

SUMMARY OF ASSUMPTIONS AND CAMPUS NOTES **FUNCTIONAL PROGRAMMATIC CAPACITY STUDY**

by the
Capital Improvements Sub-Committee
Summer 2008

During April, May and June 2008, the Capital Improvements Subcommittee of the Long-Range Facilities Planning Committee undertook a functional, programmatic capacity study of each campus within CISD. The capacity study included multiple campus visits, multiple discussions with administration at each campus and at CISD headquarters as well as a review of existing capacity studies to (i) ascertain a functional, programmatic capacity for each CISD campus and (ii) identify and understand the differences between existing capacity studies before reporting back to the LRFPC. The committee as a whole, working with Dr. Faltys, reviewed each campus report and reached a consensus regarding the final capacity numbers.

The resulting capacity study will be used as a basis among several considerations to help determine optimum usage of each campus as well as future construction and attendance zoning options.

To provide basic equality among schools, the subcommittee made certain assumptions. The assumptions are as follows:

- **ALL CAMPUSES:**
 - School-Wide Program classrooms: Each campus within CISD houses specialized facilities for certain educational programs, including without limitation, physical education, art, music, technology-related education and science. Additional programs with similar specialized facilities exist within each of the upper-level campuses. They include home economics, journalism, television and other programs. Such classrooms set aside by a campus for use by any teacher and class were treated as school-wide program classrooms and removed from the count for available capacity. However, where such specialized facilities may exist, but the campus has scheduled or blocked the room at least five out of seven blocks, the classroom was treated as a regular classroom.
 - Special Needs Pull-Out classrooms: As used within the committee's capacity study, "Special Needs Pull-Out" includes all programs for which the students are removed from regular classroom instruction for special or supplemental instruction. Such classrooms include without limitation, Quest, CARE, Speech and Language Pathology, Content Mastery, ESL, Resource and special education classes. Future changes in applicable legal requirements or in student volume that may affect the number of special needs pull-out classrooms at any campus were not ascertainable, thus the committee assumed that future needs would, at least, not decrease.

- Portables: Because the committee was attempting to identify the true capacity of existing bricks and mortar facilities, the committee excluded classrooms in portables from the total number of available classrooms at affected campuses. However, where portables are currently used to house Special Needs Pull-Out or other specifically purposed classrooms, the classes housed in portables were included in tallies for the number of such classrooms required at each campus.
 - Construction: Because the subcommittee was attempting to identify future capacity needs within the district, all facilities modifications currently underway or already approved by the Board of Trustees were treated as complete.
 - Restrictions on Capacity: Though this study attempts to identify the functional capacity of each campus by accounting for school-wide programs and special needs at each campus, the final capacity provided for each school must be viewed with a careful understanding of the infrastructure and support facilities at each school. Though a campus may have sufficient regular classrooms to hold 700 students, libraries, cafeterias and other support facilities may limit the capacity of the same building to 500.
- **ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS (GRADES PRE-K THROUGH 4):**
 - Capacity for regular classrooms: Though applicable law limits classrooms to a 22:1 ratio, the committee elected to use a 20:1 ratio to determine actual capacity of a facility. The following supports the committee's decision: Functionally, the district is required to plan and provide space for incoming students throughout the school year. If a particular school maintained 22 students in all of its classrooms, a new student would mandate the use of another classroom and teacher. In light of the foregoing and in order to fiscally account for the state mandate, CISD budgets for elementary schools at a 20:1 ratio.
 - District-Wide Assumptions:
 - The committee did not make any assumptions about the number of School-Wide Program or Special Needs Pull-Out classrooms that any campus should have because student volumes at the K-4 level differ too much to support such an assumption. As a result, the subcommittee reviewed the actual programs and special needs at each campus to determine functional capacity.
 - School-Wide Program classrooms were not counted as regular classrooms for capacity purposes.
 - Rooms for Specialty Programs, primarily housed within the middle and high school campuses and not included as regular classrooms, were assigned capacities identical to those of regular classrooms. Though they might be specially outfitted for specific purposes, Rooms for Specialty Programs are populated, often at exceedingly high ratios, throughout the school day.

