

UNIONVILLE-CHADDS FORD SCHOOL DISTRICT
740 Unionville Road
Kennett Square, PA 19348
Telephone: (610) 347-0970; FAX: (610) 347-0976
Web Site - www.ucfsd.org

SCHOOL BOARD MEETING
Minutes
January 28, 2008

The January meeting of the Unionville-Chadds Ford School Board was held on Monday, January 28, 2008 in the Unionville High School Large Group Instruction room. Mr. Murray, President, called the meeting to order at 7:40 p.m.

The following members were present: Edward Murray, Dr. Therese West, Curt Baker, Kathleen Brown, Karen Halstead, Dr. Paul Price, Dr. Corinne Sweeney, Timotha Trigg, and Edward Wandersee. Also present were Sharon E. Parker, District Superintendent, Kenneth Batchelor, Robert Cochran, Sharon Allen-Spann, Clif Beaver, Steve Dissinger, Jim Fulginiti, Rick Hostetler, Rich Hug, John Nolen, Mark Ransford, John Sanville, Colleen Shearburn, Bruce Vosburgh, Gail Wolfel, Shannon Pitt, student representative, community residents, members of the press, and Denise Miller, Recording Secretary.

Mr. Murray requested that the group stand for the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag.

Ms. Parker thanked the student musicians for their wonderful performance as we entered the high school this evening. Music served as her partner in parenting for her sons and in co-teaching when she taught. She thanked the students for the joy they brought forward, which was very magical and extremely impressive. Their music lifted our souls and teacher Paula Remzas and the students are truly extraordinary. Tonight's musicians represented three of our elementary schools and were presented with certificates from their respective Principals:

Unionville Elementary School (Mr. Clif Beaver):

1. Emily Anderson
2. Deepthi Aravind
3. Angela Kodokian
4. Jeffrey Phillips
5. Kaitlyn Russell
6. Bradley Zhu

Chadds Ford Elementary School (Mr. Mark Ransford):

1. Laura Barthold
2. Carlos Horta-Hugues
3. Ivan Yen

Pocopson Elementary School (Dr. Andrew McLaughlin):

1. Lauren Combs
2. Rebecca Hillhouse
3. Elise Rocconi
4. Victoria Soltysiak

Superintendent Parker thanked the student musicians for sharing their gifts with us and for reminding us why we come each day. She also thanked their parents for the gift of music to their children as well.

CALL TO ORDER

**MEMBERS
PRESENT**

**SUPER-
INTENDENT'S
REPORT**

**Elementary
Student
Musicians**

Superintendent's Report – Continued

Our first Martin Luther King, Jr. Day of Service included 400 members of our community on January 21st. Ms. Parker thanked members of the Administrative team who took this as a challenge and ran with it (Clif Beaver, Steve Dissinger, Mark Ransford, and Colleen Shearburn). District teams worked on:

- Songs and Smiles Brigade included 43 people singing at Pocopson Home and Crosslands.
- The Boxed Goods Brigade packed and delivered two pick-up truckloads of good to Safe Harbor and Home of the Sparrow.
- Others made 50 quarts of soup at Hillendale Elementary that was given to Aid for Friends in West Grove.
- 160 volunteer at Chadds Ford made activity books for children at the A. I. DuPont and Chester County Hospitals and for the Salvation Army.
- Patton Middle School gathered used clothing in their Boxed Goods Brigade

Ms. Parker invited everyone to be a part of the giving community of U-CF at all times.

Mrs. Sue Hayes, Forensics Team Coach, showed a large trophy that had been won by the Speech and Debate Team. They participated in the E. L. Myers Martin Luther King, Jr. tournament on January 19th. This is the only tournament in the United States where students participate in events about Martin Luther King, Jr. It included over 400 students and U-CF placed second for Sweepstakes and the M. L. King, Jr. event. There were also poetry and parliamentary debate events about Dr. King. The team placed first in Public Affairs Events (debate on Congress and original speaking). Mrs. Hayes presented a trophy with a U.S. flag to the District to use as they see fit. The team heads to Harvard next.

Ms. Parker congratulated the students and wishes them well as they continue their debate competitions. She reminded everyone of the wonderful success that the UHS Marching Band had at the Gator Bowl competition in Florida. We will need to find wall space for all of these fine trophies. Ms. Parker also commented about the children who participated in the Lego tournament (on engineering, robotics, and energy conservation). This is an opportunity that includes the spirit of collaboration – from parents, students, and grandparents. It is multi-generational and a thrilling opportunity!

Superintendent Parker stated that, when she arrived in U-CFSD, she was informed that redistricting would have to be engaged almost immediately due to an imbalance in our roster. The Administration looked at the steps they would need to take. The review being presented tonight is for the Board to see whether they feel any action is necessary.

The team invested a great deal of time and energy in the review, which could not have been done without pristine data. They looked at attendance boundaries in U-CF, building capacities, enrollment, and even immersed themselves in a Doctoral dissertation from the University of Maryland and the algorithm of it all. We did not accept architectural plans as gospel but went into the buildings and measured rooms to see if they were suitable for specific student instruction.

**SUPER-
INTENDENT'S
REPORT -
Continued**

**Martin Luther
King, Jr. Day
of Service**

**Speech & Debate
Team**

**UHS Marching
Band – Gator
Bowl**

Lego Tournament

**Redistricting
Report**

Note: The entire content of the PowerPoint presentation on the 2008-2009 Attendance Boundary Review is included at the end of the Board Meeting Minutes.

**Redistricting
Report -
Continued**

Rich Hug, Director of Technology and Communications, provided a review of the history regarding redistricting. He showed a district map of enrollment distribution at the elementary grade levels. Ms. Parker stated that the data is used in a very cautious manner since we can focus on each child and their academic needs, bus routes, and the movement pattern of community members in U-CF.

Mr. Hug that Mr. Nolen looked at each room to consider needs, identifying key programs in each school. He commented about the housing market moving more slowly due to the economy. Mr. Nolen also looked at projections and trend data regarding where we think our student population is heading to make sure we had the space at our class size guidelines two to four years out.

Mr. Hug reviewed a map that depicted open space in the District, particularly in West Marlborough Township where agricultural and land trust parcels exist. There are not many large spaces in the district that have not been developed.

John Nolen, Director of Elementary Education, reviewed the findings (based on current data) regarding current known housing developments. He outlined several points regarding enrollment trends at Pocopson, Chadds Ford, Hillendale, and Unionville Elementary Schools, respectively (as indicated in the full report listed below). He stated that some non-district programs or service locations could be combined or relocated to gain classroom space to allow for shifts in enrollment.

