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

Joint City Council/ACPS Subcommittee
(4 members)

LREFP Work Group
Explores the major issues that will impact public school facilities over the long term and guides staff in the development of a draft Long-Range Educational Facilities Plan for consideration by the School Board and City Council.

Sub Committees
- Enrollment Forecasts / Demographics
  Establishing sustainable short and long-term enrollment forecast program
- Facility Capacity Needs Analysis
  Understanding current conditions and needs of the existing facilities
- Educational Specifications / School of the Future
  Planning for our future and matching of facilities to our students and our vision.

Joint Long-Range Educational Facilities Plan
To improve facilities planning, accommodate the growing student population, and enhance educational programs and services.
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

1\textsuperscript{st} meeting
\begin{itemize}
  \item Reviewed Work Program/ HGA Scope of Work
  \item ACPS Elementary Standard Program/Room Allocations
  \item Methodology for Elementary and Secondary Capacity Analysis
\end{itemize}

2\textsuperscript{nd} meeting
\begin{itemize}
  \item Reviewed data collected on pilot school
  \item Community uses of school facilities
\end{itemize}

3\textsuperscript{rd} meeting
\begin{itemize}
  \item Review different types of capacity calculation methodologies
\end{itemize}

4\textsuperscript{th} meeting
\begin{itemize}
  \item Review capacity methodologies and make a recommendation
\end{itemize}

5\textsuperscript{th} meeting
\begin{itemize}
  \item Review scope of work for exterior site inventory
  \item Review scope of educational adequacy assessments (EAs)
\end{itemize}

6\textsuperscript{th} meeting
\begin{itemize}
  \item Review (EAs) prioritization methodology
\end{itemize}
Status on School Facility Inventory – Building Interiors

- Building Interiors
  - Site Visits 100% Complete
  - 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”

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

*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”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Age (Years)</th>
<th># FSR</th>
<th>Average Media Center SF</th>
<th>Average Dining &amp; Food Service SF</th>
<th>Average Gymnasium SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle</strong></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>4,518</td>
<td>6,648</td>
<td>12,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>5,138</td>
<td>11,131</td>
<td>15,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second. Total</strong></td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,828</td>
<td>8,890</td>
<td>14,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elem. Total</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>2,684</td>
<td>3,709</td>
<td>5,428</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
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
  - 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
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Rang A</th>
<th>Rang B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>89.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borderline</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Inadequate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-existent</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary Matrix

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

| Total                                   | 62                                             |                                                 |                                                 |                                                 | 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilization</th>
<th>Range A</th>
<th>Range B</th>
<th>Range C</th>
<th>Range D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rating</strong></td>
<td><strong>Excellent</strong></td>
<td><strong>Satisfactory</strong></td>
<td><strong>Borderline</strong></td>
<td><strong>Inadequate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>110.1</td>
<td>115.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>115.1</td>
<td>120.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>120.1</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilization - Measured in students</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>570</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rating</strong></td>
<td><strong>Range A</strong></td>
<td><strong>Range B</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Excellent</td>
<td>570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Satisfactory</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Borderline</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Inadequate</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Very Inadequate</td>
<td>Below ---&gt;</td>
<td>398.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilization</th>
<th>Students 22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rating</strong></td>
<td><strong>Range A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Excellent</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Satisfactory</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Borderline</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Inadequate</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Very Inadequate</td>
<td><strong>Below ---&gt;</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note**: The classroom capacity is 22 students based on sqft/student planning size.
Prioritization Methodology

Tiers

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Inadequate</strong></td>
<td>1- Safety &amp; Security</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2- Capacity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3- Support of Educational Program</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4- Enhancement to Learning Environment</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5- Other</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inadequate</strong></td>
<td>1- Safety &amp; Security</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2- Capacity</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3- Support of Educational Program</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4- Enhancement to Learning Environment</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5- Other</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Borderline</strong></td>
<td>1- Safety &amp; Security</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2- Capacity</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3- Support of Educational Program</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4- Enhancement to Learning Environment</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5- Other</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfactory</strong></td>
<td>1- Safety &amp; Security</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2- Capacity</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3- Support of Educational Program</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4- Enhancement to Learning Environment</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5- Other</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excellent</strong></td>
<td>1- Safety &amp; Security</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2- Capacity</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3- Support of Educational Program</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4- Enhancement to Learning Environment</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5- Other</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
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