September 2014

HAMILTON WENHAM REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

Executive Summary - 2014 School District Master Plan

Submitted by

SMMA

SMMA

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 INTRODUCTION / ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Symmes Maini & McKee Associates (SMMA) would like to acknowledge the participation and guidance provided by the district administration, Master Plan Committee, and the teachers and staff of the District.

Master Plan Committee

Michael Harvey, Superintendent

Helen Allard

Grace Belfiore

Jennifer Clifford

William Dery

Barbara Lawrence

Sheila MacDonald

William Melville

William Wilson

School Committee

Roger Kuebel, Chair

William Wilson, Vice Chair

Jeanise Bertrand

Sean Condon

William Dery

Deborah Evans

Barbara Lawrence

Sheila MacDonald

Lawrence Swartz

Visioning Participants

See Section 3.3 for a list of participants

1.2 BACKGROUND

The charge for this District-wide Master Plan is to:

1. Facilitate a visioning process, involving a broad range of community and District stakeholders to identify educational and community goals for the district with a focus on transformation of the HWRSD school system so as to promote the 21st Century learner.

2. Review a number of narrowly-defined facilities reports developed in the last 5 years regarding the state of the District's facilities as well as work conducted by the District for repairs and/or replacement of certain building components.
3. Perform a Demographic Study to understand the population changes experienced already, as well as those anticipated over the next ten years.
4. Review the role and ramifications of School Choice on the population and needed facilities.
5. Develop a comprehensive Master Plan with options for incorporating goals identified through the Visioning process with demographics, School Choice and existing buildings.

The facilities of the District consist of six (6) buildings:

- Bessie Buker Elementary School, 1 School Street, Wenham, Massachusetts.
- Cutler Elementary School, 237 Asbury Street, Hamilton, Massachusetts.
- Winthrop Elementary School, 325 Bay Road, Hamilton, Massachusetts.
- Miles River Middle School, 787 Bay Road, Hamilton, Massachusetts.
- Hamilton-Wenham Regional High School, 775 Bay Road, Hamilton, Massachusetts.
- Administration Building, 5 School Street, Wenham, Massachusetts.

The three elementary schools, the administration building and their associated property are leased by the respective towns to the District. The terms of the lease agreements for these properties require the District to be responsible for maintaining the buildings. The High School and Middle School buildings and surrounding property are owned by the District.

1.3 DEMOGRAPHY AND ENROLLMENT FORECASTS

SMMA engaged Cropper GIS, in association with McKibbon Demographics, to conduct a demographic study of the Hamilton-Wenham School District. All population forecasts presented include a constant number of 115 Choice students at the high school. Prior to the completion of this study, the School Committee made a policy changes to the Choice program, reducing the number of Choice Students to a level that does not affect program sections.

Executive Summary Findings

1. Total enrollment is forecast to decrease by 93 students, or -4.8 %, between 2013-14 and 2017-18. Total enrollment will decline by 70 students, or -3.8%, from 2017-18 to 2023-24.
2. Changes in year-to-year enrollment will largely be due to smaller grade cohorts entering the system, in conjunction with larger grade cohorts leaving the system.
3. The major factors causing the District's enrollment to decline after 2013 is an increase in the number of out-migrants in the local 18- to 24-year old age group; the rise in the number of empty-nest households and a slight decrease in the

number of in-migrating of younger families.

4. If there was zero migration into the District during the 2013-14 to 2016-17 time period, the elementary (K-5) enrollment would decline by 130 students. The in-migration is projected to be 114 students for the same time period. Therefore, the elementary enrollment is forecast to decline by 26 students.
5. At the high school, the population declines are forecast to be significantly larger. The forecast population is expected to decline by approximately 95 students, from 678 students to 583 students (including 115 Choice), a decline of about 14%. Since the development of the Demographic report, the HWRSD School Committee voted to reduce Choice numbers to a level that does not materially impact class sections.
6. The locally raised 18-to-24 year old population (recent graduating high school seniors) continues to leave the District, going to college or moving to urban areas and not returning to the communities.
7. The fertility rates for the Hamilton-Wenham School District are below replacement levels during the entire life of the forecasts. (TFR=1.76 for the district versus 2.1 for replacement level)
8. Most of the in-migration households to the District contain population in the 0-to-9 and 30-to-44 age groups.
9. If the current home construction trends continue, the number of existing home sales and the occupancy rates of the rental housing units will continue to be the dominant factor affecting the population and enrollment change.

