

BIG SPRING SCHOOL DISTRICT

Newville, Pennsylvania

SPECIAL BOARD MEETING MINUTES

MONDAY, JULY 19, 2010

The Big Spring School District is an equal opportunity education institution and will not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, religion, and disability in its activities, programs, or employment practices as required by Title VI, Title IX, and Section 504. For information regarding civil rights or grievance procedures, or for information regarding services, activities, and facilities that are accessible to and usable by handicapped persons, contact the Superintendent of Schools, Title IX and Section 504 Coordinator, 45 Mt. Rock Road, Newville, PA 17241, at (717) 776-2412.

I. CALL TO ORDER/WELCOME

The Board of School Directors for the Big Spring School District met in the Big Spring High School Auditorium, at 6:36 P.M. with President Wilbur Wolf, Jr., presiding. Six (6) directors present: Wilbur Wolf, Jr., President; William Swanson, Vice President; Terry Lopp, Treasurer; Richard Norris; William Piper; and Richard Roush.

Robert Lee Barrick, Secretary; Kingsley Blasco; and Tarin Houpt were absent.

Others in attendance: Richard Fry, Superintendent; Kevin Roberts, Director of Curriculum/Instruction and Educational Technology; Richard E. Kerr, Jr., Business Manager; Denny Clopper, The Valley Times-Star; and Brenda Line, Board Minutes.

II. WELCOME

President Wolf welcomed those in attendance and indicated that this evening's special meeting Board meeting is being conducted for the purpose of seeking public input on the Administration and Board's proposed elementary school grade realignment.

III. PLEDGE TO THE FLAG

President Wolf led all individuals present in the Pledge to the Flag.

IV. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Wendy Arnold, Fred Baker, Kelly Bales, Durreil Bear, Julie Bear, Carol Beard, Bill Beck, Timothy Blasco, Brett Brenize, Mary Brenize, Crystal Brown, Jessica Brown, Rhonda Bryar, Walter Bryar, Lisa M. Clapper, Kathy Clarke, Randy Crawford, Rob Cribbs, Kathy David, Kristen Day, Niki Donato, Johanna Durff, John Dyarman, Charles Egger, Chad Enck, Kaylee Enck, Sarah Enck, Stephanie Fauver, Toby Fauver, Laura Garner, Russ Gaus, Lori Harris, Bill Harrison, Tom Hockenberry, Gloria Horst, Joel Hosfelt, Pam Hosfelt, Trina Kennedy, Karen Kough, Jennifer Kuhn, Beth Laird, Jesse Laird, Violet Lebo, Catherine Long, Douglas Long, Kara Lowe, Harold McCommon, Kim Meacock, Angie Miller, Kelly Miller, Rachal Monismith, Dennette Moul, Katie Ocker, Steven Orr, Mike Raudabaugh, Mike Reifsnyder, Sharon Reifsnyder, Jolene Regetta, Cindy Russell, Sam Sheeler, Shani Shenk, Penny Sheriff, Jason Shover, Jessica Shover, Betsy Shughart, Karen Shughart, Beth Snyder, Michael Spears, Bethany Stanton, Cindy D. Stewart, Yvonne Swarner, Todd Vogelsong, Carol Walk, Kim Walk, Troy Walker, Christina Ward, Kelly Ward, Amy Wetzel, Tracey Wiley, Angela Wilson, and Kristi Witmer.

V. PRESENTATION

Elementary Realignment – Administration/Board of School Directors

Mr. Fry explained that the material being referenced this evening has been provided to visitors on the sign-in table, and he encouraged those present take copies of the information.

Mr. Fry offered a PowerPoint presentation entitled Elementary Reconfiguration in the Big Spring School District and offered hard copies of the presentation to those present. Mr. Fry reviewed each slide in the presentation, including the educational rationale, enrollment rationale/current buildings, information gathered from districts with similar configuration, financial rationale, and challenges with regard to a proposed elementary school reconfiguration to two K-3 facilities and one 4-5 facility. Please refer to the attached document: [Elementary Reconfiguration 7.19.10.pdf](#).

Mr. Fry concluded that the configuration that has worked in the past was not necessarily the most efficient configuration, and he indicated that past experience in the District has shown that students are resilient and adapt well to change based on the academic performance of those students who experienced changes in their late elementary/early middle school years. Mr. Fry added that he believes with the support of the staff and parents, the proposed elementary school grade configuration would serve the District well, both academically and financially.

