

# MANCHESTER BOARD OF EDUCATION

## Regular Meeting

**April 22, 2013**

7:00 p.m.

Lincoln Center

**PRESENT:** Atwater, Crockett, Cruz, Hagenow, Leon, Luxenberg,  
Pattacini, Scappaticci, Walton

**ALSO PRESENT:** Interim Superintendent of Schools Dr. Kiesel, Assistant to the  
Superintendent for Finance & Management Brooks

**ABSENT:** Assistant Superintendent for Pupil Personnel Services  
Matfess

### **A. OPENING**

#### **A.1&2. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. All in attendance participated in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, led by Chairperson Pattacini.

#### **A.3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

**ADOPTED – Minutes Regular Meeting of the Board of  
Education of April 8, 2013.**

**Secretary Leon moved and Mr. Crockett seconded the  
motion.**

**7/0/1 – Voted in favor. Ms. Luxenberg abstained, Ms. Cruz  
not yet present.**

**Mr. Leon made a motion to move Item E.3. School Uniform  
Pilot Program to B.1. Superintendent's Report Part I. Mr.  
Crockett seconded the motion.**

**8/0 – Voted in favor.**

## **B. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT – PART I**

### **B.1. School Uniform Pilot Program**

**Dr. Kisiel** reminded everyone that two years ago the principal at Illing, at that point Dr. Monroe, began a 2 year uniform pilot. That time period is coming to a close and tonight Mr. Welch, the current Illing principal, presented a power point reviewing the results. The full presentation is available on the website.

Mr. Welch used the rationale for uniforms presented by Dr. Monroe in his presentation February 13, 2012. As far as he can see, there is no correlation to achievement seen in the data. Mr. Welch did note that 91% of the teachers and staff support a uniform program in some form. He noted the Principal Advisory Committee (PAC) of students that meets with him regularly would like to see the uniform pilot ended. The students feel they are uncomfortable and restrictive of their freedom to show who they are. Mr. Welch noted a decision needs to be made as soon as possible, preferably tonight, as the vendors need time to get ready.

Also with Mr. Welch were two teachers, Mr. Mack and Ms. Alejandro, who spoke in favor of the uniforms. Mr. Mack noted that prior to uniforms, in the warm weather the female students were often scantily clad. He feels uniforms have changed the culture of the building and changed the focus of staff from noting how the children are dressed to acknowledging the child.

Ms. Alejandro feels the uniforms have been a blessing, though she acknowledged that the management of the policy was unfair to bestow upon Mr. Welch and noted someone at the school should be the "uniform person" to deal with any issues. Ms. Alejandro noted that wearing their uniform, the students become ambassadors throughout town. They also level the playing field for those that could not afford the latest fashions and in doing so aided in peer relationships because it focused students not on what the others wore, but on who they were individually. She feels the program should be expanded to other schools.

**Mr. Scappaticci** noted it is difficult to quantify the effect uniforms have and also that students are forced to express themselves in more creative ways than through clothing. He notes that sometimes in this type of situation, anecdotal evidence is all you have to justify keeping a program, when there is not data to back it up. He has seen much support with parents and in the community for uniforms.

Mr. Welch noted that when talking about uniforms during orientation for new students, he pointed out that many of their parents wear "uniforms", whether

it be suits, or actual uniforms. Mr. Welch further stated that a two year program makes no sense to him.

**Ms. Luxenberg** was distressed that Mr. Welch had used the term “families in crisis” several times during his presentation and found the time the staff used to make the program work unsettling. While she applauded the efforts of the staff to make this program work for the kids, she wondered if that is the best use of their time. She notes that for the low income families, now that we have a supply of uniforms it is easier to help them, but she doesn’t feel it makes sense only to have two years of uniforms. She wondered if other principals were on board for expanding the initiative. Mr. Welch felt it would be unfair for him to speak for the other principals. She also wondered if the Illing pilot should be extended for another two years. She did not feel it would be appropriate to extend the initiative to the district without doing further surveying.

**Mr. Leon** asked Dr. Kisiel what the results of the survey to parents on the topic was. Dr. Kisiel noted only 28% of the 2200 parents surveyed responded. Of those, there was support for uniforms.