1.4 VISIONING

SMMA teamed with Frank Locker, Educational Planning, and a group of approximately 50 teachers, administrators, students, community leaders, and parents to guide the Hamilton-Wenham Regional School District Public to shape the educational vision for the District.

Group discussions included:

- Guiding Principles
- 21st-Century Education
- Learning Modalities
- Innovative Educational Deliveries
- School Organizational Structure
- School Choice and
- Many other aspects of 21st Century Teaching and Learning

It is important to note that one of the outcomes of the Visioning sessions was the identification of Guiding Principles. They included a need to look at how students develop 21st-Century skills, in order that their learning be student-centered, active, relevant, and personalized. Some examples of this kind of learning include:

- **Project-based learning**: learning through structured but open-ended long term challenges with many potential solutions.
- **Personalized, mastery-based skill instruction**: students master one learning unit before proceeding to a more advanced task, working at their own pace and instructional mode to achieve efficient and effective individual progress.
- **Blended learning/ flipped classroom:** *Blended learning* integrates online with face-to-face activities in a pedagogically valuable manner. *Flipped classroom* provides readings or online content, such as a lecture or video, to be accessed as homework, while class time is used for discussion, group projects, and personalized help.
- **Service learning:** programs in which students engage in real-world activities of value to the community in ways structured to enable them to attain specified academic learning objectives.

1.5 EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMMING

Educational Programming Meetings

The SMMA study team conducted multiple meetings at each of the schools. At each the three elementary schools and middle school, meetings were held with the respective school principal. Additional meetings were held throughout the day with representative teachers and staff. These meetings were arranged by each principal.

At the high school, the study team made itself available to all teachers on a drop-in basis at the school library.

Principal meetings:

- Bessie Buker Elementary School: 8/19/2013
- Miles River Middle School: 9/5/2013
- Cutler Elementary School: 8/19/2013
- Winthrop Elementary School: 9/5/2013
- Hamilton-Wenham Regional High School 9/5/2013

Teacher meetings were conducted as follows:

- Bessie Buker Elementary School: 10/29/2013
- Miles River Middle School: 10/31/2013
- Cutler Elementary School: 11/15/2013
- Winthrop Elementary School: 11/18/2013
- Hamilton-Wenham Regional High School: 11/19/2013 and 11/22/2013

The principals, teachers, and staff were interviewed at the schools for SMMA to understand how the school currently functions educationally and how the school

might change in the future to accommodate better 21st-Century teaching and learning methodologies.

Class Sizes

Although the district has a policy for class sizes, most classrooms are below the policy levels:

Kindergarten:	15 - 18 students
Grades 1 & 2:	18 - 20 students
Grades 3 thru 12:	20 - 22 students

Educational Evaluations of Building Including Space Summaries

Buker Elementary School

The Buker School has a current student population of approximately 240 students, made up of two classes (sections) of each grade from Kindergarten to Grade 5. Since the population projections for the elementary grades has little variation over 10 years (a loss of 46 students across 3 schools), the impact on general education classrooms is minimal. This also indicates that, if three schools are maintained, the low class sizes currently experienced can be sustained.

Typical classrooms are generally adequate in size ranging from 930 sf to 979 sf. There appears to be adequate space for supporting subject areas: art, music, SPED, gym, while other support areas are short on space and cramped. These include: main office, teacher work room, language arts / reading, toilet rooms, etc. The library and technology lab, when combined in area, are of adequate size, but as currently configured as separate spaces do not function well for student tasks and teacher supervision.

One area of Buker School that is especially underutilized is the lower level (basement). Formerly boys' and girls' locker rooms, showers and toilets and PE offices, some of the spaces retain features of their original use but are abandoned or used for storage. The only updated space is used for a teacher's lunch space. If the lower level were renovated, it could create areas for more active learning environments. Renovations would need to be more than cosmetic. The proposed function(s) would need to become destination activities.

Although there is not a current need for significant additional space, if the Central Administration building were demolished, the site area would be available to construct a modest addition for new kindergarten classrooms and free up space within the school to be reconfigured for adequate support spaces.

It must be noted that the current building is larger than the MSBA guidelines. This is in part because of basement spaces that are awkward to access and therefore seldom used.

