Long Range Educational Facilities Plan Work Group Meeting

Tuesday, October 21, 2014

# Agenda

- **Subcommittee Reports**
  - Facility Capacity Needs Analysis and Educational Specifications
  - Action Items:
    - *Work Group concurrence with the process*
    - *Provide input on the prioritization methodology*

- **Review Preliminary October 2014 Enrollment Data**

- **Next Steps/Schedule**
  - Discussion of Work Flow
  - Review Draft Rollout Process

Facility Capacity Needs Analysis & Educational Specification Subcommittee Update

ACPS & City of Alexandria

Facilities Work Program

- Goals
  - ✓ Assess existing conditions (interiors complete, review of sites funded in FY 2015)
  - ✓ Review capacity analysis methodology

  - Review how existing capacity is allocated to meet demand
  - Establish guidelines for adding capacity, supporting education
  - Identify potential school site types

Facilities Work Program

- Approach
  - Develop a school facility and site inventory
  - Develop a capacity and utilization assessment for each school site
  - Identify space needs by type of use
  - Review findings of Enrollment Subcommittee and Educational Specifications Subcommittee
  - Develop guidelines for adding capacity
  - Review potential future school sites

Review Work Program

- 1st meeting
  - ◦ Reviewed Work Program/ HGA Scope of Work
  - ◦ ACPS Elementary Standard Program/Room Allocations
  - ◦ Methodology for Elementary and Secondary Capacity Analysis
- 2nd meeting
  - ◦ Reviewed data collected on pilot school
  - ◦ Community uses of school facilities
- 3rd meeting
  - ◦ Review different types of capacity calculation methodologies
- 4th meeting
  - ◦ Review capacity methodologies and make a recommendation
- 5th meeting
  - ◦ Review scope of work for exterior site inventory
  - ◦ Review scope of educational adequacy assessments (EAs)
- 6th meeting
  - ◦ Review (EAs) prioritization methodology

Status on School Facility Inventory– Building Interiors

- Building Interiors
  - ◦ Site Visits 100% Complete
    - Charles Barrett, Cora Kelly, Douglas MacArthur, George Mason, George Washington, Francis Hammond, James Polk, John Adams, Lyles Crouch, Matthew Maury, T.C. Minnie Howard, Mt. Vernon, William Ramsay, Samuel Tucker, T.C. Williams King Street
  - ◦ Sites not included in the scope
    - Jefferson-Houston
    - Patrick Henry
  - ◦ Product
    - Electronic floor plans

Status on School Facility Inventory– Building Interiors

‣ Elementary* "2013 Working Numbers"

Region	Avg Age (Years)	# FSR	Avg Media Center SF	Avg Dining & Food Service SF	Avg Gym SF	% homeroom meeting standard SF	% encore rooms meeting standard SF	% core space meeting standard SF
Central	71	82	2,950	3,689	4,175	43%	22%	50%
East	73	130	2,437	3,508	6,434	35%	8%	44%
West	42	182	2,732	3,926	5,361	81%	50%	50%
Total	61	394	2,684	3,709	5,428	51%	22%	46%

without Jefferson-Houston and Patrick Henry Central- C. Barrett, D. MacArthur, G. Mason
East- C. Kelly, L. Crouch, M. Maury, Mt Vernon, *Jefferson-Houston*   West- J.K. Polk, J. Adams, S. Tucker, W. Ramsay, *P. Henry*

Status on School Facility Inventory– Building Interiors

▸ Secondary "Working Numbers"

	Average Age (Years)	# FSR	Average Media Center SF	Average Dining & Food Service SF	Average Gymnasium SF
Middle	69		4,518	6,648	12,425
High	34	TBD	5,138	11,131	15,943
Second. Total	51		4,828	8,890	14,184
Elem. Total	30	394	2,684	3,709	5,428

Status on School Facility Inventory– Exterior Site Inventory

- Zoning analysis by staff
- Scope of Work for Technical Assistance
  - Describe property ownership and boundaries
  - Usable acreage of open space and recreation features
  - General size and condition of playgrounds
  - Document any natural resources/areas present
  - Document existing storm water management facilities
  - General site accessibility/traffic issues
  - Adequacy of site utilities to accommodate new construction
- Products
  - Report for each school site
  - Electronic site plans

