

**LONG-RANGE FACILITY PLANNING COMMITTEE  
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS/BUILDING USE SUBCOMMITTEE**

**CISD FACILITY RECOMMENDATIONS**

**DRAFT**  
12-15-08

**INFORMATION EVALUATED MARCH 2008 THROUGH AUGUST 2008**

- *Campus Visits and Staff Interviews:* Visited campuses and CISD administration building. Interviewed principals or assistant principals as well as CISD administration regarding facility needs, uses and existing capacities.
- *Capacity Study:* Analyzed existing district capacity studies<sup>1</sup> and conducted a new capacity study examining the function and utilization of each campus.<sup>2</sup> Multiple campus visits and additional interviews with CISD staff support the study findings. Differences between the existing and new capacity studies are attributable to a more detailed accounting of the actual use of facilities, including programmatic and functional requirements in the current study.
- *Demographic Study:* Reviewed third-party demographic study<sup>3</sup> projecting student populations through 2017. Addressed issues and questions with demographer.
- *Current Zoning Boundaries:* Analyzed existing zoning boundaries at elementary, intermediate, middle and high school campuses and compared those boundaries with projected growth.
- *City of Southlake 2025 Plan:* Reviewed City of Southlake development plan for potential growth areas and remaining available land parcels.
- *Available Land Holdings:* Identified CISD-owned land for potential development or disposal.

**CAPACITY AND USE ISSUES IDENTIFIED**

- After considering all available information, the committee identified multiple capacity and use issues throughout the district. Though the capacity and use issues are complex, the following comparison of total capacity required in 2017 versus the existing capacity of the schools highlights many of the problems.

<b>Level</b>	<b>2017 Required Capacity</b>	<b>Existing Capacity</b>	<b>2017 Capacity Shortfall</b>
Elementary	3317	3034	283
Intermediate	1484	1146	338
Middle	1534	1510	24
High School	1581	1328	253
Senior High School	1572	1425	147

- In addition, several CISD campuses are already housing students at or well in excess of functional capacity. Those campuses are JES, OUES, DIS, EIS and CHS. Insufficient

<sup>1</sup> See TFBC Building Capacity Summary dated January 7, 2003; October 2002 Capacity Study.

<sup>2</sup> See Programmatic Capacity Model dated September 12, 2008 and accompanying Summary of Assumptions and Campus Notes for the Functional Programmatic Capacity Study dated Summer 2008.

<sup>3</sup> Population and Survey Analysts, Demographic Mini-Update Carroll Independent School District, February 2008.

common areas at additional campuses prevent maximizing student populations, especially at CMS, CES and DES/DIS.

### **FACILITY RECOMMENDATIONS**

After analyzing all available information, the subcommittee identified numerous potential solutions to existing capacity and use issues.<sup>4</sup> However, following due deliberation the committee identified the best solution that fits the needs of all campuses and administrative needs within the district.

- **ELEMENTARY:**

- *RES*: Functional capacity of 712. No changes required.
- *CES*: Campus capacity of 694 is functionally limited to less than 600 students by the small gym, library and single cafeteria line. In addition, CES currently houses six early education classrooms for the district further limiting its capacity by approximately 90 students. Expand gym, library and cafeteria to maximize space utilization and the resulting function capacity is 694 students assuming that the early education classes remain at CES.
- *OUES*: Functional capacity of 498. The facility is primed for a 10-classroom addition as a result of planning during its original design. Construct 10 additional classrooms to increase functional capacity to 712 students.
- *DES*: Capacity of 530 limited to a functional capacity of 475 due to facility sharing with DIS. On the CISD-owned 17.61-acre parcel of land located on White Chapel, build a new elementary campus to house up to 712 students. Move all or a portion of the existing DES student population to the new campus. All existing DES administration and staff would move to the new facility on White Chapel.
- *JES*: Capacity of 600. Move portion of student population to new elementary facility on White Chapel.
- Assuming that all campuses, excluding JES (capacity 600), have a functional capacity of about 700 students, the needs of the district through 2017 should be met. However, in order to evenly distribute students through 2017 and beyond, campus boundaries for JES, DES, CES and RES may need to be adjusted. Given that JES campus boundaries must be adjusted sooner rather than later, any adjustments should be expeditiously undertaken.

- **INTERMEDIATE:**

- *DIS*: Following the relocation of DES, DIS would inhabit the entire DES/DIS facility to the extent of its needs, including additional/new band classrooms. Furthermore, the relocation of the DES student population eliminates the functional limitations of the single shared cafeteria and deficient playground areas for DES. However, given that even at full build-out, DIS would not need the entire capacity of DES, the existing DES facility could also be put to other uses, including housing ALL 11 of the district's early education classrooms and a potential daycare facility for CISD employees.
- *EIS*: Functional capacity of 638. Add 8 to 12 additional classrooms.

---

<sup>4</sup> See Capital Improvements/Building Use Subcommittee presentation to the Long Term Facility Planning Committee dated October 7, 2008, pages 16 - 27.

- **MIDDLE SCHOOLS:**

- *DMS*: Functional capacity of 814 with existing creative use of classroom space and only two rooms dedicated to school-wide programmatic uses. CMS has seven rooms dedicated to school-wide uses. As a result, DMS cannot readily accommodate new teaching initiatives currently being considered by the district (i.e., language arts teaming and block scheduling). With projected enrollment growth, the committee recommends the addition of 4 to 8 classrooms.
- *CMS*: Functional capacity of 697 limited to 586 students due to small library and cafeteria. Projected 2017 enrollment is 775 students. The committee recommends that the Board procure a full building assessment to determine whether the facility may be remodeled or has completed its lifespan. If the assessment indicates that the building can be renovated, then CMS requires a new library, increased cafeteria space and at least four additional classrooms to accommodate future student enrollment. If the assessment indicates that CMS is no longer a viable facility or that renovation expenses would be unreasonable, the committee recommends building a new middle school on the CISD-owned 25.25-acre parcel located on East Highland.

*It appears the 25.25 is a typo on HIS form*

- **CARROLL HIGH SCHOOL:**

- Functional Capacity of 1328, including classrooms recently constructed. Projected 2017 enrollment of 1581. The student population will exceed facility capacity no later than 2010. In addition to classrooms, growing programs such as art and the need for additional dedicated computer labs mandate the addition of at least 13 rooms comprised of five art/computer labs, 8 classrooms and converting the existing art rooms into classrooms.

- **CARROLL SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL:**

- Functional capacity of 1425, met sometime after 2014. Projected 2017 enrollment of 1575. With A/B-Day block-scheduling, campus capacity needs are not necessarily equivalent to enrollment. At this time, the committee is not aware of any additional capacity needs at the campus.

- **OTHER DISTRICT FACILITIES/NEEDS:**

- *CISD Administration Building (Kimball)*: Currently houses all CISD administrative personnel, maintenance and operations, the technology hub for the district, and warehousing/receiving functions. The building is over capacity, and the district requires additional technology space for housing the CISD network as well as space for training district personnel. Furthermore, the district requires additional space for receiving, warehousing, and distribution of equipment and supplies.
- *CIS*: Houses the district's diagnosticians. The committee recommends that the Board procure a full building assessment to determine whether CIS is a viable alternative to house CISD's administrative personnel. If CIS can be renovated, move CISD administrative personnel to CIS and expand technology, receiving/warehousing/distribution functions within the existing CISD Administration Building. If CIS cannot be renovated, sell CIS and build new CISD administrative offices on the property south of JES.