Cutler Elementary School

The Cutler School has a current student population of approximately 280 students, made up of two classes (sections) of each grade from Kindergarten to Grade 5. Since the population projections for the elementary grades has little variation over 10 years (a loss of 46 students across 3 schools), the impact on general education classrooms is minimal. This also indicates that if three schools are maintained, the small class sizes currently experienced can be maintained.

Typical classrooms are generally adequate in size ranging from 940 sf to 1,000 sf. There appears to be adequate space for supporting subject areas: art, music, SPED, gym, while other support areas are short on space and cramped. These include: main office, teacher work room, toilet rooms etc.. The library and technology lab, when combined in area, are of adequate size, but as currently configured as separate spaces do not function well for student tasks and teacher supervision.

Winthrop Elementary School

The Winthrop Elementary School has a current population of approximately 254 students, made up of two classes (sections) of each grade from Kindergarten to Grade 5. Winthrop also houses the District-wide Pre-K program. Since the population projections for the elementary grades have little variation over 10 years (a loss of 46 students across 3 schools), the impact on general education classrooms is minimal. This also indicates that if three schools are maintained, the small class sizes currently experienced can be maintained.

Typical classrooms are generally adequate in size ranging from 830 sf to 870 sf, slightly smaller than those of the Buker School. There appears to be adequate space for supporting subject areas: art, music, and SPED, while other support areas are short on space and cramped. These include: main office, teacher work room, toilet rooms etc. The library and technology lab, when combined, are undersized, as is the gymnasium.

Miles River Middle School

The Miles River Middle School serves Grades 6 to 8 with a current student population of approximately 440 students. The population projections indicate a very small drop (22 students) in the enrollment from the current 441 to 419.

The classroom count for general education and science are in line with MSBA guidelines. There are more special education classrooms and music and art spaces than MSBA guidelines. The two areas in the existing building that are currently below guidelines are Vocations and Technology and Administration.

There are no "Vocations and Technology" spaces in the current building. The MSBA guidelines call for two spaces totaling 3,200 square feet. With a restructuring of the HS and MS schedules, and a willingness to share spaces and teachers, curriculum programs could be designed and conducted in high school STEM spaces.

Music - The MSBA guidelines call for a single room to serve both band and chorus. The MS enjoys two rooms. The current instrumental and choral music teachers serve

both the high school and middle school, though the different school schedules (and bells) create limitations of the teachers' schedules and resulting offerings. If the two rooms within the MS building were shared by the middle school and high school, a more efficient use of teacher resources and space would result.

Hamilton Wenham Regional High School

The Hamilton-Wenham Regional High School has a current student population of approximately 678 students, including 115 students in the Choice Program.

There are 26 general education classrooms that range in size from 510 sf to 1,025 sf with an average room size of 818 sf. Science rooms are either 900 sf or 1,150 sf versus the MSBA guidelines of 1,440 sf.

The Spanish department is currently incorporating project-based learning as a delivery model. This seems to be the exception. Most other curriculum disciplines are departmental / subject based and delivered by conventional methodologies.

As the enrollment declines in coming years, with a likely further decline from reductions in Choice students, there will likely be increased pressure to further reduce the already modest 106 curriculum offerings.

A small number of curriculum offerings typically takes the form of reduced elective courses. For many students, the elective courses offer challenges and opportunities in areas of interest. A narrow curriculum can be limiting for some students, putting them in a category of "at risk", or in a position of looking for alternative learning opportunities or schools.

An alternative to the above discussion is for the school to shift to an interdisciplinary project-based delivery model. This idea was discussed at length during the Visioning sessions conducted last fall. This approach could, if developed properly, take pressure off the course-offering model, and also introduce variety, challenges and opportunities that might not otherwise be available.

Hamilton-Wenham Regional High School Capacity Analysis

The recent Choice Report, dated November 14, 2013, indicates that at some point in its history the current high school building had a population target of 720 students. It is unclear if this was an anecdotal or real target, when it was established or with what criteria. It may pre-date such area-influencing criteria as: Special Education, technology (computer rooms), the Public Access Facility for the Towns of Hamilton and Wenham, Title IX, and contemporary elective offerings etc. A current capacity (range) needs to be established using contemporary criteria.