Mr. Leon was distressed that we were spending so much time talking about uniforms when so many other important things need to be focused on, such as the achievement gap, summer school, etc. He sees both sides, but the data doesn’t support either view. He asked Mr. Welch how much money had been spent in helping the 123 families that had received some type of support for the uniforms. Mr. Welch didn’t have an exact number, but felt it was certainly over \$1,000. Mr. Leon noted that in a budget season such as we have now, that money could be used to save other programs. He stated that if we chose to keep uniforms, he would like to see it expanded to other grades. Mr. Leon further stated that he does not like the use of a vendor outside of Manchester and would like small, local businesses to supply the uniforms, which would help the local community as well as make the vendors more accessible to our parents.

**Ms. Cruz**, from her perspective in social services, feels uniforms help students at risk by providing a sense of pride and belonging. She wondered if a family advocate or volunteer could help assist with the management of the program, and perhaps the uniforms could be extended down to the elementary schools.

**Ms. Hagenow** is on the fence. She wondered, prior to uniforms, the time spent dealing with dress code violations in comparison? Mr. Welch did not have that baseline data as he was not the Illing principal at that point.

Mr. Mack noted that the old "dress code" was subjective and now it is easy to differentiate. Prior to uniforms one teacher might think a student's attire was fine, another might not.

**Ms. Walton** noted the Board needs to make a decision, do we expand this district-wide, or to elementary at least? Dr. Kisiel noted that the Board needs to make the decision. He stated in other districts the Boards have made the decision on behalf of the administration.

Ms. Walton stated in previous jobs she has held in schools she loved uniforms. She asked what the percentage of free or reduced lunch students were at Illing. Mr. Welch estimated that to be about 400 students. Ms. Walton reviewed that only 123 families received support for the uniforms, and she feels that the Board and schools need to be prepared to budget financial support for all families receiving free or reduced lunch if the uniform policy continues. She wonders if the Board is prepared for that.

Ms. Walton asked Dr. Kisiel if he knew the other district principal's feelings on uniforms. Dr. Kisiel stated that all the principals are opposed to uniforms, primarily due to management issues. With the new teacher evaluations starting, which will take up approximately 50% of their time daily, they were concerned with adding more to their plates. Dr. Kisiel noted that if the Board seriously wanted to expand the uniforms K-8, administrative and fiscal issues need to be discussed. In his opinion, we do not have the funds available for this year at all. The high school principal was absolutely opposed to uniforms.

**Mr. Crockett** noted that Illing wants an answer tonight. He asked Mr. Welch, if we say yes, continue the pilot, tonight, could we come back and cancel that in the coming weeks or months? Mr. Crockett also agreed that should we approve the uniforms, he would like to see them expanded down into either 6-8 or K-8 as well. Mr. Welch noted that we sign contracts with the vendors, as they order the clothes in good faith.

**Mr. Atwater** sees the pros to uniforms, but is not sure he can support all the energy going into this when there are other areas that need focus.

**Ms. Luxenberg** asked Dr. Kisiel, of the 28% of parents who responded to the survey, did he know the demographics, i.e., free/reduced lunch? Dr. Kisiel stated that was not asked of the respondents. Ms. Luxenberg also wondered if it is an all or nothing policy, uniform or no uniform. Mr. Welch stated there are other dress code policies that can be looked at.

**Ms. Walton** is not in favor of expanding a pilot to 3 or 4 years. Either it works or it does not. She wonders if we could expand into some elementary

schools, allowing parents to “choice” into those schools? She does not feel continuing the pilot without expansion makes sense and notes the administration is not on board. She asked Mr. Welch if he felt, with the new teacher evaluation system beginning, is this still a priority? Mr. Welch noted it does usurp a great deal of time, however the students do look good. He is not convinced it effects the achievement gap and would like the focus to be on curriculum and rigor, not uniforms.

Ms. Walton asked the teachers present about the guidelines, noting she was shocked last year at how stringent the guidelines were. Ms. Alejandro noted that compared to other schools that have uniforms, we are not strict. She actually wanted it more strict. Mr. Mack noted that many original guidelines have not been enforced and he feels the need is to crack down on use of IDs as many students deface theirs.

