

East Pennsboro Area School District
District Feasibility Study Steering Committee
East Pennsboro Elementary

May 30, 2017

Members present: Jay Burkhart, Andrew Cecere, Robert Copeland, Kristen Danner, Steven DavidHeiser, Glenn Gurchik, Dylan Haigh, Clint Heckman, Dennis Helm, Harold Hinton, Betsy Holley, Mike Jones, Dawn Kepler, Sarah Miller, Adam Oldham, Dearan Quigley, Melanie Shaver-Durham, Sharon Sybrant, Rich Tysarczyk, and Chad Reigle.

Tour of the East Pennsboro Elementary Building -- The committee toured the interior and exterior areas of the entire building.

After the tour, the committee began the meeting discussing what areas of the building were not compliant with ADA standards. The restrooms do not comply with current ADA standards. When the building was built, they met the standards at that time. In order to comply with the ADA twenty percent requirement, the district will have to fix whatever compliance issues are identified up to twenty percent of the project cost. Twenty percent is the cap. If all issues are identified and it does not rise to twenty percent of the total cost, the committee was advised that would be acceptable.

The committee discussed option 5. Option 5 appears to meet the needs of the district without changing the current grade configuration. A question was raised as to whether the two elementary buildings, in their current configuration, would be able to support a new grade level configuration. The K to 2; 3 to 5 grade level proposed configuration is not the most recommended. The number of transfers that a student would be required to go through could have a negative impact on their education. A committee member has a lot of research to support minimal transitions for students. The negative impacts to the students are defined in the research and it will be forwarded to the committee. The best grade span configuration is K to Eighth grade all in the same building. This configuration is mostly seen in small districts or in the inner city. There is no research to support the K to 2; 3 to 5 grade level configuration. Closing a building and building a new one is not necessarily the best educational path for students. Option 5 allows for the district to remove and rebuild the modular at West Creek Hills, build a new district administrative office attached to East Pennsboro Elementary, renovate East Pennsboro Elementary in a limited capacity, fully renovate the Middle School, and do some High School programming renovations. A lot of mentoring opportunities are lost with the K to 2; 3 to 5 grade configuration. Small, safe classes are desirable for students. The challenge with this decision will be applying a philosophical view of education while addressing the practical issues of the district.

The committee has to remember to address the future needs of the district. The options should be reviewed and discussed from a whole district perspective. The PLANCON process is being

followed and intends on long range planning. The district has to come up with a plan that makes sense. Previous construction projects included cutting some corners, we have to be sure we do the construction right. We need to plan to space out the construction so that each building has major renovations every eight years. Additionally, this committee should keep the pool renovations in mind during this process. Is this an effective use of the districts monies? The committee should also consider addressing the problem of the gym and the multi-purpose room at East Pennsboro Elementary. Future planning is important. The committee has to keep the “must haves” in mind. The MEP systems at WCH and the MS require the most attention. At EPE, the MEP mostly deal with the way we control the HVAC. The building was built with Trane Equipment being controlled with Johnson Controls. The two systems are not talking to one another efficiently. Trane controls can be purchased to address this issue, but it could be expensive. The addition of the administrative office may help the MEP issues if they could be addressed in the scope of work.

Discuss areas of strengths/concerns

Strengths as discussed by the committee following the tour:

- Available space for storage
- Layout of the building
- Playground areas
- Roof is not in terrible shape
- Overall age of the building (built in 1993)
- Exterior of the building looks good

Weaknesses as discussed by the committee following the tour:

- Interior not upgraded (wall paint, carpet in corridor)
- Some of the grout needs repointed
- Windows need resealed (currently being done by maintenance staff)
- MEP communication system
- Size of the cafeteria and the multi-purpose room
- Small kitchen
- Acoustics in the cafeteria side

Questions that need addressed:

- If grade reconfiguration would occur at existing buildings, could the district administrative office be relocated to the middle school?
- Can four tier busing be done with the current grade configuration?

The committee discussed possibly rescheduling the architects for a meeting on July 11 rather than June 27 so more discussion can occur regarding the educational effects of grade reconfiguration. The committee will discuss this further at the next meeting.

Next Meeting: Tour of the High School, June 13, 2017 beginning at 5:30 p.m.

