012)

*Note: Several members accessed additional documents and resources through their own research to contribute to the discussions.

Process

The following activities outline much of the process undertaken to develop criteria for inclusion in the next Feasibility Study.

1. **Defining the Task:** A review and clarification of the purpose and task of the CWG was conducted.
2. **Brainstorming:** At various times, members participated in brainstorming sessions to generate fresh ideas related to “creating physical spaces for learning” in general, and then developing specific criteria to address the facility issues related to the Center and Elmwood Schools.
3. **Categorizing:** General categories were generated to group the criteria and to visually capture the distribution of ideas that were expressed.
4. **Background:** Discussions were conducted to answer questions such as, “Where is the community right now in 2012 with regard to potential solutions?” and “What is the history of building projects in the district?”
5. **Review and Discussion:** As criteria were developed, there were lengthy discussions to establish a common understanding of the purpose and focus of each criterion, followed by careful editing and reworking of each criterion to ensure clarity of the wording.
6. **Ranking:** The CWG utilized ranking activities to determine the priorities of each member, and then mathematically calculated the top priorities of the group as a whole.
7. **Top Priorities:** A final list of high priority criteria was developed for the next Feasibility Study, and is hereby submitted to the School Committee for consideration. The list consists of eleven items, each accompanied by a statement to provide additional clarity regarding the criterion’s purpose.
8. **Additional Criteria:** The CWG also chose to report on additional criteria generated during meeting discussions. These additional items are other criteria that the CWG collectively agreed should be forwarded to the School Committee as part of the reported output, but which did not rise to the level of top priority criteria.

CRITERIA WORKING GROUP
RANKED PRIORITY CRITERIA

RANKED #	CRITERIA	CATEGORY	EXPLANATORY STATEMENT
1	<p>The solution should minimize safety concerns including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • safe building access • safe pick up and drop off area • clearly identified school zone • safe playground area • free of known, or the potential for future, environmental hazards and issues 	Safety	<p>Safety in and around our schools is a number one priority. This criterion addresses several areas of concern. Under <i>safe building access</i> the group discussed the need for the school entrance to be in view of the office (in particular Elmwood office staff are not able to see who comes in the building due to location of front office/entrance doors). With respect to environmental hazards and issues, the discussion included an example of asbestos tiles.</p>
2	<p>The facility (or facilities) is conducive to contemporary educational practices for student learning, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • small group activities (student collaboration) • whole class instruction • small group instruction (teacher directed) • technology integration • virtual learning • laboratory space for problem and project-based work 	Educational Space / Students	<p>The facility should serve the needs of those attending—to educate, develop learning skills, enhance growth and contribute to active participation in education.</p>
3	<p>The facility (or facilities) includes appropriate measures to accommodate emergency safety needs, including but not limited to fire, medical, disaster and lockdown.</p>	Safety	<p>We think that the safety and security of the elementary school population is a top priority.</p>

RANKED #	CRITERIA	CATEGORY	EXPLANATORY STATEMENT
4	The solution must resolve or remove the need to resolve facility issues as identified in the most recent Capital Asset Assessment document as prepared by Habeeb & Associates related to the Elmwood and Center Schools.	Issues	The Habeeb Report defines and categorizes the school building repairs needed. The solution whether it be to repair an existing building, or new construction should address these items prioritizing those items which impact student learning.
5	The facility (or facilities) supports the strategic visions for the Hopkinton Public Schools and the Town of Hopkinton.	Vision	Projects, particularly of this magnitude, ought to align with the goals of the district and community. The project ought to be carried out with a purpose and focus that considers and supports the existing visions of the district and community.
6	Adequate space is provided to accommodate professional services and meetings conducted within the school including, but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • nurse's health area • guidance offices • art & music spaces • therapeutic rooms • speech and language services • consultation areas 	Educational Space / Students	Our goal within this criterion is to ensure mindful, deliberate planning/designing is considered for aspects of student life outside of the "classroom". Including opportunities to provide space for parent/student/teacher meetings, appropriate accommodations for special education programs/services, and following best health practices for sick children.
7	The facility (or facilities) allows for flexibility to accommodate resources for students with documented needs, including but not limited to, a therapeutic space.	Educational Space / Students	This criterion provides flexibility to address the changing needs of the student population.
8	The solution identifies costs outside the domain of the school district including but not limited to town services such as water, sewer, utilities, signaling lights and signage, roads and sidewalks.	Costs	By adding this criterion it is our intention to have the solution identify any additional or soft costs that the solution will present thus capturing the total cost of the project.