Ms. Parker commented about program equity at the schools. However, there are design differences in building capacities. She stated that an intentional community decision had been made to have a very large elementary school when Pocopson Elementary School was constructed.. At Chadds Ford Elementary School, the decision was not to expand the footprint. We need to keep this in mind. We should have a common program that is extraordinary in its uncommonness.

Ms. Parker stated that the administration recommends no changes in elementary attendance boundaries for at least two years. The need will be reviewed intensively each January. We have created a database that is far more extensive than what we had available before (i.e. housing starts). With certain program relocations, sufficient classrooms exist to accommodate projected enrollment for at least two years.

Robert Cochran, Director of Business and Operations, reviewed the impact as follows:

- Personnel – PES Guidance Counselor; One Staff Move in 2008-2009
- Technology – Additional Computer Lab Capacity at PES
- Facilities – Internal District Moves
- Finance - \$69,000 – Personnel; \$20,000 – Technology
- Curriculum/Transportation/Food Service – Special Classroom Moving; Pre-1st Class Moving

Ms. Parker requested questions from School Directors.

Mr. Murray stated that we had said we needed to rely on the methodology that the Administration was going to use and no matter what the change was, someone would not be happy. Probably no one will be upset. The Board asked for a detailed study with methodology that could be supportable. He thinks we are ready to move forward for the next two years.

Ms. Parker stated that when the team went into their first meeting, they understood that redistricting was absolutely essential. By the end of the meeting, they had great concern that it was not what it appeared to be.

Mr. Murray reminded the public that the Administration was presenting this information to the Board for the first time this evening.

In response to Mrs. Brown's question, Mr. Cochran and Mr. Nolen confirmed that the plan would carry through to the 2010-2011 school year. At that point, we would have to look at what is happening at Chadds Ford and Unionville Elementary.

Mr. Wandersee complimented the Administration, having been a member of the original Redistricting Committee. The numbers were pretty close to those for which the schools were designed. We are on the mark for what we tried to accomplish.

Mr. Baker commented about looking at raw numbers and the need to consider IEP's, Gifted students, etc. even though the numbers are flat. These factors could cause distortions and a possible need for redistricting sooner. Ms. Parker stated that the group reviewed current students and trends in the areas of special needs students. These factors were taken into account to the extent that anyone can do that.

Mrs. Halstead stated that this is great and she knows everyone did a lot of work. Our brain trust and technology trust are amazing. She is proud of everyone and happy that we didn't have to go out and pay money for this study.

Dr. West referenced the annual data review and asked what would be the process if a need were found. Ms. Parker stated that we would come back to the Board and the community, possibly having a recommendation by the end of the year. We see this now as part of our ongoing responsibility. It did not cost a consultant's fee but many hours by administrators.

Shannon Pitt, Student Representative, reported regarding the following items:

1. Martin Luther King, Jr. Day of Service – Many students participated at Chadds Ford Elementary, helping with the activity books.; the Band also performed.
2. Marching Band – Congratulations for their success at the Gator Bowl!
3. Student Council – Considering a Wing-a-thon and will hold the Mardi Gras Dance (February 9th) to help lower Prom ticket costs
4. Alternative Period (10 minutes) – The administration worked with students to provide this time for help from their teachers, etc.
5. Mr. UHS – Held last week; Chris Ferron won; was a big success

**Redistricting
Report –
Continued**

**STUDENT
REPRESENTATIVE
REPORT**

Student Rep. Report - Continued

6. NHS Blood Drive – Will be held on February 6th; open all day
7. Fashion Show – February 8th, 7:30 – 10:30, featuring student designers and models

Mr. Murray requested that residents limit their comments to three minutes and stated that we would respond to them.

Karen Aubach, Pocopson Township resident, inquired about whether Pre-first grade would remain at the same schools. Mr. Nolen responded that one of the programs might be moving (from Pocopson Elementary). Although no move is easy, we felt that this would be a possibility. Unionville and Hillendale Pre-first students would remain at Unionville Elementary School.

Greg Thielhouse, Birmingham Township resident, stated that it's great that we are not changing for redistricting. In response to his question about three to five years out, Ms. Parker stated that much is predicated on the housing markets. Mr. Hug commented about more elementary space having been available two years ago when Pocopson opened. We no longer have as much space so we must look at it in a shorter period. Mr. Cochran stated that we looked at a two-year period as one in which we did not need to make major modifications. In looking at projections, our shorter-term projections become more accurate. We feel very comfortable with the two-year commitment. If we evaluate it in two years and feel the same, we would do the same thing.

Keith Knauss, East Marlborough Township resident, commented about the UHS Project being phased to include a \$54 million portion (Phase 1, vote on April 22nd) and a Phase 2 portion to be completed at an undefined future date. He stated that if the two phases were done, we would have exactly the same project that the public voted down. Mr. Knauss stated that if you listen to the public, they are asking for a new plan, not to phase the same project or finance it differently. He suggested that until then, the Board could look toward failing referenda.

Jeff Hellrung, East Marlborough Township resident, asked the Board to consider the following items:

1. Were they pleased (or resentful) that Act 1 creates a new partnership with the public?
2. Do they respect and trust the judgment of their neighbors or feel they are self-centered and ill informed?
3. What does the Board think is an acceptable High School Project (balanced needs and wants or only one acceptable project)?
4. Are you committed to one acceptable project to the end?
5. If a \$54 million project loses in April, will you make adjustments or become angry?

Mr. Hellrung commented about Board members being intelligent, well-meaning, hard-working individuals. They appreciate their service. He asked that they be flexible, practical, and given them a project they can support.

**RESIDENTS'
COMMENTS**

Residents' Comments - Continued

**RESIDENTS'
COMMENTS
(Continued)**

Gerry Clisham, East Marlborough Township resident, inquired about whether there would be a presentation showing the changes to accommodate for the population shift. He commented about the January timeline and giving the Board a month to approve or disapprove plans. Mr. Clisham stated that the Board might want to consider whether this was enough time to allow for public comment or whether the timeline should be moved back to December.

Mr. Murray stated that if there was overwhelming public comment by the time of the next Board meeting, we would be adaptive to the community. We will not try to rush a recommendation for people to accept the plan but would take as much time as we needed.

Ms. Parker stated that no action would be needed. The Board could confirm the recommendation and accept the study or direct the Administration to go back to the drawing board. She does take Mr. Clisham's point to move the timeline back into consideration. Mr. Nolen stated that Pre-first was the only move being recommended.

