D41 Community Facilities Task Force Report

Hadley Junior High and Elementary Schools Recommendations

4/25/2016

Prepared by Co-Chairs Lori Taylor and Tom Voltaggio

Glen Ellyn School District 41

Ignite passion. Inspire excellence. Imagine possibilities.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The District 41 Facilities Task Force was created by the Glen Ellyn School District 41 Board of Education (the Board) in the spring of 2015 to address growing concerns over the adequacy of existing “core” and instructional facilities and the impact of proposed curriculum and “all day” kindergarten initiatives in the Glen Ellyn School District 41 (the District/District 41). The committee began its work in the fall of 2015 and concluded its eighth-month effort in the spring of 2016.

This report summarizes the work of the committee to optimize the performance of our school facilities while maximizing the value returned to the community. This effort led to the adoption of an evaluation process and a series of bi-monthly meetings to carry it forward. It is the ultimate goal of the committee that this study will provide a useful framework and information base to stimulate focused dialog within the Board of Education and community-at-large on these issues, as a necessary prerequisite to implementation.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The committee was provided with a good deal of background information and used this information to assist in the development of evaluation criteria and solutions. The materials include the following:

Previous Studies

- Blue Ribbon Committee – School/Class Size & Affordability, November 2002
- District 41 Website – 2004
- Facilities Study 2004
- Hadley Junior High 5/6 Feasibility Study – 2006
- Space Utilization Study – 2007/8
- Facilities Website – 2008
- Referendum - 2008
- Master Facilities Plan – 2009

Demographic Studies

- Website Enrollment Webpage – 2016

Architectural Studies

- FGM Architects Building Plans
- Board of Education Presentation – January 26, 2015

Building Level Input

- Board of Education Full Day Kindergarten Presentation – November 2014
- Full Day Kindergarten Survey – October 2014
- Facilities and Programming – October 2015
- Mobile Classroom Information Sheet – October 2008

These materials are included in the Appendix for reference.

BOARD DIRECTIVE

The Facilities Task Force was commissioned to study a number of issues related to ongoing programmatic and facilities related initiatives. The Board issued a general statement to the committee, which outlined the primary focus of the study and included the following basic elements:

- Review historical facilities documentation and current needs
- Evaluate the current recommendations for viability and financial implications
- Report to the Board opportunities and challenges of facilities plans

The Board issued a companion series of directives focused on specific issues at Hadley Junior High and the four elementary schools: Abraham Lincoln School, Benjamin Franklin School, Churchill School, and Forest Glen School. These directives to the committee can be summarized as follows:

<u>Hadley Junior High</u>

- Elimination of ten portable classrooms
- Evaluation of “core” facilities
- Maximize flexibility for future programming

<u>Elementary Schools</u>

- Space options for “all day” kindergarten
- Evaluation of “core” facilities
- Maximize flexibility for future programing

The approach to addressing the issues outlined above has been the focus of the committee over the past eight months and is elaborated in the balance of this report.

COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

The Facilities Task Force is comprised entirely of volunteers from the District 41 attendance area, augmented with key District 41 personnel. District personnel have provided a valuable link to the daily operations of the District, affording the Committee access to the resources necessary to a complete understanding of the range of challenges facing the district, and the opportunities for resolution moving forward. This group has included Superintendent Paul Gordon, Chief Communication Officer Erika Krehbiel, Director of Facilities Dave Scamardo, and the five building principals: Principal Mary Hornacek, Forest Glen Elementary; Principal Scott Klespitz, Churchill Elementary; Principal Kirk Samples, Ben Franklin Elementary; Principal Linda Schweikhofer, Abraham Lincoln Elementary; and Principal Steve Diveley, Hadley Junior High. Their participation and assistance throughout the process has been instrumental and is greatly appreciated by members of the task force.

The Task Force members are a very diverse group, encompassing both parents of District 41 students (former, current, and future) and non-parents. There is gender balance, meaningful representation from a range of age cohorts, and a healthy diversity of perspective relating to issues that impact education in our community. In short, the issues presented to the committee have been viewed through a very wide lens. Committee volunteers:

Pat Ahern	Dorothy Hess
Michelle Applebee	Colleen Hindman
Shelby Bakken	John Kenwood
Scott Bots	Pete Ladesic
Marty Boyd	Kristin Massey
Jeff Cooper	Paula McGowen
Colleen Costello	Barry Nelson
Bruce Currie	Ben Peterselli
Linda D'Ambrosio	Kevin Rath
Erin Dieter	Liz Saylor
Robert Dieter	William Schumacher
Willie DiFabio	Liza Sury
Ted Estes	Lori Taylor *
Rae Guimond**	Liz Vogel
Kelly Hane	F. Thomas Voltaggio *

* Co-chair **Secretary

The committee utilized the talents of its members in a variety of tasks required to develop and produce this study. One of the key tasks required by our process is the acquisition, organization, and computation of data. Two of our members, Scott Bots and Ben Peterselli, have taken the

lead in this area, and their efforts have been very helpful to ensuring continuous process and meaningful results.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF PROCESS

The Facilities Task Force has undertaken inquiry into the kinds of issues that have historically proven to be ripe for public debate. A number of issues on the table have evolved over a number of years; and, coupled with the District's strategic objectives moving forward, render the task complicated at best. As the committee convened and organized its thoughts, it became readily apparent that the ultimate success of this undertaking would be heavily contingent upon the adoption of a systematic evaluation process. This process, if done correctly, would serve to harness the diverse ideas and perspectives of the committee and effectively channel them into an analytical, apolitical process that captures the consensus of the community moving forward.

The committee's selected process is known as "rational basis" decision making, and this approach follows a number of well-defined steps in the journey from concept to final recommendation. The key elements of "rational basis" decision making are described in the balance of this section.

Decision Statement

The first step in the process is to establish the nature of the issue requiring resolution. This is accomplished through the creation of a "decision statement," which clearly and succinctly defines the objectives and scope of the inquiry. The decision statement provides clarity and focus for the study, ensuring that the issues are properly delineated prior to commencing the development of solution(s).

Background Material

The decision statement, as described above, defines the mission in a general fashion. In reality, it is essential to explore and document the range of underlying conditions that are to be addressed with the proposed solutions. This information can flow from a variety of sources and depends on whether the issue at hand is remedial or prospective in nature. The committee has gathered input from District 41 building level leadership, community members, previous studies, historical data, live building tours, and a number of other sources in order to comprehend the full nature of the issues that are to be addressed as a part of this study. This material provides the framework for the solutions developed in the next step of the process.

Criteria Development

The next step in the process involves the creation of evaluation criteria, outlining the parameters that proposed solutions will be measured against. These criteria typically reflect the

desired characteristics of the final solution and can be tailored to accommodate a variety of considerations. The development of the evaluation criteria serves to capture the priorities of the entire team as expressed through its individual members. In the final analysis, it is the development of a comprehensive, relevant set of criteria that assures that the final recommendation will represent the optimal solution.

Weighting Factors

Upon completion of the evaluation criteria list described above, the process shifts its focus to the development of weighting factors. The list of criteria can typically be lengthy, and each of the items included has value in helping to shape the final solution. In reality, however, not all of the criteria are of equal value. Stated simply, some considerations are more important than others, and should carry more weight in the final recommendation. The application of weighting factors in the final analysis enables the most important criteria to more heavily influence the final result. The weighting factors are developed by consensus with all of the team members so that the process truly reflects the relative values that the team places on each criteria.