**Mr. Leon** asked Mr. Welch, when he was principal at Bennet, how much time was spent on clothing issues. Mr. Welch noted it was very minimal, though pointed out they are younger kids in that school. Ms. Fuini, the assistant principal at Illing and previously at Bennet, noted that it was easy to call a parent and say come bring a change of clothes because your child is wearing something inappropriate. She notes in early spring they did address the student body and explain what appropriate spring/summer clothing choices for school were.

Mr. Leon was disturbed at how much time has been spent on this issue. He notes there is a uniform committee at Illing and he would rather that energy be focused elsewhere. Ms. Alejandro notes, as the program was a pilot a committee was needed to oversee the project.

**Ms. Walton** noted that based on the information presented tonight, the time the new teacher evaluations will take for administrators, and the simple fact that no other principal is on board, she is prepared to vote not to continue the pilot.

**Mr. Pattacini** asked the teachers if they felt they spend more time or less addressing clothing issues now. Mr. Mack stated he spends less now and more time connecting with kids. Ms. Alejandro noted that prior to uniforms many male teachers would ask for her help in addressing a female student who was dressed inappropriately, for fear of doing it themselves, so she spends much less time now. She also added that this year was much easier than the first year of the pilot as well. She would be sad if the Board votes against uniforms.

Mr. Pattacini wondered, if the uniforms are kept, are there changes that they would like to see? Mr. Welch noted that the current committee exists to help

with issues. If the program continues, they will find better strategies to deal with the administration aspects. Mr. Pattacini inquired how much time was spent regarding administration. Mr. Welch noted he deals with it daily, and over the summer many hours were spent laundering, sorting, and organizing uniforms.

Mr. Pattacini wondered, if we could fund a position to administrate the program, would Mr. Welch change his view? Mr. Welch noted that in East Hartford there is a paid stipend position for a teacher to act as a liaison. Mr. Pattacini notes that if we spend money it should focus on student achievement as well as helping students become better citizens. He feels there is a component of uniforms that does support school climate, but it is clear that we need to focus on other things at an administrative level.

**Mr. Crockett** hears mixed messages. It is not an easy choice and he is not ready to vote tonight.

**Mr. Leon** stated it comes down to the fact that there is no data that uniforms impact the achievement gap or attendance. It is easier for parents and teachers, but harder on administration. Most kids hate them. We need a decision.

**Ms. Walton** noted that if one other administrator in the district was in favor of uniforms she would feel differently. She sees great things at Illing, but sees no sense continuing a pilot for 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade alone. She asked Dr. Kisiel's opinion. Dr. Kisiel is reluctant to support uniforms. If the Board favors a policy, we need time to look at costs and administrative issues and then there may be more support.

**Mr. Leon moved for the Board of Education to discontinue the uniform pilot policy at the end of the 2012-2013 school year. Ms. Walton seconded the motion.**

#### **DISCUSSION:**

**Mr. Crockett** again stated he is not prepared to vote. He needs answers to more questions. He feels there are still issues with dress, though this is extra work for administrators. The public and teachers want uniforms. As far as the administration not wanting to do extra work that has no educational value, he understands that, but states we are not here to work for administrators, they work for us. While he would like a good working relationship with the administrators, he does not feel he has heard enough information to merit the project being cancelled.

**Ms. Cruz** sees the pro's and con's. Administrators are not in support, teachers are. There is mixed student support. She will not support the motion and would like the issue explored further. She would like to give it another year.

**Ms. Luxenberg** supports the motion. It is unfortunate that there is such a time constraint, and notes the Board could have brought this up earlier and had more time to discuss. She takes issue with Mr. Crockett stating that administrators don't want to do more than they have to do. She notes we are fortunate to have such committed administrators in our district and they go above and beyond for the students on a regular basis.

**Mr. Pattacini** is torn. He notes it is down to providing funds for the administration of the system to continue for one year – he is not sure funding this is an option at this point. He feels we could benefit from a two week delay on the topic.

**Mr. Crockett** wants to put off the vote, he asked Mr. Welch to clarify with the vendors the last date we could order. Mr. Welch noted that other schools have already ordered.