- Equality of Elementary Campuses: Though the committee elected not to make any district-wide assumptions regarding the number of School-Wide Programs or Special Needs Pull-Out classrooms each campus should house, the committee does recognize that for equality of school facilities across the district, it appears that the following classrooms might be considered “standard” classrooms at each elementary campus:

Description	No. per Campus	Classroom Type	Capacity
Art	1	School-Wide Prog.	0
Behavior	1	Self-Contained	0
Computer Lab	2	School-Wide Prog.	0
Content Mastery	1	Spec. Needs Pull-Out	0
Gym	1	School-Wide Prog.	0
Life Skills	1	Self-Contained	0
Music	1	School-Wide Prog.	0
Quest	1	Spec. Needs Pull-Out	0
Science Lab	1	School-Wide Prog.	0
Other Spec. Ed.	6 ¹	Spec. Needs Pull-Out	0

The specific needs of the student population at each facility determines the number of Special Needs Pull-Out and Self-Contained classrooms.²

- Restrictions on Elementary School Functional Capacity: Certain of the elementary schools cannot accommodate students at full capacity. The affected schools are as follows:

Facility	Restriction
Carroll Elementary	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The small gym, library and cafeteria (only 1 serving line) prohibit pushing the facility to full capacity. 2. Classroom sizes are the smallest of all elementary schools.
Durham Elementary	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shares cafeteria and library with Durham Intermediate School. As currently utilized, both the library and cafeteria are undersized.
Johnson Elementary ³	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Small gym and library.

¹ This number includes small classrooms that would not otherwise be available for regular classroom capacity. The number of small classrooms at each campus may vary, but it is presumed that a campus will assign Special Needs Pull-Out classes with smaller volumes to appropriately-sized small classrooms rather than to full-size classrooms.

² For instance, Old Union currently lacks either any self-contained classrooms. Students receiving such services within the Old Union zone are currently housed at other facilities. Should additional students requiring such services enroll at the campus, self-contained classrooms would be mandatory.

- Early Education: All of the district’s early education classrooms are housed within the elementary facilities. The number of early education classrooms at each campus varies and will reduce available capacity for each regular classroom assigned to the program.

- **INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS (GRADES 5 AND 6):**
 - Capacity for regular classrooms: As approved by the Board of Trustees, CISD’s staffing model at the intermediate level is 26:1. For the purpose of this study, the committee assumed that classrooms remain at 100% capacity when they are used as scheduled classrooms. Teaming and other functional uses may, however, affect the capacity of a scheduled classroom throughout

 - Equality of Intermediate Campuses: The committee elected not to make any district-wide assumptions regarding the number of School-Wide Program or Special Needs Pull-Out classrooms each campus should house. It should be noted, however, that capacity at either intermediate campus remains affected by the functional use of special purpose rooms, specifically the science and computer labs.
 - At Durham Intermediate, the two science labs and two computer labs are not included within the scheduled classroom rotations. Rather, they remain open, dedicated classrooms available, subject to reservation, by any teacher within the building. Accordingly, the potential 104 seats in those classrooms are excluded from the capacity at Durham Intermediate.
 - At Eubanks Intermediate, the two science labs and two computer labs are included in the scheduled rotation of classrooms, meaning that students are scheduled in the rooms throughout each school day and, absent cooperation and an exchange of rooms by affected teachers, the rooms are not available to other teachers for use as needed. As a result, those classrooms (totaling 104 seats) are included in the capacity set forth for Eubanks Intermediate.

The specific needs of the student population at each facility determines the number of Special Needs Pull-Out and Self-Contained classrooms.

- Restrictions on Intermediate School Functional Capacity: Certain of the elementary schools cannot accommodate students at full capacity. The affected schools are as follows:

Facility	Restriction
----------	-------------

³ The committee was unable to conduct a detailed review of the programmatic and functional capacity at Johnson Elementary due to the timing of the study, a change in administrative personnel at the school and the summer closure of the facility for construction purposes. The information provided herein with regard to the facility resulted from a functional review conducted at the 2007-2008 year end by CISD administrative personnel.

Eubanks Intermediate	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Additional School-Wide and Specialty Program computer labs are necessary. 2. Needs eight additional regular classrooms to accommodate existing student population.
Durham Intermediate	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shares cafeteria and library with Durham Elementary. As currently utilized, both the library and cafeteria are undersized. 2. Band space is insufficient. 3. Needs additional regular classrooms to accommodate existing student population. 4. Administrative offices and main entrance are housed on the back of the building with only a single-wide door for access.