Proposed Solutions

The development of proposed solutions is the next step in the sequence. As previously stated, the proposed solutions evolve out of the information gathered and developed to this point. The solutions can encompass a broad range of ideas, and the process does not limit the quantity. It is not uncommon to evaluate solutions ranging from minimal action to the most elaborate schemes imaginable. The power of rational basis decision making is that it does not unduly limit the inquiry, but rather encourages creative solutions. The solutions developed by the team are subjected to analysis and scoring described in the next paragraph.

Analysis and Scoring

The issues have been defined, evaluation criteria have been developed, background materials have been assembled, and proposed solutions have been identified. It's now time to take all of this material and move on to the critical step of analysis and scoring.

The analysis involves measuring each of the proposed solutions against all the evaluation criteria, with a score—typically from 1 to 10—assigned in each category. This score is an assessment of how a proposed solution measures in each category defined by the criteria. This process is performed for all of the proposed solutions. As this task is completed for each of the solutions, an objective, comparative score emerges, establishing a rational comparison of how each solution performs against the others. These scores are "raw" scores and will be subjected to the weighting factors described above to achieve a final score. The following table serves to illustrate how the scoring process works.

SCORING MATRIX					
EVALUATION CRITERIA		Solution A		Solution B	
	WEIGHTING FACTOR	RAW SCORE	WEIGHTED SCORE	RAW SCORE	WEIGHTED SCORE
Criteria No. 1	10	3	**30**	10	**100**
Criteria No. 2	5	9	**45**	5	**25**
Criteria No. 3	3	3	**9**	5	**15**
Criteria No. 4	1	6	**6**	7	**7**
Total Score			**90**		**147**

The sample table illustrated above demonstrates the scoring process for a set of two hypothetical solutions applied against four evaluation criteria. The criteria are listed in the left hand column, and the proposed solutions located in the vertical columns at the right. The scoring mechanics function as follows. For Solution A, under Criteria No. 1, a raw score of 3 is assigned. The raw score of 3 is multiplied by the weighting factor of 10, to produce a weighted score of 30. Solution B has a raw score of 10 when measured against Criteria No.1. This raw score is again multiplied by the weighting factor of 10, to produce a weighted score of 100. The weighted scores for each criteria/solution are bolded for clarity. The weighted scores for the remaining criteria are similarly computed and compiled to produce a total score. As can be seen, Solution B is the preferred option with a total score of 147 versus 90. Solution B, being the preferred solution at this stage of the process, moves forward to the risk assessment process described in the next section.

Risk Assessment

The Analysis and Scoring process produces the preferred solution(s). These solutions have scored favorably in the measurement against the evaluation criteria but must still clear one final hurdle. This hurdle, known as “risk assessment,” seeks to answer the question “what can go wrong?” This is typically not a numerical analysis, as the questions are more subjective in nature. As was the case with the scoring analysis illustrated above, this process can be illustrated with the Risk Assessment Matrix as shown below.

RISK ASSESSMENT MATRIX		
PROPOSED SOLUTION	Solution A	Solution B
Risk Factor 1	High	Low
Risk Factor 2	Medium	Low
Risk Factor 3	Low	Low

The sample table is established to illustrate how the risk assessment process works. As shown in the table, the risk factors are listed in the left column. The vertical columns at the right contain a list of proposed hypothetical solutions. The solutions are measured on the probability that a risk will occur and the seriousness of the impact if it does occur. The grading system is a simple "low," "medium," or "high" under each category. As can be seen from the table, Solution A has vulnerability from risk factors 1 and 2. Solution B, which was the highest scoring option, is not impacted by the risk factors, and therefore emerges as the preferred choice.

Final Recommendation

The process concludes with a final recommendation, which gathers input from the entire effort and wraps it into a final recommended course of action.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

As the District 41 Facilities Task Force began its work, the team focused on the challenges placed before it. In the course of discussions, a number of consistent, recurring themes or principles began to emerge. These principles became embedded as an integral part of the evaluation criteria and have helped to guide the facilities "vision" embodied in the final recommended solutions. We will refer to these our guiding principles, and they can be summarized as follows:

District 41 Facilities Task Force Guiding Principles

District 41 facilities should afford full physical access on an equal basis to all students.

District 41 facilities should offer equal access to programs and services across the district.

The work of the Facilities Task Force needs to focus on crafting a strategic, "long-term" vision in the generation of solutions.

The safety and security of our buildings and grounds must be reflected as a primary objective in all outcomes.

Final solutions must maximize value to the community in the face of significant property tax concerns.

The implementation needs to proceed expeditiously to project completion within five years.

HADLEY JUNIOR HIGH STUDY

Overview

The Board of Education charge to the Facilities Task Force outlined issues at Hadley Junior High and the four elementary schools. The committee determined from the outset that it would be more efficient to divide the work effort into two studies, one evaluating the issues at Hadley and the other assessing the issues at the four elementary schools. These studies, performed separately, would be consolidated into a single report document for consideration by the Board of Education and the general public.

This section outlines the process followed for the Hadley Junior High issues, as delineated in the Board Directive section of this report. The committee followed the Rational Basis decision making process described in the previous section, and its work is described in the balance of this section.

Decision Statement

The Board Directive to the committee elaborated three major areas of concern to be addressed by the committee:

- Elimination of ten portable classrooms
- Evaluation of “core” facilities
- Maximize flexibility for future programming

The Task Force discussed these items at length and ultimately arrived at the following decision statement:

“How do we eliminate all ten portable classrooms at Hadley and accommodate core space flexibility?”

Background Material

The Task Force spent a good deal of time and effort in collecting and discussing the challenges and opportunities at Hadley. Members of the committee took the opportunity to visit Hadley during the school day to witness the school in operation and to seek input from staff members in the building. The tours were followed with an evening presentation from Principal Steve Diveley (included in Appendix for reference), outlining the issues that impact efficient building

operations and those that impact current and future instructional and co-curricular programming. The list included five primary areas of concern:

- Students in portable classrooms
- Lack of adequate storage
- Inadequate musical space/instruction
- Cafeteria/student and staff eating area
- Insufficient STEAM labs

Members of the committee voiced additional concerns about issues and conditions affecting the school:

- Safety and efficiency of traffic patterns, especially during student drop-off/pickup times
- Security
- Obsolescence of building infrastructure, including technology
- Preservation of “green” space for instruction and program

The list of items was instrumental in establishing the evaluation criteria outlined in the next section.