VI. BOARD OF SCHOOL DIRECTORS DISCUSSION

A. Slide 4 - Building Administrators More Knowledgeable of the Curriculum

In response to a question from President Wolf regarding the educational rationale for realignment outlined in Slide 4, Mr. Fry indicated that in a K-5 building, the principal is required to know curriculums for six grades. In a K-3/4-5 configuration, the building principal could assume the critical role as instructional leader and focus on curriculum design and conduct meetings to improve the curriculum with fewer grade levels.

B. Slide 5 – Opportunity to refine and standardize methods of monitoring student growth and achievement

In response to a question from President Wolf, Mr. Fry indicated that this item would afford the District the opportunity to maximize the benchmark testing program. A 4-5 building would have more standardized testing and benchmark testing than a K-3 building. The proposed grade configuration would offer more opportunity to improve the guided individual learning plans for students.

C. Slide 7 – Establish support for Professional Learning Communities

In response to a question from President Wolf, Mr. Fry indicated that the proposed grade reconfiguration would establish an environment in which staff members could collaborate on issues more easily because they are in the same building (4-5) or in buildings a mile apart (K-3). A building with fewer grade levels is more conducive to a professional learning environment.

D. Enrollment Capacity – Slides 12 and 13

In response to a question from Director Piper, Mr. Fry indicated that the current enrollment capacity is 1,600, with 1,236 students enrolled; however, that capacity is calculated using 25 students per classroom and does not include specials classrooms and does not consider the space required for learning support students.

In response to a question from President Wolf, Mr. Fry indicated that he believes the District could accommodate an additional 200 students at the elementary level.

Big Spring School Board Special Meeting Minutes ~ Monday, July 19, 2010

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT

- A. **Mr. Kim Walk**, 298 High Mountain Road, Shippensburg, PA, addressed the members of the Board of School Directors and questioned whether elementary school siblings would ride the same bus and get picked up at the same time. Mr. Walk questioned whether the school days would start at the same time for the K-3 and 4-5 buildings.

Mr. Fry responded that elementary school siblings would ride the bus together to and from school. Students would be unloaded at one school, and the bus would travel to the other school to unload the remaining students. Mr. Fry explained that the elementary school start and end times would operate with a 10-minute flex time as the students are shuttled between buildings.

In response to a question from Mr. Walk, Mr. Fry indicated that a student with special needs would have one case manager for K-3, and the student would get another case manager for the 4-5 level.

- B. **Ms. Trina Kennedy**, 208 Leeds Road, Newville, PA, addressed the members of the Board of School Directors and questioned whether the administrators are sugarcoating the effects of grade reconfiguration. Ms. Kennedy indicated that she believes the items mentioned in this evening's presentation could be done with the current grade configuration. For example, Ms. Kennedy questioned why the modular classrooms could not be eliminated without grade reconfiguration.

Mr. Fry explained that there are two modular classrooms at Plainfield Elementary School. The District spent \$25,000 in the past few years to ensure that the modular units were usable until the proposed new building opened. The modular units at that school are necessary to support a "two deep" concept.

Mr. Fry explained that the staff and parents appreciate the small class sizes at Plainfield Elementary School; however, the District would be unable to continue to offer these small class sizes from an economic standpoint.

Ms. Kennedy questioned how educating students in a 4-5 building would provide a better education.

Mr. Fry explained that students could be grouped by ability, and there would be more flexibility to meet the needs of individual students than the current configuration.

Ms. Kennedy indicated that she believes teachers at all grade levels currently work together, and she questioned how the reconfiguration would improve the collaboration among teachers.

Mr. Fry explained that it is a challenge to organize grade-level meetings when teachers are physically 25 minutes apart. Moving the teachers in close proximity would be conducive to more frequent meetings.

In response to a question from Ms. Kennedy, Mr. Fry indicated that the loss of 200 students in the last few years was not the result of students attending cyber school or homeschool. The number of students homeschooled has been consistent for the past nine years, and the number of students attending cyber school has been consistent for three years.

Big Spring School Board Special Meeting Minutes ~ Monday, July 19, 2010

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT (Continued)

B. Ms. Trina Kennedy (Continued)

In response to a question from Ms. Kennedy, Mr. Fry indicated that the Reading Buddies program could not be continued as it is currently designed and would require modification for the K-3/4-5 environment.