**The chairperson called the question:**

**Atwater – Y**  
**Walton – Y**  
**Cruz - N**  
**Crockett – N**  
**Leon – Y**

**Luxenberg – Y**  
**Hagenow – N**  
**Scappaticci – N**  
**Pattacini - N**

**4/5 – the Motion failed.**

**Dr. Kisiel** asked the Board to be clear with any other issues that could help clarify their response. He noted he will look at costs on management support and vendor timelines.

**Ms. Walton** noted that no Board member or administrator says they want it. She would like to see the costs to adequately budget support for the free/reduce lunch population and what that would look like expanding K-8, plus cost to support management of the program.

**Mr. Crockett** agreed with what Ms. Walton asked, and wondered if it would be possible to bring in volunteers to help enforce the dress code and reduce costs? Dr. Kisiel replied that in questioning other districts, a paid position would be required to manage the program.

**Mr. Pattacini** would also like Illing to provide any potential changes they suggest if the program is continued.

**Ms. Walton** added that we need a definitive date for a decision and if this extension would impact vendor costs.

**Mr. Leon** wondered how we get input from the K-6 parents. He notes that if there is no vote, the pilot ends at the end of the school year. Mr. Leon points out that the cost for a growing elementary school child would require multiple uniform purchases throughout the years and how do other districts handle this?

**Ms. Luxenberg** noted that previously Dr. Monroe held community forums with parents and community members on the topic and she would like the same done for the K-6 population. Dr. Kisiel stated there is not enough time to accomplish that prior to the next meeting. He notes the community forum on the issue at the high school brought parents both adamantly opposed and for uniforms. He feels this is a Board decision and that is how East Hartford handled it as well. Ms. Luxenberg stated that is her point, there is no time to do this and it is a disservice to the community. She feels a decision should be made tonight.

**Mr. Leon** noted that in his four years on the Board when there is a difficult decision we ask the administration to weigh in. They did on this topic and we still cannot make a decision.

**Mr. Crockett** noted that at the re-vote in two weeks we do not necessarily have to implement this district-wide, we need to give Illing an answer.

### **C. CONSENT CALENDAR**

**Dr. Kisiel** presented four items on the Consent Calendar for Board approval.

#### **C.1. Personnel Action**

Details had already been provided to the Board members in their agenda folders.

#### **C.2. Transfer of Funds**

Details had already been provided to the Board members in their agenda folders.

- Transfer from Illing Middle School Administrator General Supplies/Materials account to Illing Middle School Administrator Dues/Fees account in the amount of \$189.
- Transfer from Manchester High School Administrator Postage to Manchester High School Administrator General Supplies/Materials account in the amount of \$2,500.

- Transfer from Enrichment Contract Kelly Substitute to Enrichment Field Trip account in the amount of \$1,600.

**C.3. Manchester Head Start Selection Criteria**

**C.4. CSDE 2013-2014 Healthy Food Certification Statement**

**The Chairman called for a motion.**

**Secretary Leon moved and Mr. Crockett seconded the recommendation to adopt Item C., Consent Calendar.**

**9/0 - Voted in favor.**

**D. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Stephanie Knybel, 138 Bobby Lane, stated she has never been so disappointed in the Board of Education as she was tonight. She is a strong advocate of education in this town. She acknowledges being a board member is a tough job. She has dealt with the dress code issue with her own children in the past. She feels we have heard from administration and staff that the dress code is working. She notes the report that male staff wouldn't approach female students for dress code violations prior to uniforms. She feels this was a simple decision tonight, to keep the dress code at Illing or stop it. She suggests allowing Illing to go one more year on the pilot and work out the kinks. She notes people she has spoken to are disgusted by the Board of Education. She feels this issue should have been brought before the Board sooner and she feels it is turning into another Nathan Hale issue, will we/won't we. She wants a decision made and notes she loves the dress code, even though she doesn't have kids in our schools anymore. Ms. Knybel notes that the Board makes the decisions and the administration follows them. She doesn't think elementary school families would have an issue with it. She felt that the 6<sup>th</sup> grade academy students should have been made to wear uniforms when it opened. She notes that people wear uniforms everywhere and it is ridiculous to take two hours to discuss this.