Carol Catanese, Pennsbury Township resident, stated that she supported the comprehensive plan for Unionville High School. She does not see it as a Mercedes (being the owner of a Scion) and would not support a Mercedes. This is what we need and there is no excess. Mrs. Catanese commented that she was speaking for many other people in this district.

Heidi Brown, Chadds Ford Township resident, stated that she is not sure how Keith Knauss and Jeff Hellrung are experts. She commented about the demographic that only 30% of residents have children in the schools and their assertion that people voted no because of what the plan was. Mrs. Brown stated that many people felt it should have been more (i.e. build a new facility). They should not make assumptions and if they have done a survey, she would love for them to share it.

Sue Norris, Pocopson Township resident, echoed Mrs. Brown's comments.

Scott Litzenberg, East Marlborough Township resident and UHS Teacher, stated that he is very frustrated about the "Taj Mahal" plan. The needs are safety issues and real concerns, not extravagances. It is absolutely maddening to hear this from former Board members when many of these things were completed during their tenure. The "Mercedes" will soon buy a lot less building and we need to be more forward thinking. As a taxpayer, he does not want to pay 8% or 16% more for the same building in the future. We are not looking at anything like a Taj Mahal but things that people in the community requested. We must stop doing things halfway; the kids deserve it.

Holly Manzone, Pocopson Township resident, commented about the phenomenal elementary student musicians. She also praised the Lego kids, the debate team, the UHS Marching Band at the Gator Bowl (with 17 first place wins), Sharon Parker and the team (for an unbelievable job on redistricting), and those involved in the Martin Luther King, Jr. Day of Service. After all of this, the elephant in

Residents' Comments - Continued

the room comes back. This referendum is tearing us apart, even though we all have reasons for what we want. It is hurting our property values. Mrs. Manzone knows we need the renovations to this high school (built 50 years ago), and asked if we could work together on it. She commented about having met Keith Knauss for lunch, stating that they are further apart than she thought they were. We don't, however, have to air our dirty laundry, and listen to comments from other districts that are laughing at our "Unionville-ism."

Lisa Boyle, Birmingham Township resident, stated that she is a 1979 graduate of UHS. She commented about the huge issue of safety (i.e. Columbine and other districts) and the need to protect our children. Mrs. Boyer also discussed the modular classrooms, science labs, and sports facilities. She stated that the students were still lifting weights on the blacktop as they did in 1979. If those saying no had children in the district, they would be voting yes.

Lele Galer, Pocopson Township resident, asked that the Board provide them with enough time to galvanize the vote when it comes time. She knows there are many supporters in the community.

Sue Hayes, Pennsbury Township resident, commented about everyone's common thread of concern here. She worked with the Philadelphia School District (Masterman, Central) where 20 children have already been accepted to the University of Pennsylvania there and none from U-CF. The problem lies with marketing. No one knows who we are and we are losing to poor-performing districts.

Mrs. Hayes discussed the Red Clay School District's reputation dissolving because of ongoing referendum fighting (being looked at by Yale, etc.). She asked that the Board give the customer two to three options ("no" may even be one of them) and that we look at this as a systemic problem of image.

Mrs. Brown stated that we are not allowed to put options on the ballot. Mrs. Hayes requested that they be put out before a vote.

Dr. Price commented regarding last Thursday's meeting and the presentation by the architectural firm. It was valuable but did not address the voters who are not willing to support the plan presented last fall. It seems unlikely that the same plan would be approved. If a new referendum were defeated, it would push things back six months, which is a risk. It is incumbent on the Board to lower the cost to something the voters can support and that would serve our needs. The political reality is that if it is not approved, it won't get done. He is trying to find that compromised plan.

Mr. Baker stated that there would be substantive comments during the Facilities report later this evening.

Mrs. Brown stated that she would like to hear the list of "fluff" from the Citizens for Efficient Education. She is not sure what they are and asked if they could submit something to the Board. Mrs. Brown feels it is incumbent for the Board to provide facilities for the programs that we have. She does not see where we can cut out classrooms. It is important for her to see what it is she is supposed to be cutting out (or sports facilities, band facilities, auditoriums, technology education programs).

**RESIDENTS'
COMMENTS
(Continued)**

**COMMENTS –
SCHOOL
DIRECTORS**

Board Comments – Continued

Which ones are we not going to provide for? She asked if they were happy to have children going to lunch at 9:15 a.m. Mrs. Brown requested something in writing on which to work as a Board. She thanked the administration for the Redistricting Plan; it is a load off her mind.

Mrs. Halstead commented about the wonderful job on redistricting. She stated that the Martin Luther King, Jr. Day of Service activities were glorious. She was at the Kennett Senior Center and three UHS students came, together with a Kennett High School friend, for a good cause. She hopes Keith Knauss and Jeff Hellrung will join them next year.

Shannon Pitt, student representative, asked that everyone listen very carefully to what was said about the referendum. The student sentiment is that this has torn our community apart – over a multi-purpose room (not a Yoga room). This is already a very low cost. Since inflation is going to hurt us, we need to come together to form a common goal. After the referendum was voted down, it was like a graveyard around here. We need to start anew and forget our anger, which is ultimately hurting the students. Shannon stated that she can and will vote in the next election. We need to think about what is best for the students and not about revenge. The Board has devoted so much time to the project. Insults are not the way to work through this project.

Mr. Murray commented about the three standards for his decision:

1. Academic Needs of the Students – The administration was asked to look at a plan for today's programs and for the needs of tomorrow. They began incorporating that into the plan. Although there are some spaces that may not be utilized at 100% at the beginning, we will need them in ten years. We are trying to make a reasonable assessment and weigh the needs of the older citizens with those of the students.
2. Safety Concerns – The building was built at a time when we did not have the need for the high school Administration to be located in the front of the building. Mr. Murray commented about the \$200/ft² cost being high due to requirements for contract bidding. They would like school construction to be less if possible but the legislature does not give us that ability.
3. Student Health – We have soundly rejected any plan that does not address those things. If those issues are called a "Mercedes," he will not compromise on them. The Board considered some in-depth building. In hearing neighbors talk, the community is all over the place. Some feel that \$62.5 million is a lot and others thought we valued education here. He knows that we must proceed in the right way. Considering cost escalations, we are compelled to look at it and the need for action here.

In looking back to 1991, good people made the decision not to air-condition the whole building. We spent \$6.7 million to air-condition two-thirds of the building (~ 1,300 times the original cost) - for something most people have in their home.

**COMMENTS –
SCHOOL
DIRECTORS
(Continued)**

It was moved by Mr. Murray and seconded by Dr. Sweeney to approve the Minutes of the December 3, 2007 Reorganization Meeting (pp. 3.a.1-3) and the December 10, 2007 Regular Board Meeting (pp. 3.a.4-28).

