1

Stow Elementary School Building Committee

Presentation to MSBA
March 12, 2008

2

Background of Stow

- Who We Are
- Our School Buildings
- Challenges
- Previous work on solving the elementary school problems

3

Who We Are

- District History
  - Towns of Stow, Bolton, Lancaster
  - Regional High School created 1962
  - Three Town K-12 regionalized 1994
  - 8-person School Committee
- Regional Agreement
  - Each town will house its own K-8
  - Each town owns its buildings
  - Each town finances its own capital needs
  - The District pays for maintenance/operations
  - 2 of 3 towns must approve annual budget

4

Stow's Schools

- Hale Middle School (Grades 6-8) 64K SF
  - Built 1964
  - Renovated 1996
- Center School (Grades 3-5) 36K SF
  - Built 1954
  - Additions 1957, 1964
- Pompositticut School (Grades K-2) 36K SF
  - Built as Open Classroom 1971
  - Amphitheaters converted 2004

5

Considerations

- Building Condition
- Building Capacity
- Health & Safety Deficiencies
- Educational Program

6

Challenges: Pompo

- Building Condition out dated
  - Heating system beyond useful life
  - Open Classroom design
- Building Capacity
  - Double modular classrooms since 2004

- Removed amphitheaters (775 sf)
- Café-gymatorium
- Pre-K students have to go to Bolton/Lancaster
- 1/3 less than MSBA prototype (short 25K sf)

7 ☐ **Challenges: Pompo**

- Educational Programs suffering
  - Open Classroom design: no acoustical separation
  - SPED and tutorial classes held in janitor's closet

- Lack of security and fire safety
  - No lockdown options
  - No sprinklers
  - Not ADA compliant

8 ☐ **Building Condition Outdated**

9 ☐ **Systems beyond useful life**

10 ☐ **Power supply only on posts**

11 ☐ **CAPACITY EXCEEDED**

12 ☐ **Reading Instruction Room**

13 ☐ **Teacher Confidential Telephone Call Area**

14 ☐ **Gym-Cafeteria space**

15 ☐ **Shared Gym-Cafeteria creates storage issues**

16 ☐ **NO LOCKDOWN OPTIONS**

17 ☐ **LITTLE VENTILATION**
LOTS OF NOISE

18 ☐ **Challenges: Center School**

- Building Condition
  - Boilers 1958 and 1985 both in use
  - Well under building
  - No Sprinkler system
  - No ability to "lock down" school if needed
- Building Capacity
  - 18K sf under MSBA prototype size
  - Loss of support and allied arts space to create sufficient classrooms

19 ## Challenges: Center School

- Educational Programs suffering
  - SPED space in closets (55sf; 220sf; 285sf)
  - Science classroom lost
  - Music, art and computer lab share 1,000sf
  - Library only 900sf, approximately half the size of DOE recommended

20 ## CENTER SCHOOL LIBRARY: 900 SF VS 3000 SF

21 ## Book Closet/Conference Room

22

23 ## AV & Copy Equipment stored in hallways

24 ## Additional Challenges: District

- Pre-K mandated classrooms
  - Stow's children housed in Bolton & Lancaster
- District Agreement limits moving students across town
  - Bolton needs Emerson (District offices)
  - Lancaster: already planning for building expansion

25 ## Stow
Projected Enrollment

- ELEMENTARY (Prek-5)*

  2007: 599
  2010: 620
  2016: 630

  *Pre-K currently in Bolton/Lancaster

  Based on NESDEC projections November 2006

26 ## Stow's History of Addressing School Issues

- 1995 campus proposal to address long term middle & elementary space needs:
  $12.4MM voted down; Hale renovation approved
- SBC 2001-2005
  - Feasibility Study; Demographic studies
  - Health & Safety renovations; land search
  - 2003 SBA Moratorium went into effect
  - 2005 proposal: new site, new school $40MM. Voted down.

27 ## Stow's History of Addressing School Issues

- School Building Task Force
  - 14 months February 2006-May 2007
  - Series of community conversations
  - Seven options initially
  - Previous history of votes
  - Nearly unanimous vote at TM May 2007
  - Over 75% of vote at ballot May 2007
  - $2.2 million for conceptual design approved

28 ## ADDRESSING REGIONALIZATION

- WITHIN CURRENT DISTRICT
  - Lack of available space: would still require construction
- MAYNARD
  - Conversation began March 2007
  - Needs to be K-12
- OTHER ABUTTING TOWNS

29 ## Where We Are

- We've learned and followed the MSBA regulations
- We have the support and momentum of our community
- We got a vote to move forward
- We're ready to work with MSBA to move forward without jeopardizing future funding
- How do we do that?