In response to a question from Ms. Kennedy, Mr. Fry indicated that Oak Flat Elementary School was chosen as the 4-5 building instead of Mount Rock Elementary School because the Oak Flat facility could accommodate the additional learning support rooms that are necessary at those grade levels. Mount Rock Elementary School has 22 classrooms, and Oak Flat Elementary School has 30 classrooms.

In response to a question from Ms. Kennedy, Mr. Fry indicated that the District has spent approximately \$500,000 on the proposed new Plainfield Elementary School planning and design to date. Although the project is not a viable option at this time, the designs would be ready if and when a new facility is necessary to accommodate student enrollment.

In response to a question from Ms. Kennedy, President Wolf indicated that the economy and the consideration of taxpayers, particularly the elderly and the unemployed, were the driving forces behind the proposed realignment. The District wishes to minimize tax increases and continue to provide a quality education for students.

In response to a question from Ms. Kennedy, President Wolf indicated that the District may not be able to support three K-5 buildings because of the inability to balance class sizes efficiently in that grade configuration.

C. Mr. Christian Witmer, 111 Oakville Road, Shippensburg, PA, addressed the members of the Board of School Directors and questioned how the gifted program could be more individualized as outlined in this evening's PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Fry responded that the highest number of elementary school gifted students would be in Grades 4 and 5. The proposed configuration would enable the gifted teacher to spend more time in that one building, working with staff members to ensure that lessons are enriched and incorporated into the classroom instruction. While there are gifted students identified in K-3, there are far fewer gifted students in that age group than in the 4-5 group.

In response to a question from Mr. Witmer, Mr. Fry indicated that members of the administration would need to collaborate to determine how to group gifted students in a 4-5 building. Specifics on that particular issue have not been addressed at this time. Mr. Fry added that, with enrollment projections, Plainfield would eventually become a "one deep" building if the building remained open, and that would not be conducive to student grouping.

D. Ms. Tracy Wiley, 299 Barnstable Road, Carlisle, PA, addressed the members of the Board of School Directors and questioned how the District would ensure the safety of her five-year-old son on a long, packed bus ride.

Mr. Fry responded that the District would continue to ensure that students are safe when in the District's care.

Big Spring School Board Special Meeting Minutes ~ Monday, July 19, 2010

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT (Continued)

D. Ms. Tracy Wiley (Continued)

Ms. Wiley questioned whether the District has investigated the possibility of installing cameras on the buses.

Mr. Fry indicated that there is potential for camera installation on the buses that might warrant their installation. Mr. Fry indicated that he could work with the bus contractor on this issue.

Ms. Wiley questioned whether students would be permitted to eat snacks on the longer bus rides.

Mr. Fry indicated that the District would endeavor to be more flexible in this regard and work with the bus drivers on this issue.

E. Ms. Dennette Moul, 466 Crossroads School Road, Carlisle, PA, addressed the members of the Board of School Directors and questioned how the realignment would affect the current 11:1 elementary school student/staff ratio.

Mr. Fry indicated that the ratio would more than likely change to 12:1 or 13:1. Mr. Fry indicated that, although the ratio would change eventually, he does not expect there will be a significant change in the near future. Mr. Fry added that the proposed reconfiguration would offer more flexibility with class sizes and ensure that the classes are more similar in size in each grade.

Ms. Moul indicated that her son transitioned from Newville Elementary School to Mount Rock Elementary School very well, and she thanked the District for ensuring a smooth transition for the students.

F. Ms. Kathy David, 310 Barnstable Road, Carlisle, PA, addressed the members of the Board of School Directors and questioned whether the end of the school day would be identical for all elementary schools in the proposed reconfiguration.

Mr. Fry responded that the end of the day would not necessarily be the same at each school. A bell schedule has not yet been created. Mr. Fry explained that time would be allotted for the buses to shuttle the students, and he added that flexibility would be built into the schedule so that parents could pick up students at both the K-3 and 4-5 schools.

In response to a question from Ms. David, Mr. Fry indicated that the District has not focused a lot of effort comparing performance data among the schools. Performance is typically addressed by grade level.

Ms. David indicated that she appreciates the small class sizes and would hope that the attention to students' personal and academic needs would continue to be met if the proposed reconfiguration is approved.

Mr. Fry responded that he believes the classes sizes would remain the same initially; however, as the result of fiscal concerns, the District could not guarantee smaller class sizes indefinitely.