Status on School Facility Inventory– Exterior Site Inventory

- Summary of Site Checklist Items
  - Site grading and topography
  - Trails
  - Athletic fields
  - Large existing trees
  - Court locations
  - Playgrounds
  - Steam valley or other environmental buffers
  - Locations of site vegetation
  - Circulation of buses
  - School entrances
  - Kiss and Ride
  - Parking– staff, visitor, handicap spaces
  - Sidewalks
  - Fire lanes/Loading/Dumpsters
  - Utilities
  - Storm water management inlets
  - Site drainage deficiencies

Status on School Facility Inventory- Exterior Site Inventory

- Pilot School- George Mason
- Group 1
  - Mt. Vernon, Matthew Maury, George Washington, Douglas MacArthur, Charles Barrett
- Group 2
  - Minnie Howard, Cora Kelly, Francis C. Hammond, Lyles-Crouch
- Group 3
  - William Ramsay, James K. Polk, John Adams, Samuel Tucker, T.C. King Street Campus
- Sites Not Included
  - Jefferson-Houston, Patrick Henry

Educational Adequacy Assessments (EAs)

- Goal of EAs
  - Assess the ability of existing facilities to support the educational program
- 3 Major Areas
  - School Site
  - Overall Building Assessment
  - Instructional and Support Spaces
- Utilization

Educational Adequacy Assessments (EAs)

- Evaluation Process
  - Compile and review relevant data
    - Floor plans
    - Interior survey information (SF, acoustics, lighting)
    - Other?
  - Field Visit
    - Field verify and collect additional information
    - Survey building users
  - Summarize
  - Utilization Calculation
  - Prepare report

Educational Adequacy Assessments (EAs)

- Evaluation Factors (see handout)
  - School Site
    - Site Circulation
    - Play Areas/Fields
  - Building Assessment
    - Building Organization
    - Technology and Supporting Infrastructure
    - Safety, Security and Accessibility
  - Individual Spaces
    - Size Requirements
    - Internal Organization and Ancillary Spaces
    - Loose Furnishings
    - Fixed Furnishings
    - Lighting Quality
    - Acoustics
    - Air Quality

Evaluation Methodology: Site and Spaces

- ▸ **Rating Categories–**
- ▸ **Excellent:** The individual space, or aggregate subcategory, meets at least 90 percent of the requirements outlined in the Ed. Specs.
- ▸ **Satisfactory:** The individual space, or aggregate subcategory, meets between 70 and 89 percent of these requirements.
- ▸ **Borderline:** The individual space, or aggregate subcategory, meets between 50 and 69 percent of these requirements.
- ▸ **Inadequate:** The individual space, or aggregate subcategory, meets between 30 and 49 percent of these requirements.
- ▸ **Very inadequate:** The space(s) do not provide at least 29 percent of the requirements.

Site, Building Assessment, Instructional and Support Spaces			
	Rating	**Rang A**	**Rang B**
1	**Excellent**	89.5	100
2	**Satisfactory**	69.5	89.4
3	**Borderline**	49.5	69.4
4	**Inadequate**	29.5	49.4
5	**Very Inadequate**	0	29.4
6	Non-existent	-0.01	-0.01

Learning to Live • Loving to Learn
ACPS
Alexandria City Public Schools

Summary Matrix

	Technology and Supporting Infrastructure					
	Wireless bandwidth is adequate to enable a one-to-one student-to-device ratio	Electricity is provided in multiple locations along all walls throughout building	Clocks and PA systems are integrated, digital, and functioning	Universal wireless access is provided in all spaces of the facility.	Total Score	Percent Compliant
Yes	5	5	5	5		
Some	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5		
No	1	1	1	1		
Room 1	Yes --or-- 5	Some --or--2.5	Yes --or-- 5	No --or--1	13.5	68%
Room 2	No --or--1	Some --or--2.5	No --or--1	Some --or--2.5	7	35%
Room 3	No --or--1	Yes --or-- 5	Yes --or-- 5	Yes --or-- 5	16	80%
Room 4	No --or--1	Some --or--2.5	No --or--1	No --or--1	5.5	28%
Room 5	Yes --or-- 5	Yes --or-- 5	Yes --or-- 5	Yes --or-- 5	20	100%
					62	62%

▸ Handout provided.

Evaluation Methodology: Utilization

▸ Rating Categories

▸ **Excellent:** The school meets the capacity outlined in the educational specifications using the approved planning numbers.

▸ **Satisfactory:** The school is 10 percent over or under the capacity outlined in the educational specifications using the approved planning numbers.

▸ **Borderline:** The school is up to 20 percent under capacity or up to 15 percent over capacity based on the approved planning numbers in the educational specifications.

▸ **Inadequate:** The school is up to 30 percent under capacity or up to 20 percent over capacity based on the approved planning numbers in the educational specifications.