Motion carried (9-0).

The following financial statements and reports were reviewed:

1. General Fund Treasurer's Reports – November, 2007 (p. 3.b.2) and December, 2007 (p. 3.b.1a)
2. 2006-2007 GF Function Revenue Analyses with Details of 6100's and 7000's as of November, 2007 (p. 3.b.3) and December, 2007 (p. 3.b.2a)
3. 2006-2007 General Fund Function-Object Expenditure Analyses as of November, 2007 (pp. 3.b.4-6) and December, 2007 (pp. 3.b.3a-5a)
4. Category Expenditures Analyses – November, 2007 (p. 3.b.7) and December, 2007 (p. 3.b.6a)
5. Capital Projects Fund Reports – November, 2007 (p. 3.b.8) and December, 2007 (p. 3.b.8a)
6. Outstanding Projects Summaries – November, 2007 (p. 3.b.9) and December, 2007 (p. 3.b.8a)
7. Construction Project Reports – November and December, 2007
 - a. Unionville High School & Fields Renovation Project Budget Reports - November, 2007 (pp. 3.b.10-11 and December, 2007 (pp. 3.b.9a-10a)
8. Capital Reserve Fund Reports – November, 2007 (p.3.b.12) and December, 2007 (p. 3.b.11a)
9. Health Care Trust Fund Reports – November, 2007 (p. 3.b.13) and December, 2007 (p. 3.b.12a)
10. Debt Service Reserve Fund Reports – November, 2007 (p. 3.b.14) and December, 2007 (p. 3.b.13a)
11. Activity Account Reports
 1. C. F. Patton Middle School Activities Accounts, October through December, 2007 (pp. 3.c.1-3)
 2. Unionville High School Activities Balance Sheet – September 30, 2007 through December 31, 2007 (pp. 3.c.4-9)

Mr. Murray requested that the secretary file the financial statements and the reports.

**MINUTES
APPROVED**

**FINANCIAL
STATEMENTS**

It was moved by Dr. Sweeney and seconded by Dr. West to approve the Bill List for January, 2008 in the amount of \$890,304.91 (pp. 3.d.1-18).

Mr. Baker and Mr. Murray abstained from this motion due to a conflict of interest regarding checks No. 124007 and No. 124371 (payable to the Chester County Intermediate Unit).

Motion carried (7-0-2).

It was moved by Dr. Sweeney and seconded by Dr. West to approve the January Budget Transfers for 2007-08 as on the attachment (pp. 3.b.1).

Motion carried (9-0).

Mr. Baker provided an update regarding the Unionville High School facilities. The Facilities Committee met on Thursday, January 24th with seven Board members present, one present remotely, and one member absent. There was considerable discussion around the UHS facilities.

He believes it is important to determine if we are going to referendum as pertinent to the size and scope of the project.

Voters rejected the measure to permit the school district to borrow \$62.5 million outside of the normal restraints of Act 1 and the state's normal debt parameters. In his judgment, we probably made a mistake in asking for \$62.5 million. Since we were asking a question of the public for an exception for amounts in excess of what can be borrowed under Act 1 parameters, our ballot question overstated the amount for which we should have been asking. We should have been asking for the exception amount in excess of what we can cover within Act 1 parameters. We didn't need \$62 million outside of Act 1 parameters but needed something less.

It is clear from the work done by our financial advisor that we are capable of doing the high school and middle school program without the need for referendum. Dr. Price has challenged the wisdom of this, but if we look at a portfolio basis, it does not equate with the high-risk borrowing for three reasons:

1. We would not borrow in order to make interest payments.
The net principal payments are always positive on a portfolio basis. We would have one or two issues at any given time that would be in a capitalized interest standpoint but the entire debt portfolio of the school district continues to show positive principal payment over the period of time.
2. We would be doing a fixed-rate debt with constant net repayment of principal.
3. The payments are prescribed in the offering so there is no risk of payment adjustment based upon some market movement. You have a fixed payment structure with fixed interest rates over a period of time and constant net repayment of principal over the entire period.

Mr. Baker stated that he has great difficulty in good conscience going to the community to ask for permission to complete the programs however we choose to frame them when we know we can do it within Act 1 parameters. Why would we ask for an exception when we don't need one? We should ask if people support the building program. If we choose to go to referendum, we will have to ask for an

**BILLS
APPROVED**

**BUDGET
TRANSFERS**

FACILITIES:

**UHS Facilities
Update –
Discussion**

exception above and beyond the Act 1 parameters. That is a crucial decision of the Board on how we proceed. If we are moving to adjust the project size based on what we believe is approvable, a referendum of anything greater than zero is not appropriate in the community.

Mrs. Brown asked why he did not bring this up earlier. Mr. Baker stated that the decision in August was to do two programs, one for the high school and one for the middle school. We made room in our repayment schedule for a subsequent middle school program. We shaped the curve where there was a drop-off at the point in time where there would be a Middle School Program. The reality is that with a \$100 million program, we have the ability to do a master financing plan so we don't have to shove payments forward in order to make room for subsequent payments but you can layer the whole thing as a single program. The error that we, as a Board, made is that we should have thought of developing the entire campus as one master program. In that case, we would never have needed to go to referendum.

Mr. Cochran stated that it is doable and would be a matter of a policy decision on the Board's part as to how we want to structure it. It would commit us through the 2013-14 timeframe for the full scope of renovations on this campus. We are looking at utilizing capitalized interest, modified wraps of debt structures as you would issue them.

In response to Mrs. Brown's question, Mr. Cochran stated that we could be using every penny we have, but would not be since we would enter into such a program with assumptions that are conservative (allowing for downturns in the housing market).

Mrs. Trigg inquired (although she was in no way suggesting that we do this) about restructuring our operating debt and paying it later if the Board wanted to exceed our cap this year and not send this to referendum. Mr. Cochran stated that he has seen districts finance along this line (to loosen operating budgets) but it is not typically done. In response to Mrs. Trigg's question, Mr. Cochran stated that we have not done that in this budget or in previous budgets in this district.

Dr. Price stated that although Mr. Baker asserts that this is doable and workable, it would be similar to a situation in your own life if your spouse borrowed \$1 million and said don't worry because your job will pay for it (in the future). We are talking about the same thing here and taking on huge debt. If things don't go just right, we are in big trouble. It would certainly restrict the flexibility of the Board and district to deal with unexpected events and may also subject us to legal action by those who felt we went outside the rules.