- **MIDDLE SCHOOLS (GRADES 7 THRU 8):**

- Capacity: Though regular and Specialty Program classrooms at the middle schools can accommodate students at a minimum of 26:1, student movement throughout a scheduled day, existing programmatic uses of the facilities, budgeting requirements and applicable state staffing standards, mandated that the committee determine actual capacity by assuming that a classroom is occupied at 75% at any given time
- Equality of Middle School Campuses: The committee elected not to make any district-wide assumptions regarding the number of school-wide programs or special needs classrooms each campus should house. However, certain functional and programmatic issues at the middle school campuses affect their respective capacities.
 - Dawson Middle School houses only two School-Wide Program classrooms compared to seven School-Wide Program classrooms at Carroll Middle School. Alternatively, DMS has 15 Specialty Program rooms, while CMS has 11 Specialty Program rooms. Unlike Specialty Program classrooms, School-Wide Program classrooms are not included in the capacity count. By way of example, at DMS, the four science labs were treated as Specialty Program classrooms and included in the capacity for the facility. However, only two of the four science labs at CMS were treated as Specialty Program classrooms. Due to the nature of their use during 2007-2008, the remaining two CMS science labs were treated as School-Wide Program classrooms and removed from the capacity count. Accordingly, it is possible to identify an even greater capacity level (+100) for CMS with more efficient use of the classroom spaces and apple-to-apple treatment of the School-Wide Program/Specialty Program classrooms at each campus. Conversely, DMS cannot derive additional capacity.

- Restrictions on Capacity: Certain restrictions on the capacity at both CMS and DMS exist. They are as follows:

Facility	Restriction
Carroll Middle	1. The small library and cafeteria prohibit pushing the facility to full capacity. In fact, CMS reached its functional capacity at 586 during the 2007-2008 school year.
Dawson Middle	1. Differences in functional and programmatic use of classrooms at Dawson as compared to CMS resulted in a generous capacity count for the DMS facility. Accordingly, where CMS has ample classroom space, including one empty classroom, to accommodate additional students, additional students at DMS will stress available classroom space.

- **HIGH SCHOOLS (CHS: GRADES 9 AND 10; CSHS: GRADES 11 AND 12):**

- The committee determined capacity using the same methodology employed for the middle schools.
- Restrictions on Capacity: Certain restrictions on the capacity at both CHS and CSHS exist. They are as follows:

Facility	Restriction
Carroll High	1. Parking is limited; 2. Additional Computer Lab(s); 3. Additional Art Room(s); 4. Requires Competition Gym with adequate seating; 5. Weight Room/Field House; and 6. Tennis Courts.
Carroll Senior High	1. Parking is limited; 2. Fine Arts spaces are limited; and 3. Guidance offices are too small.

- **DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CAPACITY STUDIES:**

- Functional Capacity: In prior capacity studies, student volume of 85% or more of the assessed capacity at any campus indicated that the facility was full. The use of the 85% guideline accounted for overstatements in capacity, a failure to properly account for programmatic use of a campus and future state mandates affecting available capacity. Because the committee assessed the functional and programmatic uses of each facility, the available capacity at each campus

decreased.⁴ Accordingly, the current capacity study more accurately reflects the capacity of a campus, and the 85% guideline should not be used to interpret the data.

- **CAMPUS SUMMARIES:**

- Exhibit A:⁵ A chart identifying the functional and programmatic capacity at each CISD campus, except Carroll Intermediate. Carroll Intermediate is currently closed and would require significant updates to reinstate its use as an educational facility.
- Exhibit B: Campus maps identifying all School-Wide Program, Specialty Program, Self-Contained, Early Education, Special Needs Pull-Out and regular classroom spaces as utilized during the 2007-2008 school year. The maps do not include portables at any facility.

⁴ For example, a 2002 capacity study used a 28:1 ratio and determined that CMS' effective capacity (after accounting for specialty programs, scheduling and related issues) was 947. Since 2002, CISD has implemented teaming, which reduced capacity by 14% or 132 students. In addition, CISD budgets at 26:1 rather than 28:1 (the maximum allowed by state law), which results in another 102-student reduction in the capacity at CMS.

⁵ Projected enrollment as set forth within Exhibit A will necessarily change upon completion of a new demographic study currently underway.