Evaluation Criteria

The committee spent the better part of a couple of work sessions developing the criteria to be used for the evaluation of the proposed solutions. The list of criteria for Hadley included two levels of criteria: the mandatory criteria, those that **must** be satisfied by any viable solution, and the desired outcomes, elements of a solution that are desired but not mandatory. The list of mandatory criteria included the following five items:

- Portables must disappear
- Solution must fit on current property
- Attendance boundaries must not change
- No reduction in programmatic capacity
- Students stay on campus during construction

The second level of criteria, the desired outcomes, includes items that are desired elements of the final solution. The initial list contained around eighteen separate items, but through discussion and evaluation, it was determined that there was a degree of redundancy; subsequently, the list was streamlined to include the following twelve items:

- Create adequate flexible space for current and future program
- Minimize impact on local property taxes
- Minimize operating cost impact
- Improve safety

- Provide operating flexibility
- Optimize efficient use of “core” space
- Minimize construction cost impact
- Enhance faculty resources
- Maintain grade level separation
- Include eco-energy savings
- Conserve relevant outdoor activity space
- Enhance/create architectural identity

Weighting Factors

The committee deliberated on and sought to develop an equitable approach to determining appropriate weighting factors for each of the criteria. It was agreed that each committee member would submit their proposed weight factors to be compiled into average values. Two sets of values were submitted as a part of this process. First, each member of the committee was asked to rank the criteria according to relative importance, with the idea that individual criteria could carry identical weighting factors where appropriate. Second, the team was asked to rank the criteria from the most to least important. The average values were computed for each approach and are summarized in the “Importance” and “Rank” columns of the matrix included below. The values included in these columns were reconciled into a final weighting factor shown in final “Weight” column of the table below. This process was followed for each of the twelve criteria.

WEIGHTING FACTOR COMPUTATION MATRIX			
CRITERIA	IMPORTANCE (AVG)	RANK (AVG)	WEIGHT
Adequate/flexible space for current and future programming	7.667	8.792	10
Minimize impact on property taxes	7.75	8.375	10
Minimize operating cost impact	8.167	7.667	9
Improve safety	7.292	7.875	8
Provide operating flexibility	7.792	7.708	8
Efficient use of core space (bathrooms, lunchrooms, hallways, gym	6.792	7.333	6
Minimize construction cost impact	7.735	6.958	6
Enhance faculty resources (meeting/collaboration space)	6.292	5.708	4
Maintain grade level separation in the building (6th graders in the same area of the building, etc.)	5.167	5.375	4
include eco-energy savings	6.042	4.75	3
Conserve relevant outdoor activity space	5.375	4.583	3
Enhance /create architectural identity	3.333	2.25	1

Proposed Solutions

Upon completion of the criteria, and in consideration of the background material, the committee formulated a series of proposed solutions. After much discussion, the team settled on six proposals which are summarized as follows:

1. Construct ten new classrooms on grade (with an option to add two additional classrooms for future flexibility) and make bus lane improvements
    - Includes mechanical space, toilets, and circulation
    - Connection to existing building
    - Removal of existing portable classrooms
    - Budget Cost: $6.6M (10 Classrooms)
    - Budget Cost: $7.4M (12 Classrooms)
2. Construct ten new classrooms (with an option to add two additional classrooms for future flexibility), a new “Cafetorium”(combination cafeteria and performing arts venue), remodel existing cafeteria into science labs and standard classrooms, add storage, and make bus lane improvements
    - Includes mechanical space, toilets, and circulation
    - Connection to existing building
    - Removal of existing portable classrooms

- Cafetorium includes “warming kitchen”
- Cafetorium includes performance stage
- Six of the ten new classrooms are to be constructed into vacated existing cafeteria space
- Budget Cost: $12.0M

3. Construct ten new classrooms (with an option to add two additional classrooms for future flexibility); a new “Cafetorium”; remodel existing cafeteria into science labs and standard classrooms; add storage, remodel “PODS” into classrooms, music, and flexible space; and make bus lane improvements
    - Includes mechanical space, toilets, and circulation
    - Connection to existing building
    - Removal of existing portable classrooms
    - Cafetorium includes “warming kitchen”
    - Cafetorium includes performance stage
    - Full integration of existing portables into existing cafeteria and reconfigured “PODS”
    - Budget Cost: $15.0M
4. Do nothing – Maintain the status quo
5. Construct ten new classrooms on grade (with an option to add two additional classrooms for future flexibility), complete minimal work on existing “PODS” and cafeteria space
    - Budget Cost: $8.0M
6. Construct ten new classrooms on grade (with an option to add two additional classrooms for future flexibility), complete minimal work on existing “PODS” and cafeteria space, and reconfigure existing “PODS” for music rooms
    - Budget Cost: $10.5M

Scoring and Analysis

The next step in the process involves the measurement and analysis of each of the proposed solutions against the list of previously developed criteria. The analysis and scoring phase afford the opportunity to objectively compare the performance of each proposed solution when measured against the full range of criteria. In this manner, the solution which most closely adheres to the criteria provides the confidence that the goals of the project have been satisfied and that the solution selected is optimal.

The team approached the scoring and analysis effort by dividing into four sub-committees, each tasked with evaluating the proposed solutions against three of the criteria. The recommended

HADLEY SCORING MATRIX

CRITERIA		TEN NEW CLASSROOMS	TEN NEW CLASSROOMS, CAFETORIUM	TEN NEW CLASSROOMS, CAFETORIUM, REMODEL PODS	DO NOTHING	TEN NEW CLASSROOMS, MINIMAL PODS, CAFETERIA	TEN NEW CLASSROOMS, PODS FOR MUSIC, CAFETERIA
		SOLUTION NO.1	SOLUTION NO.2	SOLUTION NO.3	SOLUTION NO.4	SOLUTION NO.5	SOLUTION NO.6

analysis and scoring from each sub-committee was presented to the entire team for review and comment. The results of this effort are summarized in the Scoring Matrix below:

As can be seen from the matrix above, the raw score in each category was multiplied by the weighting factor to produce a weighted score for each of the criteria. The weighted scores were totaled, producing a range of scores that demonstrates the adherence to the full list of criteria from best to worst. The rationale for the scoring can be summarized as follows:

Adequate/Flexible Space

The raw scores in this category ranged from 1 to 10, with a weighting factor of 10 indicating that this was considered a very important consideration in the final solution. Option 4, which is to "Do Nothing," received a score of 1, reflecting the fact that it does nothing to address future space or flexibility needs. The remaining options—numbers 1, 5, 6, 2, and 3—had raw scores of 4, 5, 7, 8, and 10, respectively. This sequence reflects the proposed solutions from the least to most comprehensive, hence the range of scores. Each successive solution in this sequence outlines increasingly elaborate space and flexibility scenarios, and the final scores reflect that.

Property Tax Impact

The raw scores in this category ranged from 1 to 9, with a weighting factor of 10 indicating that this was considered a very important consideration in the final solution. Option 3, which is the most elaborate, expensive solution, received a score of 1, indicating the maximum potential for property tax impact. The solution with the least potential impact on property taxes, with a score of 9, was Option 1, reflecting the minimal scope and cost of this approach. Options 6, 5, and 2, with scores of 7, 6, and 3, reflect the order of complexity from low to high and an increasing potential for property tax impact. The increasing impact results in a lower score, with the underlying assumption that lower property tax impact is more desirable in the final solution.

Operating Cost Impact

The raw scores in this category ranged from 3 to 10, with a weighting factor of 9 indicating that this was considered a very important consideration in the final solution. Option 1, which is the least elaborate solution, received a score of 10, indicating that it has the least impact on operating costs. The most elaborate solution, Option 3, was deemed to have the greatest impact on operating cost, and was scored at 3. Options 2, 5, and 6, with scores of 4, 6, and 8, reflect the increasing level of complexity and impact on ongoing operating costs.

Improve Safety

The raw scores in this category ranged from 6 to 8, with a weighting factor of 8 indicating that this was considered an important consideration in the final solution. The scores were very tightly grouped, reflecting the opinion of the committee that all of the solutions perform similarly in this area. Options 2 and 3, the most elaborate solutions, scored slightly higher, reflecting the enhanced potential to improve safety with these alternatives.