Mr. Baker stated that this is incorrect. The analysis was completed by a financial advisor and not by him. Public Financial Management's analysis holds debt at its current percent of total expenditures that will never be exceeded. It would not force us into a back-end referendum (since it does not exceed the total percentage and the growth is with the Act 1 index which is approximately 3.4%). What you are looking at is it moving in a lock step with total expenditures. If we ran into trouble, we would defer borrowing it or would not borrow it. It is wrong to infer fear into the public by suggesting otherwise.

FACILITIES -

**UHS Facilities
Update –
Discussion
(Continued)**

Dr. Price asked how you could take on \$100 million of debt and not increase your debt payments.

Dr. Sweeney wondered about making a proposal and seeing if there was a second. Mr. Wandersee stated that we could motion the Board to get a sense of whether they want to consider this philosophy further.

Dr. West stated that if we have a motion as to whether or not we want to consider this as a philosophy that is different than whether or not we are going to referendum. She commented about what the risks would be and stated that if it sounds too good to be true, it probably is. There is a lot more she wants to know and she asked whether we were prepared to talk about it now.

Mr. Murray stated that it would be difficult to have all of those things. It's difficult to assemble them on a risk basis (the cons) as there are aspects/limitations that could occur into the future. It gets into a matter of policy. The financial advisor has put this together with certain assumptions. If any of the assumptions fail, you've got real problems.

It is true as Mr. Baker said that you would keep the percentage to the budget of debt service at the same level. It is also true that historically those levels go up and down, and you would be holding that level constant. There is never a time in a budget where we've never borrowed more or kept our borrowing at the same level that we don't have the need for increased salary or increased student activity. The real risk is what other functions would be utilizing that money had it not been for the average growth of the debt service each year. It would take a reaffirmation of future Boards to put money away to draw on the money when you have to borrow it. That takes a very long, sustained effort over a long period of time. We're asking you now to think about all of the possibilities that might occur for future Boards and weigh that in your decision going forward.

Mr. Baker stated that the point he heard was to figure out how we were going to pass a referendum at Thursday's meeting. The only point that is being made here is that is not necessary a foregone conclusion that referendum is required.

Mrs. Trigg thinks this is not a good practice to mortgage into the future of our kids. Previous Boards did not do this and that is how she conducts her affairs privately. Since World War II, this district has built a new school every 14 years. What if we need to build another school sooner? It seems obvious to her that we have not had a 0% increase or a decrease in the budget historically. Pushing it off into the future is wrong and she doesn't like it.

Mr. Wandersee stated that we would reserve the plan for future use.

Mr. Murray commented about the spectrum of different ways we could approach this:

- Look at borrowing \$100 million and keeping it under the cap
- Look at the high school program as it was laid forward and see if anyone would like specific discussion on exactly what was proposed at referendum

FACILITIES -

UHS Facilities Update – Discussion (Continued)

- Address the base part of the presentation that Maryann went through; looking at the academic space, the new construction space to see if there is any commonality on that. The first part of the building program was the new construction. We could consider that portion as a place to start conversation.

Mr. Wandersee commented about being discouraged, stating that he would like to see us work on the high school tomorrow morning. We should start on the critical/priority needs soon. He is willing to move forward with a partial piece of the pie and then going out and borrowing money. He would like to see this done while we are going into a recession but that probably won't happen. Mr. Wandersee thinks we have to find a little creativity in doing this project. He asked whether we could start some action on the top priorities.

In response to Mrs. Brown's question, Mr. Wandersee stated that he would start construction on building the classroom improvements, and possibly a little further. He commented about Maryann Marotta's presentation of plans for new construction (Phase 1). They encompass all new construction, safety construction, lab construction, and the administration office coming to the front of the building for \$53.7 million. She and her associates had to pick out a number, and the Board debated about the number and getting voter approval.

Mr. Wandersee reviewed the first, second, and third floor plan costs as presented by MM Architects:

First Floor -	\$ 11.129 million
Second Floor -	16.716 "
Third Floor -	<u>10.220</u> "
	\$ 38.065 "

That includes the auditorium and moving the offices. With the addition of site costs, we are at \$41 million plus \$2 million and \$3 million in escalation costs to \$46 million. Soft costs of 21.3% take the total to \$56 million (about \$3 million higher than the \$53.7 million they talked about and not much lower than the \$62.5 million they started out with). He would like to get something done but does not want to use capitalized interest. Mr. Wandersee would love to hear some ideas on how to get it in motion.

In response to Dr. Price's question, Mr. Wandersee stated that if you are going to do it (classroom building), you must do it when construction starts. You cannot go back and do it. Mr. Wandersee stated that you could postpone the auditorium (not do it in Phase 1). Mrs. Brown stated that this would represent a \$3.7 million savings.

Mr. Hostetler stated that in discussion with Maryann Marotta, if you look at just the classroom addition, when it is complete, that necessitates renovation of the current District Office for the high school offices and the high school offices for classroom space. This is what is included in her price.

If you took out the auditorium and did not renovate the existing auditorium, that is about a \$12 million item. In response to Dr. West's question, Mr. Hostetler stated that the dollar amount is embedded in these amounts. The chiller might need to be added at some point; items are not evenly divided over the project.

FACILITIES -

UHS Facilities Update – Discussion (Continued)

Mr. Murray stated that we could ask for the \$55 million before us. Mrs. Halstead stated that our athletic fields are a mess and commented about the Music Department storage area in the back. She is not sure it will ever get done.

Mrs. Brown stated that we don't have a lot of time here. She is not sure we can educate people as to what we changed, what we dropped off, etc. We're not really sure why people voted no. What if we go back out to referendum with the plan that we have since we know what it is and try to market it better. Dr. Price stated that we would lost six months. Mrs. Brown stated that we have already lost this summer.

Mr. Murray stated that MM Architects put in the escalations based on a late 2008 bid. He asked whether it would pass if the cost was \$49 million. Dr. Price felt it would have a better chance of passing. Mr. Murray stated that since we won't know what the public would approve, it has to do with how we package what we want to accomplish. He does not want to prioritize one child's education over another child's education.

Mr. Murray stated that there is a meeting scheduled for February 11th. We should take this document and try to come to some conclusion as to where each person might feel comfortable. Mr. Baker agreed but stated that we would have to take the original plan because there are substantive differences (i.e. fields, etc.).

Mr. Wandersee stated that he never even thought of not doing different aspects. He was thinking of proposing them and doing them at another time. He is not trying to marginalize anyone's project. Maybe we should just put it out there again and at least show the taxpayers we are taking some out of it.

Mrs. Brown stated that we did not have enough time to sell it the last time. Mrs. Halstead stated that we don't know what the feelings are out there in the community (what is the magic bullet?).