RANKED #	CRITERIA	CATEGORY	EXPLANATORY STATEMENT
9	If either Center or Elmwood Schools are decommissioned as school buildings, the solution should address the financial impact of maintaining or disposing of either property.	Costs	This criterion was established to ensure that the solution identifies additional financial impacts that may occur as a result of having an empty school building. For example, financial impact could be expenses in the case of demolition, maintenance/repair costs, or revenue in a case of rental agreements.
10	The solution considers cost and operational efficiencies in each of the following categories including, but not limited to: administrative, educational, and operations and maintenance	Costs	This criterion asks that options are cost effective and operationally efficient. For instance, the location of the school office and office equipment could enhance the administrative operation of the school. The location of professional services could enhance the educational program by reducing the out-of-class travel time to services such as the occupational therapist. The choice of lighting could reduce cost of energy efficiency (operations), but also costs related to changing bulbs (maintenance).
11	The feasibility study for the Center and Elmwood Schools must include options for expansion and renovation of existing school buildings and new construction.	Educational Space	The thinking around this criterion was to ensure that expansion and renovation would be examined as possible solutions to the challenges at Center and Elmwood schools. As criteria were discussed there was some concern that they could be interpreted to exclude expansion and renovation, and only build new. This criterion was developed to ensure these options were fully explored in addition to looking at a newly constructed school as a viable solution.

CRITERIA WORKING GROUP

ADDITIONAL CRITERIA DISCUSSED

Listed below are additional criteria that were generated during CWG meeting discussions. These additional items reflect other criteria that the CWG collectively agreed should be forwarded to the School Committee as part of the reported output; however, these criteria did not rise to the level of inclusion in the final top criteria. The following criteria are not prioritized and are not listed in any particular order.

- The facility (or facilities) provides dedicated space to enable educators to communicate and collaborate effectively in a manner reflective of modern educational practices.
- The facility (or facilities) should parallel guidelines outlined by the MSBA School Building Grant Program, unless identified as an educational or community need.
- The facility (or facilities) accommodates both early childhood and elementary age children.
- The solution should maximize the reuse of materials and equipment currently in existence in Center and Elmwood Schools.
- If renovation is the chosen solution, the activity in and around the school should in no way impact (or affect) the educational practices or daily activities of the students or faculty. (The environment may be altered but the learning cannot be compromised.)
- Primary use for the facility will be the educational and extra-curricular programs by students; however accessibility could also be designed to accommodate usage by the community
- The solution shall identify educational learning outcomes that should be measured after the implementation of the solution, within 3-5 years.
- The solution should be cost effective, minimizing tax impacts as much as possible.
- The solution should allow for flexibility in future use.
- The solution should incorporate energy efficient design/green considerations where possible.

Note: The CWG had several lengthy conversations about the topic of districting and could not come to agreement as to whether a criterion should be established that either allowed or restricted districting.



Please include in SC packet

1 message

Mary Ann DeMello <mdemello@hopkinton.k12.ma.us>
To: Jeannine Gilmore <jgilmore@hopkinton.k12.ma.us>

Thu, May 31, 2012 at 11:19 AM

From: **Frank** <franksivo@gmail.com>
Date: Thu, May 31, 2012 at 6:51 AM
Subject: CWG
To: Mary Ann DeMello <mdemello@hopkinton.k12.ma.us>

Dr. Demello,

I want to thank you again for your hard work and dedication in supporting the CWG. Extending your workday until after 9PM shows great dedication to our town and our issues.

As I reflect on the output of our team, there are many things of which to be proud. Also on reflection there are some things I simply find unsupportable (based my views and on the views of the community I had joined to represent). I am not writing this note to try to sway you or the group to my position. Instead, I write to resign my membership from this group, and not have my name associated with the recommendations being presented on June 7th, or subsequently.

While I made many attempts to bound our scope to the Center School as the primary concern, ultimately we treated with equal weight both Center and Elmwood schools. This flaw in our scope, and subsequent process ultimately has led to recommendations that go far beyond what I think is fiscally prudent. Of particular note are the criteria the CWG has put forth on #4 (full remediation of both Center and Elmwood schools as described in the Habeeb report) and #30 (which allows for full renovation and rebuild options, not simply remediation, for Elmwood). Perhaps it was that I had to miss a key meeting on 6/14 (due to SC debate. Otherwise, I believe I had perfect attendance), perhaps it was that the composition of the team (underrepresented the general community?), perhaps we simply rushed the process in the past 2 days, or perhaps with no clear problem statement we just over scoped the effort from the beginning. No matter the cause, I find I can not accept the full set of recommendations created by the group.

I shall be attending the June 7 meeting for other reasons, but I certainly would appreciate it if you drop my name from all final reports and introductions of the CWG on June 7th.

Kind regards,

Frank

—
Mary Ann DeMello, Ed.D.
Assistant Superintendent
Hopkinton Public Schools
89 Hayden Rowe Street