Big Spring School Board Special Meeting Minutes ~ Monday, July 19, 2010

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT (Continued)

- G. Toby Fauver**, 202 Campground Road, Carlisle, PA, addressed the members of the Board of School Directors and indicated that he has met with Mr. Fry and Mr. Kerr in the past in an effort to understand the proposed elementary school reconfiguration.

Mr. Fauver encouraged the Board and administration to ensure that the District would get a "full return on its investment" if the realignment adopted. Mr. Fauver encouraged the Board to set performance metrics and track results against those performance metrics and hold the administration and staff accountable for the results.

Mr. Fauver indicated that he understands the student enrollment projections, and he cautioned that a change in the economy and the addition of water, sewer, and housing developments could quickly change those enrollment projections. Mr. Fauver encouraged the Board to preserve the Plainfield property in the event that construction of a new school would become necessary in the future.

In response to a question from Mr. Fauver, Mr. Fry indicated that staff collaboration would be enhanced, particularly at the 4-5 level, if all teachers were in one location instead of located 20-25 minutes apart. Although substitute teachers could be hired to enable the teachers to leave the building for collaboration, this is at a great financial cost to the District at a time when the District is attempting to decrease spending where possible.

Mr. Fauver encouraged the administration to use WebEx or other online video conferencing methods to allow teachers to stay in the classroom and attend meetings, saving time and money.

Mr. Fauver indicated that he understands the need to consolidate staff, and he appreciates the PSERS challenge; however, he encouraged the Board to consider the impact on the quality of life of the parents who might work in Harrisburg and must travel to Newville for school events.

Mr. Fauver encouraged the Board to ensure that a plan of action is outlined if a K-3/4-5 grade configuration is adopted. In addition, Mr. Fauver encouraged the Board to hold the staff and administration accountable to the busing plan and standards outlined this evening.

Mr. Fauver concurred with Ms. Wiley regarding cameras on buses as a security measure. Mr. Fauver suggested that the Board invest any savings from the reconfiguration into safety and security for the students.

- H. Beth Laird**, 3 Chenelle Lane, Shippensburg, PA, addressed the members of the Board of School Directors and questioned whether her children in Grades 5 and 3 would travel to school on the same bus.

Mr. Fry indicated that elementary school siblings would ride the same bus at the same time.

Ms. Laird questioned whether downtown Newville traffic studies have been conducted to determine how feasible the shuttle buses would be.

Mr. Fry indicated that the administration is working with the bus contractor on this issue.

Big Spring School Board Special Meeting Minutes ~ Monday, July 19, 2010

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT (Continued)

H. Beth Laird (Continued)

Ms. Laird indicated that she is a teacher at a neighboring school district, and she cautioned that a delayed bus could lead to behavior problems on that bus.

Ms. Laird questioned whether the administration has considered three K-5 schools rather than the proposed realignment.

Mr. Fry indicated that a K-5 configuration would require an entire District realignment and redrawing of the elementary school boundaries. Mount Rock Elementary School is not large enough to accommodate the entire Plainfield Elementary School enrollment.

Ms. Laird indicated that, in her opinion, it would be difficult to have grade-level activities in a K-3/4-5 configuration because instead of 50-60 students gathering for a grade-level activity, it would be approximately 200 students assembled. Ms. Laird indicated that she believes it is hard enough for students to transition to middle school as a whole group, but the proposed reconfiguration would require students to make that transition into a "mini middle school" in Grade 4.

In addition, Ms. Laird indicated that a K-3/4-5 configuration would mean that the older students would no longer be afforded the opportunity to interact and serve as role models for the younger students.

Ms. Laird thanked the Board for conducting a meeting to address these issues.

I. Rhonda Bryar, 140 Greason Road, Carlisle, PA, addressed the members of the Board of School Directors and questioned whether students would remain in one classroom for the 4-5 configuration.

Mr. Fry responded that the proposed 4-5 building would "continue to be an elementary school building," and he added that it would not resemble a middle school. The proposal is for one floor to be Grade 4 and the other floor would be Grade 5. Special needs rooms would be available as well.

J. Ms. Kristi Witmer, 111 Oakville Road, Shippensburg, PA, addressed the members of the Board of School Directors and questioned whether jobs would be lost as a result of the proposed reconfiguration.

Mr. Fry responded that it is the current plan to keep all staff and rearrange/decrease the staff through attrition. As a staff member resigns or retires, that individual would not be replaced unless replacement was critical to the educational process. Some staff positions would be eliminated; however, those employees would be transferred to other necessary and vacated positions.. Mr. Fry added that the administration could not guarantee this would happen if student enrollment decreases dramatically; however, the intent is to proceed as outlined above.