Dr. Price stated that it is the money. Mr. Murray stated that we have a new plan for \$55 million. Dr. West asked whether it was being suggested we need to consider that this is not the plan. The Administration and KCBA Architects laid out the needs and MM Architects came up with the original plan. This is the first phase of it. We have not gone back and questioned whether there is another way. Mrs. Brown stated that we had taken a plan for nearly \$100 million and knocked it back to \$62 million.

Dr. West stated that they only care that \$62 million was too high. If the original plan was an honest, good faith effort without fluff and is what our kids need, we need to commit to this as the right path. How we get there is the debate.

Mrs. Trigg thinks we need a community discussion to come up with creative ideas. In a meeting like this, there is limited opportunity for discussion. We have to find a way to bring the community together and have a real discussion, not just a war in the newspapers.

Mr. Murray stated that the original plan was a good faith effort that started at \$100 million and was cut to \$62 million. He asked whether it was the Board's will to continue with this plan or to start again.

**FACILITIES -
UHS Facilities
Update –
Discussion
(Continued)**

Dr. Price asked what we would do if it were presented as is and defeated again.

Mr. Murray stated that he is asking if this represents the needs of the school district (\$62.5 million plan). He has serious reservations as to whether the Board members believe that is true.

Mr. Wandersee asked whether there could be cutbacks to the District Offices, etc., although he was not suggesting it. Mrs. Halstead stated that we had already done that and currently have people at the Middle School or other places that are not here. She does support the whole project and always has supported it. Many of her constituents are saying it should be bigger. The pro-education people were shocked that it was defeated. She was not surprised, having lived through similar issues in the Delaware schools. Mrs. Halstead doesn't know what could be done since our hands are tied as a Board and Administration to go and stand at a podium to solicit votes.

Mr. Wandersee commented on his beliefs that we have to start work soon, go out to the public with something less than the original \$62.5 million plan, and get pretty creative to find out how to get there.

Mr. Baker stated that Dr. West had a good question about the commitment to the original plan.

Mr. Murray stated that the original plan of \$62.5 million represents the needs of the school district. He asked whether the Board believes that truly represents the needs of the school district.

Mr. Murray asked for a poll of the Board regarding the question as to whether the \$62.5 million plan truly represents the needs of the school district.

Mrs. Trigg stated that this was a tough question. Each person considers needs differently. She doesn't have enough detail to know. If these are our needs, is this the only way to get them fulfilled? People are asking her about the possibility of building a second high school.

Mr. Wandersee echoed Mrs. Trigg's comments. He is not sure whether they are our needs or our wants.

Dr. Sweeney stated that our administrative leaders have told us that these are the needs, and they are the educators who should be giving us the recommendation.

Dr. Price commented about not having been involved in the original planning.

Mrs. Trigg -	Unsure
Mr. Baker -	Yes
Mrs. Halstead -	Yes
Mrs. Brown -	Yes
Mr. Wandersee -	Unsure
Dr. West -	Yes
Dr. Sweeney -	Yes
Dr. Price -	Abstained
Mr. Murray -	Yes

Totals: Yes – 6 Unsure – 2 Abstained – 1

FACILITIES -

**UHS Facilities
Update –
Discussion
(Continued)**

Dr. Sweeney stated that we cannot go back and ask for the same price tag. We still know we want that plan but how can we get there (phasing, etc.)? We cannot just go out and say it louder or harder. She cannot support that approach.

Mr. Murray stated that we have a sense from the Board as to whether the \$62.5 million plan represents the needs of the school district. Dr. Sweeney's question in going forward it do we support a phased program. Dr. Sweeney clarified that we should find out if the majority is in support of going back as is. Dr. Price agreed.

Mr. Baker stated that this creates an impossibility for him. While he would support moving forward with the program and not moving to a phasing spot, he cannot support going out with a \$63 million plan for reasons that were unrelated as we discussed earlier. I am in the impossible spot of a win or a loss based upon procedural decision making that is not necessarily in the interest of the Board.

Mr. Wandersee discussed going out again (but not with a \$63 million plan) but something that was hybrid. If we cut out \$4-5 million and readapted it, he feels it could work. Mrs. Brown asked if he was suggesting pulling some money out of the original plan. Mr. Wandersee agreed and stated that it should not be a lot.

Mr. Murray thinks it would not be good if we go out to referendum on the same plan. It does show disrespect and presumes it did not happen. He is also not willing to compromise on the needs but would be in favor of a phased approach and would support the plan in front of him. No one knows the magic number it would take to get it passed (\$49.9 million?) The \$55.9 million plan is a phased approach that our architect gave us and he would be in favor of proceeding with it.

Mrs. Brown stated that phasing makes sense. It does not make sense if we take part of the phased approach. We cannot break the phases apart (physical issue); it would cost us more money.

Dr. West inquired about meeting with MM Architects prior to the Work Session on February 11th to discuss this further. Mr. Murray stated that we would meet with MM Architects but must have an absolute item for February. Mrs. Brown stated that this would not mean we couldn't do a vote in May or June. Mrs. Halstead stated that all Board members really need to be present at the February 11th meeting.

Dr. West left the meeting briefly.

It was moved by Dr. Sweeney and seconded by Mrs. Trigg to approve the Settlement Agreement with EJ Electric on the Chadds Ford Elementary School Project as on the attachment (pp. 4.a.1-4).

Motion carried (8-0).

It was moved by Mrs. Trigg and seconded by Mrs. Halstead to approve the following new courses:

1. Language Arts Mastery – Grade 12 (pp. 5.a.1-3)
2. Math Mastery – Grade 12 (pp. 5.a.4-6)

FACILITIES -

**UHS Facilities
Update –
Discussion
(Continued)**

**Settlement
Agreement –
EJ Electric**

CURRICULUM:

**Language Arts &
Math Mastery
Courses**

Curriculum – Continued

Mrs. Brown stated that these courses are for students who are not successful on the PSSA tests.

Motion carried (8-0).

Dr. West returned at 10:40 p.m.

It was moved by Mrs. Brown and seconded by Mrs. Trigg to approve the Concurrent Enrollment Agreement with Immaculata University as on the attachment (pp. 5.b.1-7).

Mrs. Brown stated that there was no cost for this agreement and thanked Mr. Batchelor for working on it.

Motion carried (9-0).

It was moved by Mr. Wandersee and seconded by Dr. West to approve the Lease Agreement with Ricoh (formerly Lanier) for a 60-month lease of a Model #MP9000 photocopier at a monthly rate of \$526.56 (including a \$10,000 down payment) for Chadds Ford Elementary School.

