

## Trimble County Local District Facility Plan Agenda (6), 05 03 16

5:30 P.M. @ Trimble Co. High School

1. Call to order:
2. Chairman's comments:
3. Review and approval of Minutes
4. Review of Forum comments from last week
5. Facilitator/Outline of meeting:
  - a. Committee work session to develop facility plan concepts
  - b. Review and discussion of last week's proposal
  - c. Pro's and Con's (see summary notes)
  - d. Other options
  - e. Review of summary items

Forum to follow tonight's meeting

Next Week

1. Review Summary of topics (see following draft)
2. Review capacity information

3. Generate educational program input from school centers for next meeting. Include student input.

4. Discuss current plan and recommend changes.

- a. Organizational structure
- b. Projects and estimates
- c. Project priorities
- d. Capacity /enrollment

Things to accomplish moving forward: Committee charges:

Revise existing plan, including the following:

- a. Review and update organizational structure
- b. Review and update new construction and renovation needs, with revised architectural and engineering estimates
- c. Develop working draft District Facility Plan (DFP) document: Discuss projects and priorities.
- d. Forward draft DFP to KDE for approval

**Next LPC meeting Tuesday April Tuesday May 10<sup>th</sup>**

Draft summary of major topics discussed to date. (red notes were added from last weeks presentations).

1. Facilities affect student and staff performance, extent of parental involvement, ability to recruit and retain quality staff, and provide for the health and safety of occupants.

2. School facilities in Kentucky shall achieve equity and adequacy per the Kentucky Constitution.

3. Per 702 KAR 4:180 all school public school facilities are evaluated every 4 years by licensed architects and engineers in accordance with state standards and a capital plan (District Facility Plan, DFP) is developed.

4. School construction is accomplished through the following 3 restricted capital funds:

a. Capital Outlay (KRS 157.420)(\$100 per student per year based on the average daily attendance)(attendance based model).

b. Facility Support Program of Kentucky (KRS157.440)(local 5 cent taxed is levied per \$100 assessed property value and equalized at 150% of the statewide average assessment per student). Wealth and attendance based model).

c. School Facilities Construction Commission (KRS 157.611) funding is provided by the General Assembly to districts based on a pro rata share of facility need as defined by the District Facility Plan divided by the statewide unmet need). (facility needs based model)

5. Urgent Needs funding has been used by the General Assembly in addition to the 3 statutory methods above to improve vertical equity and adequacy when necessary. In order to qualify districts must have facilities in the highest priority of the Parsons Facility evaluation 2010, and have committed 10 cents revenue to their building fund.

6. All restricted funds are accessed by way of priority through a district's facility plan, which is established by the Local Planning Committee (LPC), Local School Board, and Kentucky Board of Education, through a system of public forums and hearings.

7. 702 KAR 4:180 sets the measures of all school facilities and management facilities including but not limited to relative condition, capacity, educational standards, and cost of renovation and replacement.

8. The District Facility Plan uses holistic measures including, cost of delivery of services, condition and ability of facilities to support a modern educational program, transportation, and demographic data and trends.

9. Funding for operations and facilities is generally supported in the SEEK educational formula through student attendance (average daily attendance, ADA). ADA in Trimble has dropped around 250 students in the past 10 years about a 20% decline. This has cost Trimble county about \$1,000,000 per year in SEEK revenue.

10. It is important for LPC's to review and determine the educational organizational structure or its preschool through 12<sup>th</sup> grade alignments for each facility. The number of transition points can be a risk factor, and in any case, boards should collaborate among grades and facilities for every student to have a smooth and seamless transition to the next grade.

11. DFP capital priorities shall be established in priority order in accordance with regulatory guidelines, with education facilities first and management support facilities last.

12. It is important for LPC's to understand bonding to mitigate capital needs, and operations expenses to understand the equity and adequacy of the cost of delivery of services. Bonds are sold in 20 year increments. Local bonding is about \$200,000. An additional \$360,000 shall be available in July 2016.

13. School facilities are generally measured on 30 cycles. At the end of a buildings 30 year functional life it can be assumed that all major systems except structure may need replacement.

14. About 65% of Trimble County revenue comes from the state.

15. Demographic trends indicate a slow but continuing decline in school age population in Trimble County.

16. A proposal was reviewed by the committee that proposes the following:

A. A change in organizational structure from P-5, 6-8, 9-12 to P-6, 7-8,9-12. This revision would move sixth grade students from the existing middle school facility to Bedford and Milton Elementaries respectively. There is adequate capacity at each facility. The change would also propose that 7-8 grades currently housed at the existing middle school facility, be moved to the existing high school and housed in the newer wing (1994 addition) and adjacent areas.

B. The purpose of the existing middle school would be revised to house educational programs and staff .

C. Some pros expressed to the proposal are as follows:

a. proposed organizational structure reduces (by one) the number of educational transition points, theoretically improving the tracking of student progress and the continuity of individual student experience.

b. The proposal increases the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade student academic offerings, and after school experiences. Data support from like

sized districts of similar socioeconomic composition have had success with the configuration.

c. In accordance with demographic trends of declining student population, the proposal would cause better utilization of existing space, maximizing facilities of best condition and educational suitability to house students.

d. Reduces operational expenses, including staffing, utility and maintenance costs.

e. Has little if any negative impact on the cost of transportation.

f. In accordance with limited resources for capital bonding, consolidates a capital priority for students without a conflict of a second priority (of equal importance), providing one focus for a student focused capital improvement.

g. The proposal may provide leadership and growth opportunities for 6<sup>th</sup> grade students to better prepare them for 7<sup>th</sup> grade.

D. Some cons expressed to the proposal were as follows:

a. 6<sup>th</sup> grade students will not identify with the middle school and may consequently view the change as lowering growth opportunities to higher grades.

b. 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grades will be in close proximity to older students, causing possible concern about bullying.