Establishing a building capacity can be a complicated process. With every student having a slightly different schedule due to academic preferences, academic levels, electives based on interest etc., and the schools' Master Schedule of the current 106 curriculum offerings (117 in the Program of Studies), there cannot be straight-line analysis.

The most universal criteria would be the space Guidelines established by the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA). The analysis could be by:

Gross building area or what MSBA refers to as gross floor area (GFA). Since HWRHS is approximately 52 years old, the building efficiency (net-to-gross area) may not meet today's norms. Additionally, the educational program of 52 years ago was different, yielding different types and sizes of rooms than needed today.

Net educational area, or what MSBA refers to as net floor area (NFA), is the actual functional area for the educational program and staffing needs. This is the gross (or total) area minus corridors, toilet rooms, wall thicknesses, building support areas etc. Since many of HWRHS spaces are smaller than the current MSBA Guidelines, this would not be an accurate criterion for the analysis.

Because of a number of factors discussed, we believe neither net floor area nor gross floor area is the best method for determining school capacity. Instead, the number of academic teaching spaces may be the most accurate criterion for comparison.

Academic Classrooms and Science - Currently, there are 22 academic classrooms and 5 science classroom / labs in the school. The academic classrooms serve the curriculum areas of: English, Social Studies, Math, and Foreign Language. Using the MSBA **Summary of Spaces** form, we can back into the 22 the academic classrooms and 5 science classroom / labs.

- Using the "typical academic classroom" approach, we believe the current HWRHS building has a capacity range of 650 to 660 students +/-.
- Using the "science lecture / lab" approach, we believe the current HWRHS building has a capacity range of 570 to 590 students +/-.

Choice Dilemma

Politics aside, the HWRSD has a facilities dilemma at the high school if Choice remains.

Our Master Planning process has included obtaining a good deal of school and community response including our Visioning process; meeting with teachers and staff at each of the schools, and numerous meetings with the steering committee. A major goal identified by the community and the Ddistrict includes creating learning environments that support and enhance 21st-Century skills. This goal can be accomplished by a combination of efforts, some that do not include renovation and/or new construction, and others that likely will.

1. The addition of flexible furniture and a change of delivery model could accomplish some of the goals without the need for renovations, though these efforts could be greatly reinforced by renovated facilities.
2. To accomplish more of the goals, there is a need to right-size the science labs and other teaching spaces and reorganize and reappoint the classrooms and

support areas. To do this, the district will likely want to apply for an MSBA grant to help pay for such a renovation.

3. Accomplishing paragraph two above and keeping Choice will likely require a modest addition.

Since the MSBA does not recognize Choice when developing population projections, any renovation and/or additional project would likely not be sized to support a Choice program.

During the course of this study, the Hamilton-Wenham Regional School Committee voted to reduce the number of Choice Students at the high school. Since the MSBA does not recognize Choice when addressing capital projects, exploring the impact of a reduced population, including reduced Choice numbers, is an "interim" condition and therefore difficult to evaluate with other "Options" for the facilities.

Central Administration Building

The former Center School building, constructed circa 1881, contains approximately 5,580 sf on each of three floors for a total of 16,740 sf. The building is not fully used and somewhat inefficient.

The Lower Level is not used for central administration offices but primarily for building utilities, storage and wood shop.

The Main Level houses most of the central administration personnel in four former classrooms that have been subdivided. The net area currently being used is approximately 3,460 sf.

The Second Floor houses three staff plus space for payroll records, school records and storage and approximately 645 sf for offices

In a contemporary office building, the program area for Central Administration offices is approximately 5,500 square feet.

1.6 PREVIOUS STUDIES REVIEW

Over the course of the last several years, and particularly in 2011, the Hamilton-Wenham Regional School District executed a number of conditions assessments of its existing facilities. These assessments were conducted by both outside consultants and via internal reviews. As a requirement of the Master Planning effort and, as outlined within the School District's Request for Proposals, SMMA was charged with reviewing these previous studies; collecting data about the District's building stock and performing an analysis with the goal that this information would inform the overall Master Planning effort. While it was not the charge of this project to conduct a new Facilities Conditions Assessment, SMMA was tasked with reviewing the previous studies, validating and providing an update of the information within and consolidating our findings into a singular document.