In response to Mr. Wandersee's question, Mr. Cochran stated that Mr. Ransford is using some of his carryover rate for this lease (that includes all maintenance and toner for the first 600,000 copies).

Motion carried (9-0).

It was moved by Mr. Wandersee and seconded by Mrs. Halstead to approve the submission of Plancon Part K: Project Refinancing for Issuance of General Obligation Bonds, Series of 2007 to Advance Refund a portion of the General Obligation Bonds, Series AA of 1998 and Series A of 1998 as on the attachments (pp. 6.b.1-3) to the Pennsylvania Department of Education.

Mr. Cochran explained that the Board refinanced this Bond in November with more than \$400,000 in savings. We are merely approving the documentation that our financial advisors prepared to have the debt refinance filed with the Pennsylvania Department of Education.

In response to Mrs. Trigg's question, Mr. Cochran stated that this was to refinance debt that we already have.

Motion carried (9-0).

It was moved by Dr. Sweeney and seconded by Dr. West to approve the following personnel items (agenda items 7.a. through 7.h.):

- a. Professional Conferences (24)
 1. Approve the Attendance at Professional Conferences as on the attachments (pp. 7.a.1-3)

**CURRICULUM -
Continued**

**Concurrent
Enrollment
Agreement w/
Immaculata
University**

PERSONNEL:

**Professional
Conferences**

Personnel – Continued

- b. Retirement (1)
 - 1. Dianne Johnson – Unionville High School Spanish Teacher, (ERIP), effective at the end of the 2007-2008 school year
- c. Resignations (2)
 - 1. Marilyn Olbera – Food Service Assistant, effective December 14, 2007 on November 23, 2007
 - 2. Edmund Johnson – Bus Driver, effective January 8, 2008
- d. Reclassifications (4)
 - 1. Anthony Massari – from Hillendale Elementary School Custodian to Head Custodian, effective January 2, 2008, at a salary of \$15.78 per hour
 - 2. Helen Komarnicki – from Unionville High School second-shift Custodian to Unionville Elementary School second-shift Custodian, effective January 14, 2008
 - 3. Blanche Woodward – from full-time Van Driver (30+ hours per week) to part-time Van Driver (less than 30 hours per week), effective January 7, 2008
 - 4. Sara Tracy – from part-time Van Driver (less than 30 hours per week) to full-time Van Driver (30+ hours per week), effective January 7, 2008
- e. Supplemental Contracts (2)
 - 1. Jeff Hammond – Assistant High School Softball Coach
 - 2. Cassidy Taylor – Basketball Clock Timekeeper
- f. Substitutes (4)
 - 1. Erin Watkins - Elementary
 - 2. Doris Musser – Food Service Assistant
 - 3. Marrick Wyatt – Elementary
 - 4. Lindsay Hartman – Elementary/Special Education
- g. Employ (5)
 - 1. Timothy Murphy – C. F. Patton Middle School Math Specialist (Long-Term Substitute), effective January 22, 2008 through the end of the 2007-2008 school year, at the Bachelor's Step 1 salary level, pro-rated
 - 2. Tara Gulli – 12-week Substitute School Social Worker, effective approximately February 17, 2008, at a salary of \$130 per day
 - 3. Richard Grebner – Bus Driver, effective December 19, 2007, at a salary of \$14.71 per hour
 - 4. Melissa Hunt – Floater Custodian (8 hours per day x 182 days), effective approximately January 14, 2008, at a salary of \$12.97 per hour
 - 5. Thomas Cullen – Unionville High School 12-month second-shift Custodian (8 hours per day x 260 days), effective approximately January 14, 2008, at a salary of \$12.97 per hour

**Personnel
(Continued)**

Retirement:

D. Johnson

Resignations:

M. Olbera

E. Johnson

**Reclassifi-
cations:**

A. Massari

H. Komarnicki

B. Woodward

S. Tracy

**Supplemental
Contracts**

Substitutes

Employ:

T. Murphy

T. Gulli

R. Grebner

M. Hunt

T. Cullen

Personnel – Continued

h. Leaves (2)

1. Susan Pacella – Pocopson Elementary School part-time Speech Pathologist, Maternity Leave followed by Unpaid Child-Rearing Leave through the end of the 2008-2009 school year
2. Amy Thompson – Pocopson Elementary School Grade 3 Teacher, Maternity Leaver, from approximately May 6, 2008 through the end of the 2007-2008 school year

It was moved by Mr. Wandersee to nominate Mr. Murray as the nominee from the Unionville-Chadds Ford School Board to stand for election to the Center for Arts and Technology, Special Education, and Chester County Intermediate Unit Board for a term beginning July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2011. Elections will be conducted by mail ballot to all Chester County School Board members on or before February 1, 2008.

It was moved by Mrs. Halstead to close nominations for the C.A.T./Special Education/I.U. Board Representative.

Motion carried (9-0).

It was moved by Mr. Wandersee to nominate Dr. West as the representative from the Unionville-Chadds Ford School Board to the Chester County School Authority for a term beginning January, 2008 through January, 2013.

It was moved by Dr. Sweeney to close nominations for the Chester County School Authority Representative.

Motion carried (9-0).

Mrs. Halstead reported for Co-Curricular and Student Life that Joe Derickson has provided us with a list of all coaches and activities for sports. This is the first time we have had such a document and she thanked him for compiling the list.

Dr. West reported for Communications regarding:

1. PTO Advisory Committee Meeting – February 4, 7:00 p.m. (UHS Library Classroom)
2. Communications Committee – February 5, 9:00 a.m. (U-CF District Office Conference Room)
3. Coffee Chats – February 5
 - There has been some discussion regarding the continuation of the Coffee Chats. We will discuss this at another time.

Mr. Wandersee reported for Legislation that there is some discussion of a 100% reduction of property tax. If interested in this, contact Senator Pileggi, Senator Barrar, or Representative Ross.

Mr. Murray reported for the Center for Arts & Technology/ Intermediate Unit and Special Education. There is a flurry of activity at the Intermediate Unit that needs to be discussed at the next Executive Session.

**Personnel
(Continued)**

Leaves:

S. Pacella

A. Thompson

**C.A.T./Special
Education/I.U.
Board
Representative –**

E. Murray

**Chester County
School Authority
Representative –**

T. West

**CO-CURRICULAR
& STUDENT LIFE**

**COMMUNI-
CATIONS**

**LEGISLATION
AND POLICY:**

**C.A.T./
SPECIAL
ED. / I.U.**

3.a.20

**RESIDENTS'
COMMENTS**

Sue Hayes, Pennsbury Township resident, asked about the law regarding market research being conducted with regard to the UHS Project. Mr. Wandersee stated that this would be problematic because we cannot spend any money on it. Ms. Hayes asked about the possibility of a question being placed in *The Kennett Paper*. Ms. Parker stated that we could survey the community about aspects of the school program (i.e. or phasing, prioritizing) but we cannot be specific to the referendum. Ms. Hayes suggested that we get some market research.