▸ **Very inadequate:** The school does not fall in any of the other ranges.

Utilization				
Rating	**Range A**	**Range B**	**Range C**	**Range D**
1 Excellent	100			
2 Satisfactory	90	99.9	100.1	110
3 Borderline	80	89.9	110.1	115
4 Inadequate	70	79.9	115.1	120
5 Very Inadequate	0	69.9	120.1	300

Evaluation Methodology: Utilization

- ### Rating By Size–
- **Excellent:** Enrollment of 570 is met.
- **Satisfactory:** Enrollment is up to 57 students over or under capacity.
- **Borderline:** Enrollment is up to 114 students under capacity or 58 students over capacity.
- **Inadequate:** Enrollment is up to 171 students under capacity or up to 86 students over capacity.
- **Very inadequate:** Enrollment is more than 171 students under capacity or more than 86 students over capacity.

Utilization - Measured in students		Number of Students		570
Rating	Range A	Range B	Range C	Range D
1 Excellent	570			
2 Satisfactory	513	569	571	627
3 Borderline	456	512	628	656
4 Inadequate	399	455	656	684
5 Very Inadequate	Below --->	398.43	684.57	<---- Above

Evaluation Methodology: Utilization

- ▸ ## Rating by Number of Students–
  - ▸ **Excellent:** The classroom holds all 22 students based on the sqft/student planning size.
  - ▸ **Satisfactory:** The classroom is under or over capacity by 2 students.
  - ▸ **Borderline:** The classroom is under capacity by 4 students or over capacity by 3 students.
  - ▸ **Inadequate:** The classroom is under capacity by 7 students or over capacity by 4 students.
  - ▸ **Very inadequate:** The classroom is under capacity by more than 7 students or over capacity my more than 4 students.

	Utilization			Students	22
	Rating	**Range A**	**Range B**	**Range C**	**Range D**
1	Excellent	22			
2	Satisfactory	20	22	22	24
3	Borderline	18	20	24	25
4	Inadequate	15	18	25	26
5	Very Inadequate	**Below --->**	15	26	**<---- Above**

Prioritization Methodology

▸ Tiers

1. Safety and Security
2. Capacity
3. Support of Educational Program
4. Enhancement to Learning Environment
5. Other

Prioritization Methodology

Rating	Tier	Priority
Very Inadequate	1- Safety & Security	1
	2- Capacity	2
	3- Support of Educational Program	3
	4- Enhancement to Learning Environment	4
	5- Other	5
Inadequate	1- Safety & Security	6
	2- Capacity	7
	3- Support of Educational Program	8
	4- Enhancement to Learning Environment	9
	5- Other	10
Borderline	1- Safety & Security	11
	2- Capacity	12
	3- Support of Educational Program	13
	4- Enhancement to Learning Environment	14
	5- Other	15
Satisfactory	1- Safety & Security	16
	2- Capacity	17
	3- Support of Educational Program	18
	4- Enhancement to Learning Environment	19
	5- Other	20
Excellent	1- Safety & Security	21
	2- Capacity	22
	3- Support of Educational Program	23
	4- Enhancement to Learning Environment	24
	5- Other	25

Status on Educational Adequacy Assessments (EAs)

- Schedule
- Pilot School
- Group 1
  - Mt. Vernon, Matthew Maury, George Mason, George Washington
- Group 2
  - Douglas MacArthur, Charles Barrett, Cora Kelly, Francis C. Hammond
- Group 3
  - Lyles-Crouch, William Ramsay, James K. Polk, John Adams, Samuel Tucker
- Sites Not Included
  - Jefferson-Houston, Patrick Henry, Minnie Howard, T.C. King Street

Preliminary Enrollment Information

- Division wide PK–12th enrollment is 14,156
- Enrollment has increased 4.0% compared to school year 2013–2014
  - +3.4% Elementary
  - +6.0% Middle
  - +5.4% High
- +.32% projection error
- Growth at every grade except 1st and 11th
  - Highest at 2nd, 8th and 9th grades

DRAFT LREFP ROLLOUT PROCESS
December 2014 – March 2015

Dec 2014
- Work Group Reviews / Endorses
- Presentation to PTAC
- Community Engagement via AlexEngage

Dec/Jan 2015
Brief Commissions

Jan/Feb 2015
Brief Council/School Board

Early Feb 2015
Draft LREFP to School Board Public Hearing

Feb 2015
City Council Accepts / Endorses

Feb/Mar 2015
Submit to School Board for Approval

Discussion/Next Steps