Big Spring School Board Special Meeting Minutes ~ Monday, July 19, 2010

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT (Continued)

- K. Mr. Russ Gaus**, 308 Steelstown Road, North Newton Township, Newville, PA, addressed the members of the Board of School Directors and questioned whether the enrollment projections account for future new housing developments.

Mr. Fry indicated that PDE enrollment projections are based on live births in the District, and a formula is used to predict the future enrollment. Future housing developments are unpredictable and not used in the PDE enrollment projections.

Housing developments in the Plainfield Elementary School attendance area had been predicted 2.5 years ago; however, because of changes in the economy and water/sewer/zoning restrictions, any development in that area could be three to five years into the future or possibly even longer. Mr. Fry indicated that the District has the architectural plans for the construction of a new Plainfield Elementary School if enrollment warrants a new facility in the future.

In response to a question from President Wolf, Mr. Fry indicated that the District could accommodate an additional 120 elementary school students, if necessary, after the proposed reconfiguration.

- L. Brett Brenize**, 355 Kerrsville Road, Carlisle, PA, addressed the members of the Board of School Directors and questioned what plans the Board had for the Plainfield Elementary School building.

President Wolf indicated that this was still a matter of discussion. Two options are being considered: Maintain the building in its current condition or demolish the building and preserve the site for future development.

In response to a question from Mr. Brenize, Mr. Wolf indicated that the District is not considering the sale of the property.

In response to a question from Mr. Brenize, Mr. Fry indicated that the 2010-2011 kindergarten enrollment is 162 students at this time; however, Mr. Fry indicated that he expects that number to increase to approximately 180 students.

- M. Ms. Angie Miller**, 204 Milwick Road, Carlisle, PA, addressed the members of the Board of School Directors and questioned how the District would ensure that her two diabetic children would be safe on the long bus ride from the far northeast corner of the District to Newville when the bus driver is not trained to identify when a diabetic is in distress.

Mr. Fry indicated that some bus routes would not increase in length; however, in a situation like Ms. Miller's, Mr. Fry indicated that the District would provide special transportation for any student, K-12.

Ms. Miller indicated that her children would be attending three different schools in a six-year period, and she questioned how the nurses would be able to provide adequate care for her children. Ms. Miller indicated that it is difficult dealing with diabetes on a daily basis, and the school transitions would make it even more difficult. Ms. Miller indicated that several other Plainfield Elementary School parents are in the same situation with diabetic children.

Big Spring School Board Special Meeting Minutes ~ Monday, July 19, 2010

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT (Continued)

M. Ms. Angie Miller (Continued)

Mr. Fry responded that the administration would ensure that the nurses in each building would be apprised of her children's medical conditions and would be prepared to meet their medical needs.

In response to a question from Ms. Miller, Mr. Fry indicated that although the schools used as examples for the K-3/4-5 configuration in this evening's presentation have fewer square miles, Big Spring compensates by offering more buses to transport students.

N. Ms. Trina Kennedy, 208 Leeds Road, Newville, PA, addressed the members of the Board of School Directors and indicated that she, too, has a diabetic child at Oak Flat Elementary School. Ms. Kennedy indicated that in a smaller school environment, her child's classmates know when her child is having a diabetic incident and they report that to the staff members. Ms. Kennedy indicated that, in her opinion, in a larger school environment, classmates would be less likely to identify and report when her child is having a diabetic incident. Ms. Kennedy indicated that this would be the case not only for diabetics, but for asthmatics as well. Ms. Kennedy indicated that the health concerns for her child extend from the long bus ride and throughout the entire school day.

O. Ms. Johanna Durff, 168 Horse Killer Road, Shippensburg, PA, addressed the members of the Board of School Directors and questioned if an alternative configuration would be considered or if the proposed K-3/4-5 reconfiguration is a "done deal."

President Wolf indicated that the Board has not made the final decision to adopt the K-3/4-5 grade configuration. Mr. Wolf indicated that the Board would discuss this issue and make a decision in September or October 2010. Mr. Wolf indicated that the Board would like additional information on three K-5 buildings prior to making the final decision.

Mr. Wolf added that, given the student enrollment projections, he believes the District would certainly adopt a plan that includes three elementary school buildings. The question now becomes the grade configuration of those three buildings.