Vic Dupuis, East Marlborough Township resident, stated that he is amazed that after 18 months, there are aspects of the UHS Plan about which you are not aware. He gave the Board an "A" for the plan but an "F" for not putting it out there. The only things out there were the auditorium and fields. The \$62.5 million plan is a good plan. There is a very short deadline (April) to get to the point of referendum. He suggested that community meetings be scheduled.

Joanne Bates, Birmingham Township resident, inquired about the feasibility of pulling this out of the Primary and General Election votes. She referenced studies that were completed by Cornell University about this topic.

Bruce Yelton, Pocopson Township resident, commented favorably about Mr. Baker's statement to look at both sites for \$100 million. He has encouraged the Board to look at our needs for over a decade. The financing proposal would deserve removal from the Board for anyone who supported it. Mr. Yelton commented about people who would finance a survey. He also mentioned the Catholic church building a new school and purchasing property for \$65 million while prevailing wage laws and union labor will cost Unionville-Chadds Ford \$100 million to do the same thing.

Gregg Lindner, Chadds Ford Township resident, commented about the two men in the back who were very eloquent. It is totally unnecessary to take shots at the Board members. He would like to see us stop those individuals at three minutes. Joanne Bates mentioned not having this vote at the Primary election, which is something of interest. Mrs. Bates asked if we could also look at reducing the number of polling places to keep the focus on the school.

Heidi Brown, Chadds Ford Township resident, stated that it's not the magic number but the magic of the School Board coming together. They should stand behind a plan, verbalize it publicly, and it will pass. Last time, the perception was that the School Board was not completely behind it.

Lawrie Bolger, Pocopson Township resident, thinks the plan is very solid and the Board should not back down on it. If people don't know the facts, you must tell them by providing the information they need and want. She commented about her parents who are resident of Traditions having received their information from the Citizens for Efficient Education. They did not have compelling facts from the school district.

Mr. Baker commented about his father having served on the Glendale, California School Board for 16 years. He then became President of the California School Boards Association, saw Proposition 13 pass, and the deterioration of education in that state. What you are seeing from him is a deep-seated belief in representative government and the local control of public education. He cannot compromise and will continue to act to protect the authority of the Board. Local control by the Board must be retained.

Ms. Parker stated that Sharon Allen-Spann, Supervisor of Human Resources, requested a very brief Executive Session with the Board regarding a personnel issue.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen M. Brown
Secretary

**BOARD
MEMBER'S
COMMENT**

**MEETING
ADJOURNED**

**2008-2009 Attendance Boundary Review
A Report to the School District Board of Directors
January 2008**

Prepared by:
District Administration

Committee Members

Core Team

- Clif Beaver
- Bob Cochran
- Steve Dissinger
- Rich Hug
- Andrew McLaughlin
- Sharon Parker
- Denise Miller
- John Nolen
- Mark Ransford

Ex Officio

- Ken Batchelor
- John Sanville

Support Team

- Sharon Allen-Spann
 - Rick Hostetler
 - Jim Molleca
 - Dot Shaw
 - Colleen Shearburn
-

The Committee Reviewed

- The history of UCFSD attendance boundary development
- Updated enrollment, capacity and classroom data
- Current school size and grade configuration research
- Recent and previous stakeholder input
- Buildings (visits) and building plans

Guiding Principles

- Maintain Quality of Program
 - Assure Equity of Program/Facilities
 - Maintain Neighborhood Schools Concept
 - Preserve School Culture
 - Maximize Building Design
 - Minimize Frequency of Boundary Change
-

History

- In November 2001, the School Board reaffirmed their June 1998 decision to modify the grade structure at the elementary level from a K-3 (CFES, UES), 4-5 (HES) to a K-5 (all four elementary buildings) structure
- A comprehensive redistricting effort started in April 2000
- The school board accepted the attendance boundaries recommended by the redistricting committee in 2001
- The boundaries were effective starting in the 2002-2003 school year and remain in effect today
- The redistricting committee commented that the accepted plan would have a life of three to five years
- The 2007-2008 school year is the sixth year
- In 2005, district administration recommended an attendance boundary plan to relieve anticipated overcrowding in PES and perceived under-utilization of CFES
- As a part of the study, significant work was done to determine whether a change in grade configuration could provide a solution to K-12 enrollment issues
- District administration recommended a change in attendance boundaries with no change in grade configuration
- After presentation of the plan, no changes were adopted by the school board

Data Utilized

- Enrollment Projections and Trends by Building
 - Enrollment Distribution
 - Special Education Projections and Trends
 - Building Capacities
 - Building Program and Classroom Needs
 - Housing Start Projections
 - Classroom Sections Study
 - Classroom Availability Study
 - Classroom Size Report
 - Building and Site Data
 - Open Space Data
 - Transportation Data
-

Findings (Based on Current Data)

1. Trend data includes impact of current known housing developments
2. Enrollment at Pocopson Elementary School is projected to neither increase nor decrease significantly after the 2011-2012 school year
3. Chadds Ford Elementary and Hillendale Elementary School enrollment has risen in the last two years and is projected to continue to rise
4. Enrollment at Unionville Elementary School has decreased and projections show no significant increases or decreases
5. The district provides equity in program and instruction; however, there are design differences in building capacities
6. Some program locations can be shifted to provide classroom space in schools
7. Some non-district programs or service locations could be combined or relocated to gain classroom space to allow for shifts in enrollment
8. Student and program needs can be met in all four schools for the next two years based on student projections, classroom availability and program analysis studies

Recommendation

District administration recommends:

No change in elementary attendance boundaries

for a period of two years

Recommendations

1. No change to elementary attendance boundaries for a period of two years (2008-2009 and 2009-2010 school years)
 - With certain program relocations, sufficient classrooms exist to accommodate projected enrollment for at least two years
 2. Annually, data and research regarding attendance boundaries will be updated and the need for boundary change will be reviewed each January
-

Impact

Personnel

PES Guidance Counselor

One Staff Move in 2008-2009

Technology

Additional Computer Lab Capacity at PES

Facilities

Internal district moves

Finance

\$69K - Personnel

\$20K - Technology

Curriculum/Transportation/Food

Service

No Significant Impact