Operating Flexibility

The raw scores in this category ranged from 3.14 to 8.4, with a weighting factor of 8 indicating that this was considered an important consideration in the final solution. As can be expected, the two most elaborate alternatives, Options 3 and 2, received the highest scores of 8.4 and 7.4 respectively. Options 1 and 6, scoring 3.14 and 4.1, reflect the minimal scope and operating flexibility with the solutions. Option 5, correspondingly, received a score of 6.4.

Core Space Efficiency

The raw scores in this category ranged from 1 to 10, with a weighting factor of 6 indicating that this was considered a moderately important consideration in the final solution. Solution No. 4, do nothing, received a score of 1, reflecting that it does nothing to improve performance in this area. The two most elaborate alternatives, Options 3 and 2, received the highest scores of 10 and 9 respectively. Options 6, 1, and 5, scoring 4, 6, and 7, reflect the reduced scope and impact on core space efficiency with the solutions.

Construction Cost Impact

The raw scores in this category ranged from 2 to 10, with a weighting factor of 6 indicating that this was considered a moderately important consideration in the final solution. The wide range of construction costs ranging from $6.2 million on the low end to $15 million on the high end produces a similarly wide range of scores in this area. The least costly solutions, Options 1 and 6, score the highest at 10 and 8 respectively. Options 5, 2, and 3 reflect construction costs in ascending order, and are scored at 6, 4, and 2 respectively.

Enhance Faculty Resources

The raw scores in this category ranged from 3 to 6.4, with a weighting factor of 4 indicating that this was considered a less important consideration in the final solution. The scores were very tightly grouped, reflecting the opinion of the committee that all of the solutions perform somewhat similarly in this area. The two most elaborate alternatives, Options 3 and 2, received the highest scores of 6.4 and 5.9 respectively. Options 1 and 6, scoring 3 and 3.4, reflect the

minimal scope and impact on core space efficiency with the solutions. Option 5, correspondingly, received a score of 4.6.

Grade Level Separation

The raw scores in this category are clustered into two groups, with a weighting factor of 4 indicating that this was considered a less important consideration in the final solution. Options 2, 3, and 5 scored 10, reflecting a high degree of flexibility to maintain grade level separation with these options. Options 1 and 6, with scores of 3 and 4, reflected a concern on the part of the committee with maintaining grade level separation with these alternatives.

Eco-Energy Savings

The raw scores in this category ranged from 2 to 10, with a weighting factor of 3 indicating that this was not considered a major factor in the final solution. The proposed solutions all have the potential to be designed with high efficiency, eco-friendly building systems. The more comprehensive solutions impact greater portions of the building, and the potential for savings increases accordingly. In keeping with this reality, the eco-energy savings scores are 10, 8, 6, 4, and 2 for Options 3, 2, 5, 6, and 1 respectively. This reflects the scope of solutions from the most to least elaborate.

Outdoor Activity Space

The raw scores in this category ranged from 6 to 10, with a weighting factor of 2 indicating that this was not considered a major factor in the final solution. The preservation of outdoor activity space is directly related to the amount of additional space constructed on the site. The two least intrusive solutions, Options 6 and 1, with scores of 10 and 9.5, reflect minimal intrusion on available outdoor activity space. Options 5, 3, and 2, with scores of 8, 7, and 6, reflect slightly greater impact on the site, but still performed well in this analysis.

Architectural Identity

The raw scores in this category are identical at 5, with a weighting factor of 1 indicating that this was not considered a major factor in the final solution. The committee chose to score all options identically, reflecting the opinion that any alternative chosen would likely be designed to be consistent with the current architectural vocabulary. This category does not influence the selection of a final option.

Scoring Summary

The scores tabulated in the Scoring Matrix fell into three groupings. Options 2 and 3, scoring at 461.2 and 458.8, are the two highest scoring alternatives. The next group, which includes Options 5 and 6, scored 452.2 and 446.2. The final group, which includes Options 1 and 4, scored 434.6 and 90. These alternatives are clearly outside range of the first two groups, and logically need to be eliminated from consideration at this stage. These results suggest, at this point in the analysis, that there is clearly support within the committee to move forward with a solution that incorporates additional space, with an apparent preference for the most comprehensive schemes. The final determination of the preferred alternative will be contingent on the outcome of the risk assessment analysis which is discussed in a later section of this report.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS STUDY

Overview

This section of the report outlines the process followed for the elementary school issues delineated in the Board Directive section of this report. The committee again followed the Rational Basis decision making process described in a previous section. This work is described in the balance of this section.

Decision Statement

The Board Directive to the committee elaborated three major areas of concern to be addressed by the committee:

- Consideration of “all day” kindergarten
- Evaluation of “core” facilities
- Maximize flexibility for future programming

The Task Force discussed these items at length and ultimately arrived at the following decision statement:

“How do we provide space for “all day” kindergarten and address deficiencies at each of the elementary schools?”

Background Material

The Task Force spent a good deal of time and effort in collecting and discussing the challenges and opportunities at the four elementary school campuses. Members of the committee took

the opportunity to visit each of the four buildings during the school day to witness the schools in operation, and to seek input from staff members at each building. There were challenges in arranging for all of the committee members to visit all of the buildings, so video tours were created for each of the schools and made available to the team. These videos have been valuable tool to supplement the onsite observations. The tours were followed with an evening presentation from the four elementary school principals: Kirk Samples at Benjamin Franklin Elementary School, Scott Klespitz at Churchill Elementary School, Mary Hornacek at Forest Glen Elementary School, and Linda Schweikhofer at Abraham Lincoln Elementary School (included in Appendix for reference). The principals outlined the issues that impact efficient building operations as well as current and future instructional and co-curricular programming:

- Lack of adequate storage
- Inadequate space for music and art instruction (e.g., Churchill School band/orchestra)
- Inadequate space for teacher collaboration
- Inadequate adult toilet facilities
- Student and staff eating lunchrooms
- Insufficient STEAM labs across the district

Members of the committee voiced additional concerns about issues and conditions affecting the schools and generated the following list:

- Safety and efficiency of traffic patterns, especially during student drop-off/pickup times
- Accessibility issues at various buildings (e.g., Basement Band room at Forest Glen)
- Lack of adequate nurse's stations
- Lack of space for "one-on-one" consultation with specialists
- Dedicated teacher/staff work areas
- Adequate bathroom space, particularly ADA compliant
- Entrance Security
- Obsolescence of building infrastructure, including technology
- Preservation of "green" space for instruction and program

The list of items was instrumental in establishing the evaluation criteria outlined in the next section.