The reports which were reviewed included:

- Dore and Whittier Space Needs and Demographic Study
- Dore and Whittier Comprehensive Facilities Study

- Evergreen Audit report
- Capital Management Committee Facilities Needs Assessment

From these efforts SMMA was to provide options and recommendations for the future use of these building assets, taking into account the substantial maintenance and refurbishment work completed or planned during the 2012-2014 timeframe. Additionally, SMMA was to consider the role school Choice could play, if any, in the future facilities needs of the District when preparing options/recommendations. The results of these latter elements are further described within Section Six of this report.

During the period of this Master Planning effort, SMMA reviewed the previous conditions assessment reports outlined above. Additionally, the SMMA team reviewed various existing condition drawings that were provided to us. SMMA also conducted site visits to each of the District's five schools as well as its Central Administration building. Our team included: an architect and mechanical, electrical, plumbing/ fire protection, structural and civil engineers. Based on the information provided, the team developed a matrix of potential projects identified within the previous studies that remain outstanding. The matrix is contained within Section 6.

In support of our efforts, the SMMA team conducted site visits to all the District's buildings on two dates, February 27, 2014 and March 18, 2014. Our efforts are summarized, school-by-school and discipline-by-discipline, within this section with recommendations within Section Six.

1.7 OPTIONS / COSTS

By definition, the Master Plan is a vision for the school district, looking forward a number of years. How the Master Plan might be implemented is a function of the communities' ability to fund future capital projects. The Master Plan "Options" identify both short term and long term strategies, including some that simply keep the existing buildings operating with updates for changing educational pedagogy, while others chart a direction for the educational facilities for the next fifty (50) years.

Each of the four building types that are included in this study have what we have called Master Plan "components". Since the timing and scope of potential projects will require significant discussions with the two communities, there is no "recommendation" that accompanies the options at this time.

Building types include:

1. High School
2. Middle School
3. Elementary Schools
4. Central Administration

1. **High School** - these options are tied directly to the anticipated populations, and therefore sizes of the building. All options are intended not only to accommodate but enhance the concepts of 21st-Century Teaching and Learning. This could be accomplished by developing environments that can enhance project-based learning; student-centric activities, flipped classrooms

and exhibit "flexibility" to accommodate other curriculum delivery approaches that may be developed in the future.

Option 1.A: 5 Year Plan

The most significant short-term impacts on teaching and learning can be accomplished with improvements to classroom furniture and a move to 1:1 educational technology.

Option 1.B: Reconfigure the existing high school building to accommodate a 10-year projected population of 468 students. This projection does not include Choice students.

The existing building is approximately 125,600 gross sf. The projected population can be accommodated within the school's existing footprint. Modifications can be made to respond better to desired educational delivery models and provide flexibility for the future.

Option 1.C: Similar to Option A with a modest 7,000 square foot addition to accommodate a slightly larger population of 583 students.

Option 1.D: New building - Although thought of by the communities as different buildings, the current middle school and high school are age groupings within the same building, though constructed at different times. They share some building services, some corridors as well as some program spaces. Because of the buildings' interdependency, replacement of the high school would suggest replacement of all grades served (6 - 12).

Option D is identified as a combined Middle School / High School with a ten-year projected population of 888 students resulting in an approximate building size of 170,000 sf.

Because of the relatively new middle school, and the reasonably good condition of the high school, it is SMMA's opinion that it is unlikely that the MSBA would approve this option.

		2023 - 2024 Proposed Population	Area (gsf)	Construction Cost*	Project Cost (x 1.25)	MSBA Participation Cost to Town**	Comments
1.	**High School**						
A.	High School - 5 Year Plan	651	125,600	$5,000,000	$6,250,000	$6,250,000	No Participation, with Choice
	Seismic up-grade if required for Option 1A			$900,000	$1,125,000	$1,125,000	No Participation, with Choice
	Furniture and Technology			$1,200,000	$1,500,000	$855,000	
	Total				**$8,875,000**	**$8,875,000**	
B.	Reconfigure within the existing foot print	468	125,600	$42,000,000	$52,500,000	$29,925,000	without Choice ***
	Furniture and Technology			$1,200,000	$1,500,000	$855,000	
	Total			**$43,200,000**	**$54,000,000**	**$30,780,000**	**Say $31 M**
C.	Option B with science addition	583	132,000	$45,000,000	$56,250,000	$56,250,000	with 115 Choice, include 7,000 sf new construction
	Furniture and Technology			$1,200,000	$1,500,000	$855,000	
	Total					**$57,105,000**	****
D.	New HS / MS Building (HS 468, MS 420)	888	170,000	$67,389,069	$84,236,336	**$48,014,712**	without Choice, assumes a new site, site acquisition not included