Carol Nelson, 71 Yale Drive, has twins at Illing and is on the uniform committee. She supports uniforms. She notes her twins wore uniforms when they attended school in Hartford years earlier. She is a paraprofessional in Hartford and was there when they rolled out uniforms in 2005. As an artist, she originally thought uniforms would inhibit self-expression, but quickly saw why they are worth the work. As a parent she finds them easier. All the teachers she has worked with over the past seven years love the uniforms. They are simpler and everyone knows what the rules are. She feels it saves parents money as they don't have to purchase designer clothes. She notes you can get slacks at thrift stores and it eliminates fashion comparisons and arguments from children, it is simply follow the rules, it's non-negotiable. She thinks at Illing one employee should be

trained to handle the role of point person who is also an administrative assistant, and it is not as expensive or complicated as it is being made out to be. That uniform specialist can also track data. She feels the vendor should be local and on a bus line to make it easier for parents. She prefers footwear be addressed to prevent safety concerns and be one color. She would like to continue this into the high school with a district-wide logo for shirts, keeping the Illing shirts as is for now. She notes the middle school has worked hard to teach manners and that momentum will be lost if not rolled into the high school.

## **E. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT – PART II**

### **E.1/2. Teacher Evaluation Program - Administrator Evaluation Program**

**Dr. Kisiel** reviewed that it took about five months to rewrite the teacher and administrator evaluations to be consistent with the state Department of Education guidelines. The essence of the systems is to attempt to identify high quality teachers and identify those that need assistance or that may need to be terminated. Dr. Kisiel's full power point can be found on the website.

Dr. Kisiel reviewed that 45% of the teacher evaluation is based on CMT/CAPT and other student learning measures; 40% is based on observations; 10% on parent satisfaction surveys; and 5% on SPI. All teachers in the school are judged the same regarding SPI, this encourages them to work together to achieve the same end. It is anticipated that 50% of an administrators daily time will be spent on evaluations.

**Ms. Walton** noted she struggles with the state guideline of 5% of the evaluation being on the SPI of the school. She feels this penalizes those willing to take on the challenge of working with a low performing school. She feels for those teachers. Dr. Kisiel agreed with that but feels the SPI targets are fairly reasonable and he encourages the teachers to see value in working together; the achievement of all the kids pays off.

Ms. Walton stated that Connecticut is at the forefront of this changing course of education and she wishes the Board and community would invest as much time in this, which is shaping our future, as we do in other issues. She asked about the survey portion of the evaluation, is that for each individual teacher? Dr. Kisiel revealed it is not a teacher survey, but a whole school survey. The effectiveness of teaching is a shared responsibility. He notes you never get 100% of the surveys completed and they need at least 18-22% to have any relevance.

**Mr. Pattacini** noted that 50% of the administrator's time is to be spent on these evaluations and wondered what the current percentage level they are

expending is. Dr. Kisiel felt it was far less, possibly 20%. Dr. Kisiel feels this is the best thing to happen to Manchester as the current system doesn't identify practice needed to be done to improve teaching and learning. The outcomes of this system will far outweigh the time spent. If done properly, this will have the greatest impact on student achievement than anything else we have done – it is relevant, meaningful, and has impact. High quality evaluations lead to high quality teaching.

Mr. Pattacini wondered, with these evaluations taking 30% more time from administrators, would that be 30% of their current work that is not done, or will the work be made more efficient? Dr. Kisiel noted administrators will have to pay close attention to their time and delegate more duties. There is a program available to help them with their time study and Dr. Kisiel hopes to access that with Alliance Grant funds.

Mr. Pattacini wondered if the Board needed to take action on this tonight. Dr. Kisiel stated the State Board of Education wants local Boards of Education to approve these documents, even though the state will review them against the checklist and ultimately approve them.

**Mr. Leon moved for the Board of Education to authorize the Superintendent to approve and move forward to the state for the teacher evaluation program and the administrator evaluation program. Mr. Crockett seconded the motion.**

#### **DISCUSSION:**

**Ms. Walton** wondered if we need to increase the number of administrators, or maybe the role of a dean of students to manage student behavior, as it seems the role of principal will be changing to grow teaching, learning, and instruction in a building?