Evaluation Criteria

The committee spent the better part of several work sessions developing the criteria to be used for the evaluation of the proposed solutions. The list of criteria, as was the case with Hadley, included two levels of criteria: the mandatory criteria, those that must be satisfied by any viable solution, and the desired outcomes, elements of a solution that are desired but not mandatory. The list of mandatory criteria included the following three items:

- Space to provide “all day” kindergarten for all students
- Children attend “all day” kindergarten at their home school
- No reduction in academic/co-curricular program capacity

The second level of criteria, the desired outcomes, includes items that are desired elements of the final solution. The initial list contained around nineteen separate items, but through discussion and evaluation, it was determined that there was a degree of redundancy, and the list was streamlined to the following fourteen items:

- Appropriate support of core spaces (e.g., bathrooms, lunchrooms, hallways, gyms)
- Adequate dedicated space for art, music, band/orchestra, STEAM
- Dedicated work space for specialists with room to work privately with students: OT, PT, Speech, Health (Nurse’s Office)
- Teacher work rooms for staff collaboration
- No (or minimal) boundary changes
- Minimize operating cost impact
- Minimize construction cost impact
- Minimize impact on local property taxes
- Conserve relevant outdoor activity space
- Students stay on campus during construction
- All programs/service spaces are accessible to all students (accessibility)
- Capacity to accommodate fluctuations in school population according to the last ten years of enrollment data
- Enhanced and uniform level of security and safety for all schools (e.g., entryways, dropoff/pickup)
- The elementary school solutions must be equitable (meaning that each of the four schools will have the ability to support its academic programs similar to the others, and the solutions do not burden one area of the district versus the others)

Weighting Factors

The committee deliberated the most equitable approach to determining appropriate weighting factors for each of the criteria. It was agreed that each committee member would submit their proposed weight factors, and they would be compiled into average values. Two sets of values were submitted as a part of this process. First, each member of the committee was asked to rank the criteria according to relative importance, with the idea that individual criteria could carry identical weighting factors where appropriate. Second, the team was asked to rank the criteria from the most to least important. The average values were computed for each approach

and reconciled into a final weight factor for each of the fourteen criteria. This process is summarized in the following matrix.

WEIGHTING FACTOR COMPUTATION MATRIX			
CRITERIA	IMPORTANCE (AVG)	RANK (AVG)	WEIGHT
All programs/services spaces are accessible to all students (accessibility)	7.33	12.32	8
Enhanced and uniform level of security and safety for all schools (ex. entryways, drop off/pick up, etc.)	7.25	12.2	9
Minimize impact on property taxes	7.17	12.04	9
Appropriate support of core spaces (bathrooms, lunchrooms, hallways, gyms, etc.)	7	11.8	8
Capacity to accommodate fluctuations in school population according to the past 10 years of enrollment data (flexibility)	7	11.52	7
The elementary school solution(s) must be equitable (meaning that each of the four schools will have the ability to support its academic programs similar to the others, and the solution(s) doesn't burden one quadrant of the district over the others).	6.96	11.24	7
No (or minimal) boundary changes	6.67	10.56	6
Minimize construction cost impact	6.63	10.56	6
Minimize operating costs	6.5	10.56	7
Students stay on campus during construction	5.96	9.24	4
Conserve relevant outdoor activity space	5	8.04	3
Adequate dedicated space for art, music, band/orchestra, STEAM	5	7.92	3
Teacher work rooms for staff collaboration	4.96	7.72	2
Dedicated work space for specialists with room to work privately with students - OT, PT, Speech, health (nurse office)	4.46	7	2

Proposed Solutions

Upon completion of the criteria, and in consideration of the background material, the committee formulated a series of proposed solutions. After much discussion, the team settled on ten proposals which are summarized as follows:

1. Modify the elementary schools to add the necessary space to accommodate “all day” kindergarten and address deficiencies in the core area facilities. This solution was presented to the Board of Education on January 26, 2015 and is included in the Appendix for reference. Budget Cost: $16.5M
2. Construct Early Learning Center at Spaulding School site and address deficiencies at the four elementary schools. This solution was presented to the Board of Education on January 26, 2015 and is included in the Appendix for reference. Budget Cost: $23.6M
3. Construct new K -5 Elementary School at Spaulding School site and address deficiencies at the other four elementary schools. This solution was presented to the Board of Education on January 26, 2015 and is included in the Appendix for reference. Budget Cost: $29.2M

4. Move the Pre-K program out of Forest Glen Elementary School freeing space for “all day” kindergarten at that location. Budget Cost: N/A
5. Add space to Hadley to accommodate the Pre-K program. This, as in the Option 4 above, would create the space for “all day” kindergarten at Forest Glen. Budget Cost: N/A
6. Solution No. 1 enhanced with the addition of long term modifications to facilitate future program modifications and enrollment fluctuations. Examples of long term modifications could include the reconstruction of the “rotunda” at Lincoln School or the reconfiguration of the “diamond” wing at Churchill School. Budget Cost: $21.5M
7. Offer “all day” kindergarten within the framework of existing facilities in each building. Budget Cost: N/A
8. Relocate existing 5th grade students from existing elementary buildings to Hadley or a newly constructed central facility, freeing space in the existing buildings for “all day” kindergarten and other purposes. Budget Cost: $26.9M
9. Maintain the status quo, do nothing. Budget Cost: $0
10. Reconstruct all four elementary schools at their current locations to incorporate “all day” kindergarten, address enrollment fluctuations, and provide the flexibility to accommodate current and future program requirements. Budget Cost: $120.0M

Scoring and Analysis

The committee moved forward to the measurement and analysis of each of the proposed solutions against the list of previously developed criteria. The analysis and scoring phase affords the opportunity to objectively compare the performance of each proposed solution when measured against the full range of criteria. In this manner, the solution which most closely adheres to the criteria provides the confidence that the goals of the project have been satisfied, and the solution selected is optimal.

Mandatory Criteria Evaluation

The initial step in this process involved the comparison of the ten proposed solutions against the mandatory “must have” criteria. The mandatory criteria, as previously stated must **all** be satisfied for a solution to be considered. The failure to satisfy each of these “must haves” in essence is an acknowledgment that a particular solution is unworkable, and needs to be discarded as a matter of course. As an example, if the goal of the exercise is to generate solutions that provide “all day” kindergarten, then any solution that fails in this regard is not a solution to be considered.

The mandatory criteria list includes the following:

- Space to provide “all day” kindergarten for all students
- Children attend “all day” kindergarten at their home school

- No reduction in academic/co-curricular program capacity

In performing this evaluation, the committee determined that a number of the proposed solutions failed to satisfy all three of the criteria listed above. The solutions falling prey to this analysis can be summarized as follows:

Solution No. 2 – This option proposes the construction of a centrally located Early Childhood Learning Center, and requires relocation of all kindergarten students from their home school to this new location. The relocation of kindergarten students out of their home schools to a centrally located Early Childhood Learning Center fails to satisfy the second mandatory criterion and thus will not be considered for implementation.

Solution No. 4 – This option proposes to move the Pre-K program out of Forest Glen. This solution facilitates the addition of "all day" kindergarten at Forest Glen, but does not provide the space to accommodate "all day" kindergarten at the remaining schools. It requires that students be relocated from their home school to attend "all day" kindergarten at a facility which can accommodate them. This option fails to satisfy the first two mandatory criteria and is discarded on this basis.

Solution No. 5 – This option proposes adding space to Hadley to house the Pre-K program, relocating it out of Forest Glen. This solution facilitates the addition of "all day" kindergarten at Forest Glen, but does not provide the space to accommodate "all day" kindergarten at the remaining schools. It requires that students be relocated from their home school to attend "all day" kindergarten at a facility which can accommodate them. This approach fails to satisfy the first two mandatory criteria in much the same way as Solution No. 4 above and is discarded on this basis.

Solution No. 7 – This proposal seeks to offer "all day" kindergarten in existing space. There is currently inadequate space to offer "all day" kindergarten at each building for all students. This option fails to satisfy the first mandatory criterion and is discarded on this basis.