* 2014 Dollars

** Based on 43% MSBA Reimbursement (recent Accelerated Repairs Projects)

*** Includes Seismic Upgrades

**** The committee voted to not consider this option

Middle School

Option 2A: **2 Year Plan** - identifies modest floor plan changes that allow the team core classes to share project rooms. We are calling these project rooms "maker spaces". These changes are proposed to be done in concert with administrative changes:

Teachers, school administrators and district administrators all recognize that the middle school should return to a "Team" approach to curriculum delivery and social units. The district administration has proposed implementation of a Team approach starting in school year 2014 - 2015.

The current middle school can be easily adapted to serve better the Team approach. We are suggesting that some of the administrative proposals could be accomplished relatively quickly, while other work could be accomplished across either a 2-Year Plan or a 5-Year Plan.

		2023 - 2024 Proposed Population	Area (gsf)	Construction Cost*	Project Cost (x 1.25)	MSBA Participation Cost to Town**	Comments
2. Middle School							
A.	Existing Building w/ educational plan changes - 2 Year Plan	420	91,200	$600,000	$750,000	$750,000	No Participation, Modest educational space changes, 2 year enrollment projection 427
B.	Existing Building w/ educational plan changes - 5 Year Plan	387	91,200	$700,000	$875,000	$875,000	No Participation
C.	New school, see component 1D	-	-	-	-	-	

* 2014 Dollars

** Based on 43% MSBA Reimbursement (recent Accelerated Repairs Projects)

2. Elementary Schools

The Hamilton Wenham Regional School Agreement requires one elementary school to be located in the town of Wenham. The Buker School currently fulfills that requirement. Some of the options discussed below do not adhere to that requirement. If one of those options were to be chosen, alterations would need to be made to the Regional School Agreement.

The Master Plan Committee discussed the merits of small schools as the district is currently configured. A good deal of study data exists that describe the advantages and cost effectiveness of small schools.

During the course of this study, SMMA had an informal discussion with a MSBA project manager to review their approach to small schools. Here are some paraphrased comments from that discussion.

- Every community is reviewed individually to understand their unique issues
- Communities with small student populations are encouraged to regionalize or expand their region to maximize building and operational efficiencies
- As part of MSBA's Module 3 Feasibility Study, the Authority will require the district to explore options with the following issues in mind:
  - Building / Construction efficiencies
  - Program efficiencies
  - Long-term operational efficiencies; both operations and maintenance (fuel, cleaning, power etc.) and efficiencies of staffing

OPTION 3.A: 5 YEAR PLAN - is intended to incorporate building changes that support educational goals identified through the Visioning sessions and meetings with school and district educators as well as the Master Plan Committee.

Buker - 5 Year

- Reconfigure the main entrance and administrative offices to provide a more secure entry sequence and main office needs
- Relocate and enlarge the nurse's office
- Remove the wall between the Media Center and Technology room. These two spaces are supervised by one media specialist. The activities of this program (such as research) are integral to both spaces
- Repurpose the lower level through comprehensive renovations to provide for a maker space, teacher planning and other usable spaces. Since this is a relatively small area, it may be cost effective to implement without MSBA Grant funds. This work could also be postponed to a comprehensive renovation described below.

Cutler - 5 Year

- Reconfigure the main entrance and administrative offices to provide a more secure entry sequence and main office needs
- Relocate and enlarge the nurse's office
- Remove the wall between the Media Center and Technology room. These two spaces are supervised by one media specialist. The activities of this program (such as research) are integral to both spaces.

Winthrop - 5 Year

- Reconfigure the main entrance and administrative offices to provide a more secure entry sequence and main office needs
- Relocate and enlarge the nurse's office
- Repurpose spaces made available from current renovations

Note that work described within the 5-year plans could trigger code-required upgrades for handicapped accessibility, automatic fire protection, seismic upgrades etc. As part of any proposed building upgrades, these issues need to be investigated by design professional.