**Dr. Kisiel** noted we need to wait and see. The decision now is whether to evaluate all teachers or a third now. He sees the major issue with the high school, where there are approximately 200 teachers and six administrators. In his opinion we should try to evaluate all of them and then look at the goal. If we cannot achieve the goal we should be honest with the State and come to the Board with feedback. Unfortunately, we don't have the State's 4-5 pilot studies to look at that were supposed to be provided.

**Ms. Walton** wondered if we should consider using this only for instructional teaching staff versus all other staff for this first year? Dr. Kisiel stated there was a discussion on that and the question was asked, who would we choose to exclude? Looking at the teaching and learning components, and the practice and outcome side, that applies to everyone.

**The question was called.**

**9/0 – Voted in favor.**

**E.3. S.A.A.M. Program Update**

**Dr. Kisiel** reviewed that there were 1098 applicants for the S.A.A.M. program. At the last meeting he had made the decision to remove the Kindergarteners from the roster due to both space limitations and funding issues. He heard the concerns regarding this from the Board and realizes early intervention is important. Dr. Kisiel asked the Kindergarten teachers to look at the registrants on the list and identify which of those children would benefit from academic support over the summer. Of the 245 Kindergarteners registered the teachers identified 113 students that would benefit from academic support.

We can accommodate 300 students at Highland Park School and 330 students at Bennet Academy for the program for grades 1-5. After meeting with the core planning team for S.A.A.M., it was determined that Martin Elementary could accommodate a 4 day morning program for these students. There is an issue of the building not having air conditioning, but there are possibly some funds available through the grant to accommodate that problem.

**Mr. Leon** thanked the superintendent for finding a creative solution for this year.

**Ms. Walton** echoed Mr. Leon, noting this was a lot of work and she appreciates the extra mile to serve our Kindergarteners. She wonders if there might be an opportunity, since this is only a half day program, to partner with the Rec Department to run a program for families that might need a full day program. Dr. Kisiel noted Scott Sprague has approached us to use his staff that is already in place to work with us. Those arrangements have been made. Next year Dr. Kisiel sees this as a joint effort.

**F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

None.

**G. NEW BUSINESS**

**G.1. School Facility Options**

**Dr. Kisiel** turned the floor over to the Building & Sites Committee to report on the SMARTR Committee recommendations for Cheney/Bennet, Washington, and Robertson and tonight they are looking for action to move the SMARTR recommendations forward.

**Mr. Crockett**, Chair of the SMARTR Committee, noted we are looking for authorization to move forward on the schematic design for the Cheney/Bennet project as recommended by SMARTR on Wednesday, April 17<sup>th</sup>.

**Mr. Leon** gave an overview of the April 17<sup>th</sup> meeting, to which all Board members were invited and several attended. Mr. Leon briefly reviewed the plan for Cheney/Bennet, including the 5<sup>th</sup> grade moving to that campus, replacing the boiler house with an addition to Cheney, and a like-new renovation of Cheney, and noted that SMARTR had unanimously approved this plan. One the Board of Education approves it, the plan will move to the Board of Directors for approval before the schematic phase begins.

**Ms. Walton** reviewed the negatives to keeping the boiler plant versus building a new addition to replace that building, which included noise impact to classrooms, inefficient space, and a security issue with the location of the office.

**Mr. Leon moved for the Board of Education to recommend to the Board of Directors to authorize a Schematic Design for Renovation of Cheney/Bennet 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> grade as recommended by SMARTR Committee on Wednesday April 17<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Crockett seconded the motion.**

**9/0 – Voted in favor.**

Next **Mr. Crockett** moved on to Washington and noted there was a split decision on this building as to whether to build new or renovate like new. While the new option was \$900,000 more, the majority of the committee felt the fields were very important to that neighborhood and the town, and that the additional cost was worth saving that space.

**Mr. Leon** added that one issue in making this a 7/3 vote was that the 1912 portion of the building is in the historic district. With the renovation plan taking more green space, not providing as smooth a flow to the building, and intruding on the neighborhood use of the property, the historic value of preserving that building had to be weighed against the benefits to the neighborhood.

**Ms. Scappaticci** noted that the SMARTR Committee had noted the passion behind preserving the Cheney Building in the Cheney/Bennet plan, and wondered why there was no passion to preserve the 1912 portion of Washington?

**Mr. Leon** replied that the consensus was the functionality of the Washington building was more important for a better learning environment.