Solution No. 9 – Do nothing. This approach fails to satisfy the first two mandatory criteria, in that it does not create the space for "all day" kindergarten, and does not enable students to attend a kindergarten at their home school. This option is discarded on this basis.

The remaining options satisfy all of the mandatory criteria, and move forward to examination against the fourteen desirable objectives. This analysis is reviewed in the remainder of this section.

Desirable Objectives Analysis

The team approached the analysis process against the desirable objectives for the elementary schools in a similar fashion to that developed for Hadley. The team was divided into four sub-committees, each tasked with evaluating the proposed solutions against a number of the fourteen criteria. The recommended analysis and scoring from each sub-committee was presented to the entire team for review and comment. The results of this effort are summarized in the Scoring Matrix below:

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SCORING MATRIX

CRITERIA		MODIFY EXISTING BUILDINGS		NEW K-5 ELEMENTARY		MODIFY EXISTING BUIDINGS PLUS DEFICIENCIES		REMOVE 5TH GRADE FROM ELEMENTARIES		REBUILD SCHOOLS	
		SOLUTION NO.1		SOLUTION NO.3		SOLUTION NO.6		SOLUTION NO.8		SOLUTION NO.10	
	COST	$16.5M		$29.2M		$21.5M		$26.9M		$120.0M	
	WEIGHTING FACTOR	RAW SCORE	WEIGHTED SCORE	RAW SCORE	WEIGHTED SCORE	RAW SCORE	WEIGHTED SCORE	RAW SCORE	WEIGHTED SCORE	RAW SCORE	WEIGHTED SCORE
Property tax impact	9	5	45	2	18	4	36	3	27	1	9
Security	9	3	27	7	63	7	63	7	63	10	90
Program/space accessible to all	8	3	24	10	80	9	72	10	80	10	80
Core space efficiency	8	5	40	5	40	8	64	7	56	10	80
Operating cost impact	7	4	28	1	7	6	42	3	21	8	56
Adequate future building capacity	7	6	42	10	70	7	49	7	49	10	70
Equity	7	6	42	9	63	8	56	7	49	10	70
Construction cost impact	6	6	36	2	12	5	30	4	24	1	6
No boundary changes	6	10	60	1	6	10	60	10	60	5	30
Students in buildings during construction	4	3	12	10	40	2	8	8	32	1	4
Dedicated space for art/music	3	5	15	6	18	7	21	7	21	10	30
Outdoor activity space	3	5	15	5	15	5	15	5	15	5	15
Dedicated space for specialists	2	2	4	7	14	9	18	7	14	10	20
Teacher workrooms/collaboration space	2	5	10	7	14	9	18	8	16	10	20
TOTAL SCORE			400		460		552		527		580

As can be seen from the matrix above, the raw score in each category is multiplied by the weighting factor to produce a weighted score for each of the criteria. The weighted scores are totaled, producing a range of scores that demonstrates the adherence to the full list of criteria, from best to worst. The rationale for the scoring can be summarized as follows:

Property Tax Impact

The scores in this category range from 1 to 5, with a weighting factor of 9, indicating that this is a very important consideration in the final solution. Option 10, which is the most elaborate, expensive solution, received a score of 1, indicating the maximum potential for property tax impact. The solution with the least potential impact on property taxes, with a score of 5, was Option 1, reflecting the reduced scope and cost of this option when compared to the others. Options 3 and 8, with scores of 2 and 3, reflect the order of complexity from low to high, and an increasing potential for property tax impact. Option 6 scored a 4, reflecting its reduced impact compared to the more expensive alternatives. The increasing impact results in a lower score, with the underlying assumption that lower property tax impact is more desirable in the final solution.

Enhanced/Uniform Level of Security

The scores in this category range from 3 to 10, with a weighting factor of 9, indicating that this is a very important consideration in the final solution. The scores were an identical 7 for Options 3, 6, and 8, reflecting the opinion of the committee that all of these solutions could afford a reasonably good opportunity for enhanced/uniform levels of security. Option 10, the most elaborate solution, scored a perfect 10, reflecting the reality that new schools can be designed with a very high level of security in mind. Conversely, Option 1, the least elaborate solution affords a relatively low potential upgrade opportunity for enhanced security and therefore scored a 3.

Programmatic/Space Accessibility to all Students

The scores in this category range from 3 to 10, with a weighting factor of 8, indicating that this is an important consideration in the final solution. The score was an identical 10 for Options 3, 8, and 10, reflecting the opinion of the committee that all of these solutions could afford an excellent opportunity for full access to program and space by all students. Option 6, scoring 9, was only slightly less effective in this category. Option 1, scoring 3, affords the least expansive opportunity for improvement in this area.

Core Space Efficiency

The scores in this category range from 5 to 10, with a weighting factor of 8 indicating that this is an important consideration in the final solution. The scores were spread across a relatively tight range, reflecting the opinion of the committee that all of the solutions perform somewhat similarly in this area. The two most elaborate alternatives, Options 10 and 6, received the highest scores of 10 and 8 respectively. Options 1 and 3, scoring 5, reflect the minimal scope

and impact on core space efficiency with these solutions. Option 8, correspondingly, received a score of 7.

Operating Cost Impact

The scores in this category range from 1 to 8, with a weighting factor of 7 indicating that this is an important consideration in the final solution. Option 10, which involves replacing the four buildings with high efficiency new ones, affords the greatest opportunity to reduce operating cost, and therefore received a score of 10. At the other end of the scale, Option 3, involving the addition of a fifth school, has the greatest impact on operating cost, and therefore received a score of 1. Options 8, 1, and 6, with scores of 3, 4, and 6, reflect the increasing level of complexity and impact on ongoing operating costs.

Adequate Building Capacity for Enrollment Fluctuations

The scores in this category range from 6 to 10, with a weighting factor of 7 indicating that this is an important consideration in the final solution. Options 3 and 10, involving new school construction, were deemed to offer the greatest flexibility to address space for future enrollment increases and or fluctuations, and therefore scored 10. The remaining options—numbers 1, 6, and 8—scored from 6, 7, and 7 respectively. This sequence reflects solutions that work within the constraints of existing buildings and offer a good but somewhat reduced opportunity to address future space expansion to accommodate enrollment fluctuation.

Equity

The scores in this category range from 6 to 10, with a weighting factor of 7 indicating that this is an important consideration in the final solution. Options 3 and 10, involving new school construction, were deemed to offer the greatest opportunity to address any perceived or actual equity concerns that currently exist among the district's four elementary buildings. The remaining options—numbers 1, 8, and 6—scored from 6, 7, and 8 respectively. This sequence reflects solutions that work within the constraints of existing buildings and offer a good but somewhat reduced opportunity to address equity issues.

Construction Cost Impact

The scores in this category range from 1 to 6, with a weighting factor of 6 indicating that this is a moderately important consideration in the final solution. The wide range of construction costs ranging from $16.5 million on the low end to $120 million on the high end does not produce a wide range of scores in this area. The least costly solutions, Options 1 and 6, score the highest at

6 and 5 respectively. Options 10, 3, and 8 reflect construction costs in descending order and are scored at 1, 2, and 4 respectively.