Ms. Durff indicated that she would be interested to hear more about the two different grade configuration options.

President Wolf indicated that all Board meetings are open to the public, and he encouraged everyone to attend the Board meetings on the first and third Mondays of each month, with occasional meetings conducted on the Tuesday evening following a Monday holiday.

P. Christina Ward, 22 Royal Drive, Carlisle, PA, addressed the members of the Board of School Directors and questioned whether the decision has been made to close Plainfield Elementary School.

President Wolf indicated that, from a financial standpoint and based on the condition of the Plainfield Elementary School physical plant that is inadequate to serve the needs of the students, he believes that the most prudent decision is to close Plainfield Elementary School and educate the students in more up-to-date buildings.

Big Spring School Board Special Meeting Minutes ~ Monday, July 19, 2010

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT (Continued)

- Q. Mr. Steven Orr**, 1310 Centerville Road, Newville, PA, addressed the members of the Board of School Directors and indicated that, as a former educator, he looks for two main indicators to determine if education is successful: (1) how individual students perform and how students as a whole perform and (2) parental support of students and school district and teacher support of the students.

Mr. Orr indicated that he likes what he has seen this evening, and he thinks it is a good idea. Mr. Orr suggested that the staff members be polled by secret ballot to determine if they support the K-3/4-5 configuration. Mr. Orr indicated that, in his opinion, if the teachers are opposed to the idea, they “won’t buy into it.” Even if it is a great plan and a better plan on paper, it might not work as well as hoped if the staff members are opposed to the reconfiguration.

Mr. Orr indicated that he would hope the teachers would be in favor of this reconfiguration; however, he would like the Board to have that type of date before making a final decision.

President Wolf indicated that he has spoken with teachers who are in favor of the reconfiguration based on the benefits of meeting with peers, sharing methodologies, and sharing curriculum ideas.

Mr. Orr indicated that while the opinions of a few staff interviews are helpful, he believes that polling the whole of the staff by secret ballot would provide more valuable information.

Mr. Fry indicated that he met with staff members just prior to the initial proposal in May, and he had the sense that staff members were in favor of the reconfiguration.

- R. Mr. Mike Raudabaugh**, 36 Royal Drive, Carlisle, PA, addressed the members of the Board of School Directors and indicated that he presented petitions in opposition of the proposed K-3/4-5 realignment several years ago when it was proposed; however, he had inadequate time to provide a petition for this evening’s meeting. Mr. Raudabaugh indicated that neighboring districts that have adopted the K-3/4-5 configuration phased in the reconfiguration over several years. Mr. Raudabaugh encouraged Big Spring to considering phasing in the reconfiguration, looking at three K-5 schools, seeing how that works, seeing how that affects students, and determining whether PDE’s projected enrollments are accurate.

Mr. Raudabaugh indicated that “it only takes two years for the economy to change and we could have Plainfield back in the mix.” Mr. Raudabaugh indicated that, in his opinion, a transition to K-3/4-5 would be easier once the students have been in the three K-5 buildings for a while.

Mr. Raudabaugh indicated that he appreciates the Board’s consideration of the financial ramifications of the proposed reconfiguration.

- S. Ms. Angela Wilson**, 2101 Pine Road, Newville, PA, addressed the members of the Board of School Directors and questioned what grade configuration would be assigned to Plainfield Elementary School if enrollments increase requiring a school to be built on the site.

President Wolf indicated that the Board would make that decision when the time comes.

Big Spring School Board Special Meeting Minutes ~ Monday, July 19, 2010

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT (Continued)

S. Ms. Angela Wilson (Continued)

In response to a question from Ms. Wilson, Mr. Wolf indicated that if a new Plainfield Elementary School building were constructed in the future, elementary school reconfiguration would be inevitable.

Ms. Wilson noted that she would miss the ability to stay after school and talk with her children's teachers in the future because she would be required to rush to a different school to pick up another child.

VIII. BOARD OF SCHOOL DIRECTORS DISCUSSION

No additional Board of School Directors discussion was conducted.

Mr. Fry indicated that the administration would compile answers to the questions asked this evening and ensure that the information is posted on the District's website.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Norris, seconded by Swanson to adjourn. Roll call vote: Voting Yes: Norris, Piper, Roush, Lopp, Swanson, and Wolf. Motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:17 P.M.

Robert Lee Barrick, Secretary

NEXT REGULAR SCHEDULED BOARD MEETING: MONDAY, AUGUST 2, 2010