**Mr. Crockett** added that for the Cheney building, there was no way that building would be approved for demolition and the only approved use for it was a school. At Washington it was a different story and Mr. Crockett felt there was not strong opposition to a new facility there.

**Mr. Till** added that accessibility in the three level Washington building presented a challenge, among other obstacles in trying to make that building work.

**Ms. Walton** noted that simply put, as a Board member she looked at educationally sound decisions, which included not utilizing the boiler building in the Cheney project. The goal was to make the safest, most accessible environment best for education. She looked at Washington through the same lens, and noted it is not about what is best for historic preservation, but what is best for the kids in that neighborhood. Another factor considered was the yards in that area tend to be small and many neighbors use the fields at Washington for recreation, and the new build option preserves more of the fields for the neighborhood to use.

**Mr. Scappaticci** pointed out there is still a small field left untouched in the renovation option. Ms. Walton reviewed that the renovation plan cut the size of the fields in half. Mr. Scappaticci felt that the historic commission would not react to this plan positively and he will not support this option.

**Mr. Leon** understood Mr. Scappaticci's thought process, but he disagreed. He feels that the community will support this plan and the historic society is only a small portion of the community. If we advocate for this plan and help people understand the process, Mr. Leon feels they will support it.

**Mr. Leon moved for the Board of Education to recommend to the Board of Directors to authorize a Schematic Design of a New Construction for Washington Elementary School as recommended by the SMARTR Committee on Wednesday, April 17<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Crockett seconded the motion.**

**8/1/0 – Voted in favor. (Scappaticci opposed.)**

Next discussion turned to Robertson, where **Mr. Crockett** reviewed that the SMARTR Committee is recommending a like-new renovation option.

**Mr. Leon** noted that underground piping restricted relocation of the building and the like-new option is both less expensive and serves the educational function desired at that building.

**Mr. Leon moved for the Board of Education to recommend to the Board of Directors to authorize the Schematic Design of Renovation of Robertson Elementary School like-new as recommended by the SMARTR Committee on Wednesday, April 17<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Crockett seconded the motion.**

**9/0 – Voted in favor.**

### **G.2. School Roofing Options**

**Dr. Kisiel** reviewed that the intention of the referendum last fall was to re-roof three schools. With rising costs, aside from the pitch issue previously discussed, there are now insufficient funds available to replace all three roofs as intended. The decision before the Board tonight is whether to spend the funds replacing one roof, the largest, which is Verplanck, or replace two roofs, those at Bowers and Waddell. The administration recommends replacing two roofs.

**Mr. Leon moved for the Board of Education to authorize to submit ED049 Grant Application, approval of final plans and specifications dated 4/19/2013 for Bowers Elementary School Roof replacement, and cost estimate dated 4/15/2013. Mr. Crockett seconded the motion.**

**9/0 – Voted in favor.**

**Mr. Leon moved for the Board of Education to authorize to submit ED049 Grant Application, approval of final plans and specifications dated 4/19/2013 for Waddell Elementary School Roof replacement, and cost estimate dated 4/15/2013. Mr. Crockett seconded the motion.**

### **DISCUSSION:**

**Mr. Leon** expressed his disappointment that with the higher costs all three roofs could not be replaced. He noted that at least some work was done at Verplanck last year and he feels we need to do more in the near future. He notes that 4-5 years ago Verplanck was earmarked as “next” for a new school and they should be put at the top of the agenda after we move forward on the other projects we are discussing currently, especially for a new roof next year.

**The question was called.**

**9/0 – Voted in favor.**

**H. COMMUNICATIONS**

None.

**I. COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**I.1. Building & Sites Committee**

**Mr. Leon** noted that the committee had discussed the roof issue presented tonight and whether to fund 1 or 2 roofs.

**J. PUBLIC COMMENTS** (Limited to items on tonight's agenda)

None.

**K. ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS**

None.

**L. ADJOURNMENT**

**Mr. Pattacini** called for a motion to adjourn.

**Secretary Leon** moved and **Mr. Crockett** seconded the motion to adjourn the meeting.

**9/0 - Voted in favor.**

**Adjournment 10:18 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,

Neal Leon  
Board Secretary