No Boundary Changes

The scores in this category range from 1 to 10, with a weighting factor of 6 indicating that this is a moderately important consideration in the final solution. Options 1, 6, and 8 all scored 10, reflecting the reality that these solutions are contained within the existing buildings and will not require boundary modifications of a temporary or permanent nature. Option 10, encompassing the reconstruction of all four buildings, will require a temporary boundary change and phased implementation to facilitate construction at each campus. Consequently it scored a 5. Solution 3, adding a fifth school, requires a permanent boundary change and therefore scored a 1.

Students Remain in Buildings During Construction

The scores in this category range from 1 to 10, with a weighting factor of 4 indicating that this is a somewhat less important consideration in the final solution. Options 3 and 8 scored 10 and 8 respectively, reflecting the reality that these solutions involve new construction and can be carried out without dislodging students. Option 10, encompassing the reconstruction of all four buildings will require relocation of all students for the duration of construction at each campus, and therefore received a score of 1. Solutions 6 and 1, with scores of 2 and 3, will also require relocation of a temporary nature to complete construction. This relocation is less intrusive than required under Option 10.

Dedicated Space for Art and Music

The scores in this category range from 5 to 10, with a weighting factor of 3, indicating that this is not a high priority in the final solution. The scores were tightly clustered for Options 1, 3, 6, and 8, reflecting the opinion of the committee that all of these solutions could afford a reasonably good opportunity to address the additional space requirements of the music program. Option 10, the most elaborate solution, scored a perfect 10, reflecting the reality that new schools can be designed to afford the maximum facility amenities for all programs, including music.

Outdoor Activity Space

The scores in this category were identical at 5, with a weighting factor of 3 indicating that this is not a heavily influential consideration in the final solution. The preservation of outdoor activity space is directly related to the amount of additional space constructed on the site. The committee was of the opinion that each of the options under consideration could offer similar performance in the area of outdoor space and is heavily dependent on the final architectural solution.

Dedicated Space for Specialists

The scores in this category range from 2 to 10, with a weighting factor of 2 indicating that this is a less important consideration in the final solution. The scores were very tightly grouped, reflecting the opinion of the committee that all but one of the solutions affords similar opportunities to create the desired space. Option 1, the least elaborate alternative, scored 2, reflecting the reality that this solution does not envision the addition of dedicated space for these functions. The remaining alternatives ranged from 7 to 10, reflecting increasing levels of complexity and hence the opportunity to add the dedicated space.

Teacher Workrooms/Collaboration Space

The scores in this category range from 5 to 10, with a weighting factor of 2 indicating that this is a less important consideration in the final solution. The scores were very tightly grouped, reflecting the opinion of the committee that all of the solutions perform somewhat similarly in this area. The two most elaborate alternatives, Options 6 and 10, received the highest scores of 9 and 10 respectively. Options 8 and 3—scoring 8 and 7—reflect a less comprehensive scope and reduced opportunity to create the dedicated teacher workrooms and collaboration spaces. Option 1, the least elaborate solution, correspondingly received a score of 5.

Scoring Summary

The scores tabulated in the Scoring Matrix fall into two groupings. Options 1 and 3, scoring at 400 and 460, are the two lowest scoring alternatives. The remaining group includes Options 8, 6, and 10, scoring at 527, 552, and 580. Options 1 and 3 are clearly outside range of the higher groups and would logically seem to be out of the running at this stage. The committee, after much discussion, expressed a preference to continue with all five options at this stage in the process and move ahead with the Risk Assessment on each. The final determination of the preferred alternative will be contingent on the results of that effort, which is the subject of the next section.

RISK ASSESSMENT

Risk Assessment, the final step in the evaluation process, is in many ways the most important. Up to this point in the process, the committee has worked methodically through the "rational basis" approach for both Hadley Junior High and the four elementary schools to resolve the challenges presented to them. Upon completion of the scoring and analysis effort, the committee had a good sense of how the competing proposals measured against the project criteria. The final step, the subject of this section, is the risk assessment. Risk assessment is the final "sanity check" and seeks to determine if there are external considerations that exist which can undermine the ultimate success of the chosen alternative(s). In plain English, "What can go wrong?"

As previously stated, the committee did not favor the elimination of alternatives at the conclusion of the scoring analysis described in the previous sections. Rather, it was determined that the risk assessment process would be most effective if applied to all of the solutions generated, regardless of their ranking through the scoring process.

The discussion of appropriate risk factors occupied a full meeting and resulted in the following list:

- *What is the likelihood that a bond referendum is required?*
  A solution requiring a bond referendum can fail if the vote is negative. This is a significant risk factor.
- *If a bond referendum is required, what is the likelihood that it will not pass?*
  For the solutions that require a referendum, what is the likelihood of failure? The financial impact of a given proposition will typically be a major factor in the outcome. This is a significant risk element to the successful implementation of a given solution.
- *What is the likelihood that a particular solution will generate meaningful negative public opinion?*
  This phenomenon has been witnessed historically in many situations involving major issues of public policy, so it is important to assess the risk of a given proposal in this regard.
- *Are there aspects of the construction that pose a risk to the success of a particular solution?*
  The risk associated with this question relates to the successful implementation of a construction program and whether undue complexity or logistical concerns could potentially undermine a particular solution.
- *Does the solution limit the flexibility to develop academic programs in the future?*

This question seeks to determine if a proposed building solution limits the development of future programs in any way.

- *Is there a risk to the successful implementation of a particular solution from changes that occur at the state level?*
  This inquiry seeks to evaluate the risk present for a particular solution in the event that the state alters the financial or regulatory environment.
- *Does the solution threaten the financial stability of the district?*
  This is a significant factor to be considered in the final outcome.
- *Does this particular solution require the passage of an education fund referendum?*
  The concern stated here is the need to evaluate the additional risk posed to the success of a proposed facility initiative by the need to pass an education fund referendum for teaching or staff additions.
- *Does the solution create a situation where the district is overbuilt?*
  The concern elaborated with this question is whether a proposed solution generates the potential for overbuilding.

Risk Assessment Analysis

The creation of the risk factors outlined above was followed with discussions and the creation of a scoring system. The risk assessment scoring approach requires the comparison of each solution against the complete list of risk factors. The grading scale employed here was to categorize each factor with a “low,” “medium,” or “high” potential for impact. This effort was performed for the Hadley and elementary school solutions and is outlined in the following narrative.

Hadley Risk Assessment Analysis

The committee performed the risk assessment analysis for Hadley Junior High and summarized its results in the following table:

HADLEY RISK ANALYSIS MATRIX						
Risk Category	Solution No. 1	Solution No. 2	Solution No. 3	Solution No. 4	Solution No. 5	Solution No. 6
	Ten new Classrooms	Ten new Classrooms, Cafetorium	Ten new Classrooms, Cafetorium, remodel PODS	Do Nothing	Ten Classrooms, minimal PODS work, Cafeteria	Ten Classrooms, PODS for music, Cafeteria
	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Bond Referendum Needed	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Bond Referendum Passing	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Public Opinion	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
Constructability	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Future Programs	Low	Low	Low	Medium	Low	Low
State Changes	Low	Low	Low	High	Low	Low
District Finances	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Education Referendum	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Overbuilding	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low

The evaluation of the risk factors for all of the proposed solutions, with the exception of Solution No. 4, was quite favorable. Solution No. 4, which is to do nothing, does raise some potential risk concerns. It should be noted that this solution did not score well in previous evaluations against the project criteria and was not seriously considered as a viable solution.