OPTION 3.B: COMPREHENSIVE RENOVATIONS - If there is a desire to maintain the existing small schools, it is possible to comprehensively renovate school buildings of the age and character of those in Hamilton Wenham. Such a renovation would transform the schools to a level that could serve the communities for many years to come.

Below we compare comprehensive renovations of the existing schools with other options.

		2023 - 2024 Proposed Population	Area (gsf)	Construction Cost*	Project Cost (x 1.25)	MSBA Participation Cost to Town**	Comments
3. Elementary Schools							
A.	3 Existing Schools - 5 Year Plan						
	Buker School	218	46,330	$700,000	$875,000	$875,000	Assumes No MSBA Participation
	Seismic up-grade if required		46,330	$300,000	$375,000	$375,000	Assumes No MSBA Participation
	Cutler School	250	44,455	$600,000	$750,000	$750,000	Assumes No MSBA Participation
	Seismic up-grade if required		44,455	$300,000	$375,000	$375,000	Assumes No MSBA Participation
	Winthrop School	260	48,000	$600,000	$750,000	$750,000	Assumes No MSBA Participation
	Seismic up-grade if required		48,000	$300,000	$375,000	$375,000	Assumes No MSBA Participation
		728				**$3,500,000**	
B.	3 Existing Schools - Comprehensive renovations						
	Buker School	218	46,330	$17,000,000	$21,250,000	$12,112,500	educational space changes, comprehensive renovations
	Cutler School	250	44,455	$17,000,000	$21,250,000	$12,112,500	educational space changes, comprehensive renovations
	Winthrop School	260	48,000	$17,000,000	$21,250,000	$12,112,500	educational space changes, comprehensive renovations
	Total	**728**	**138,785**	**$51,000,000**	**$63,750,000**	**$36,337,500**	
Note: if seismic upgrades are not required for Option A, add seismic upgrade costs to Option B							
C.	Two Schools of equal size	364	62,800	$23,000,000	$28,750,000	$16,387,500	
		364	62,800	$23,000,000	$28,750,000	$16,387,500	
	Total	**728**	**125,600**	**$46,000,000**	**$57,500,000**	**$32,775,000**	**Say $33 M**
D.	One New School	728	105,560	$38,000,000	$47,500,000	**$27,075,000**	**Say $27 M**

* 2014 Dollars

** Based on 43% MSBA Reimbursement (recent Accelerated Repairs Projects)

1.8 MSBA PROCESS

MASSACHUSETTS SCHOOL BUILDING AUTHORITY (MSBA) PROCESS

Districts seeking MSBA grant reimbursement for Capital Projects must follow a well-defined process described below: The full MSBA Process can be found on the website http://massschoolbuildings.org/building. The process is subject to change. Please refer to the website for current information.

Module 1 – Eligibility Period Status

Updated at June 5, 2013 Board Meeting

The MSBA has formalized its grant process with the establishment of an **Eligibility Period.** The **Eligibility Period** assists the MSBA in:

- Identifying whether a District is ready to manage and fund a capital project.
- Determining a District's financial and community readiness to enter the capital pipeline.

- Providing a definitive schedule and identifying needs for planning and budgeting.

The MSBA Board of Directors votes to invite a District into the Eligibility Period based on a review of the District's Statement of Interest ("SOI"). The vote initiates a 270-day period for the District to complete certain preliminary requirements that include:

1) Certification of the District's understanding of the grant program rules by executing an Initial Compliance Certification;
2) Formation of a School Building Committee and submitting the membership to the MSBA for acceptance;
3) Provision of a summary of the District's existing maintenance practices;
4) Certification of a design enrollment for the proposed project agreed upon with the MSBA (may not be applicable for Repair Assessments depending on the proposed scope of work);
5) Confirmation of community authorization and funding to proceed (see MSBA Vote Requirements); and,
6) Execution of the MSBA's standard Feasibility Study Agreement, which establishes a process for the District to be reimbursed for eligible expenses.

Districts that successfully complete the preliminary requirements to the satisfaction of the MSBA within the 270-day Eligibility Period are eligible to receive an invitation from the MSBA Board of Directors to the Feasibility Study phase. This phase requires the District utilize MSBA-specific procurement processes and standard Request for Services ("RFS") templates. Districts are required to use standard contracts to procure a team of professionals to work with the District as a proposed project advances through the MSBA grant process as defined in Module 2.