The use of color on the chart above was done in an effort to visually highlight the scoring. The committee chose green for low, yellow for medium, and red for the high risks. As can be seen in the table, the committee did not see significant potential for the risk factors to impact the solutions in a meaningful way. The one area where concerns were raised was in the area of public opinion. In the area of public opinion, it was the feeling of the committee that virtually any solution will generate some adverse public opinion. Correspondingly, a medium risk score was assigned. The risk assessment process did not reveal what was considered to be fatal flaws with any of the competing alternatives.

Elementary School Risk Assessment Analysis

The committee performed the risk assessment analysis for the Elementary Schools, and summarized its results in the following table:

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS RISK ANALYSIS MATRIX					
Risk Category	Solution No. 1	Solution No. 2	Solution No. 3	Solution No. 4	Solution No. 5
	Modify Existing	New K-5	Modify Plus	Remove 5th grade	Rebuild Schools
Bond Referendum Needed	Low	High	Medium	High	High
Bond Referendum Not Passing	Medium	High	High	High	High
Public Opinion	Medium	High	Medium	High	High
Constructability	Low	Medium	Low	Medium	High
Future Programs	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
State Changes	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
District Finances	Low	Medium	Low	Medium	Medium
Education Referendum	Low	High	Low	Medium	Low
Overbuilding	Low	Medium	Low	Medium	Medium

The evaluation of the risk factors for the proposed elementary school solutions clearly highlights the significant risk elements inherent in a number of the proposed solutions. In particular, Solutions 2, 4, and 5 indicate serious concerns in a number of key categories. In all cases, the committee felt that the high expense associated with these solutions would require a bond referendum with a very high probability of failure. There was also a strong sentiment among committee members that each of these three proposals would face very strong negative public opinion. The overwhelming adverse impact of the risk assessment was, in the final analysis, deemed fatal for Solutions 2, 4, and 5, effectively removing them from consideration.

Solution No. 1 performed very well in the risk assessment process. It was generally considered as a low risk proposition with the exception of two categories. The committee felt, given a cost of $16.5M for this option, that there was not a high probability of a bond referendum being required, and if one was undertaken, that there was a medium potential for failure. The other area of concern for Solution No. 1 was with public opinion. In this category, the committee was of the opinion that this option, encompassing a relatively limited scope of work, would be a subject of concern to many. The risk in this area was ultimately determined to be medium. In all other categories, this solution was graded as a low risk proposition.

Solution No. 3 performed well in this analysis but did raise areas of concern. The committee was of the opinion that the cost associated with this option, $21.5M, could drive the district to seek a bond referendum. The potential for this to occur was rated medium. If a referendum is required, the prospect of failure was considered to be high. The other area of concern focused on public opinion, and the potential resistance to the construction of the Cafetorium facility.

This risk was assessed to be medium. In all other categories, the risks associated with this option were felt to be low.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The culmination of the process described in this report is the formulation of final recommendations for Hadley Junior High and the four elementary schools. The committee worked for eight months to build a foundation, and the recommendations outlined in this section flow directly from the work described in the previous sections of this document. The determination of a final course of action ultimately resides with the Board of Education and community-at-large, but the committee is hopeful that this effort can provide meaningful input and guidance moving forward. The formulation of final recommendations for Hadley Junior High and the elementary schools is the main topic covered in the balance of this section; however, the committee felt very strongly that this report offer some very important "global" insights that emerged in the course of our work. These are summarized as follows:

- The concept of "neighborhood" schools is very important, and solutions involving the relocation of K-5 students to locations outside of their home schools are strongly opposed.
- Solutions involving construction on the Spaulding site are not favored.
- There is major concern over costs and the potential for impact on property taxes.
- The unanimous top priority among all of the initiatives discussed is the elimination of portable classrooms at Hadley Junior High.
- The committee was predominantly in favor of providing "all day" kindergarten for all students, but a portion of the group would accept a reduced scale program to contain costs.
- The committee is strongly interested in addressing the deficiencies at the elementary schools and has concerns that the implementation of "all day" kindergarten may eliminate the deficiencies from being addressed.

Hadley Junior High Recommendation

There were six solutions analyzed addressing the issues raised at Hadley. The committee analyzed them in light of a series of criteria designed to outline the parameters of the optimal solution. At the conclusion of this process, Solutions 2 and 3—each involving the construction of a "Cafetorium," elimination of the portable classrooms, and reconfiguration of the existing cafeteria and /or PODS areas—emerged as the highest rated options. Solution 3 is the more comprehensive of the two, primarily with an increased focus on work within the PODS area.

Solutions 5 and 6 are more limited in scope, primarily focusing on construction of permanent classroom to replace the portables, coupled with a variety of enhancements to the existing building. These two options scored at a consistently lower level than Options 2 and 3.

The application of the risk assessment did not alter the viability of any of the proposed options for Hadley. They all fared well in this regard. The committee proceeded to make a final selection based largely upon the results of the prior analysis.

The vote among committee members was largely based upon one's view of the need for a Cafetorium. Solutions 1, 2, and 4 received no support. Solutions 5 and 6, combined for clarity into one category (no Cafetorium), received support from 40% of the committee. The remaining option, Solution 3, was the clear favorite, garnering 60% of the votes among the committee members.

Solution 3 is the recommendation of the committee for Hadley Junior High.

Elementary Schools Recommendation

There were five solutions analyzed addressing the issues raised at the four elementary schools. The committee once again analyzed these solutions in light of the criteria designed to outline the parameters of the optimal solution. At the conclusion of this process, the solution with the highest score was No. 10, followed by Nos. 8, 6, 3, and 1.

The risk assessment analysis, unlike with Hadley, had a major impact on the viability of the proposed solutions for the elementary schools. The application of the risk factors eliminated Solution Nos. 10, 8, and 3 from consideration, leaving Nos. 6 and 1 as the final two options.

The vote among committee members was largely based upon one's view of the need to limit the effort primarily to expansion for "all day" kindergarten or to a scope of work encompassing the full range of deficiencies. Solutions 10, 8, and 2, based upon the unfavorable risk assessment, received no support. Solution 1 (minimal approach) received support from 20% of the committee. The remaining option, Solution 6 (fully enhanced approach), was the clear favorite, garnering 80% of the votes among the committee members. The combination of a high score and favorable risk assessment outcome renders this a logical choice.

Solution 6 is the recommendation of the committee for the four elementary schools.

A final comment is appropriate to clarify the selection process among committee members. The voting patterns, while establishing a clear consensus, fell largely into two camps, divided by concerns with costs. There is a significant concern among a block of the committee members over cost and property tax related issues. This group does not oppose the options chosen, per se, but does have concern over the ability of the community to support the more expansive and expensive solutions. While these might seem to be irreconcilable positions, it does offer a significant insight into the need to craft implementation strategies that can bridge the divide and capture the support of both groups.

The committee maintained its focus on the primary tasks assigned by the Board of Education; however, there was a lot of discussion along the way on how to move the process forward. The whole topic of implementation, including construction phasing and financing scenarios is an area beyond the scope of this committee, but one that will need to be thoroughly evaluated. The ultimate success of this undertaking will depend in large measure on the development of creative implementation strategies that can successfully craft a compromise between the desire for comprehensive solutions and the ability to pay for them.

APPENDIX

For more information and documentation go to www.d41.org/ftf