East Lansing Public Schools
Elementary School Community Bond Committee

Report to the Board of Education
November 28, 2016

Table of Contents

Bond Committee Members

Eric Schertzing, Chair

Daniel Bollman	Henry James	Gretchen Neisler
Robert Burns	Dichondra Johnson	Allison Parker-Johnson
Terah Chambers	Michael Kaplowitz	Karin Pfeiffer
Steven Haider	Judy Kehler	David Powers
Sameer Hamadna	Erica Loomis	Joanne Russell
Richard Houang	Samantha Marable	Lisa Rutkowski
Joan Ilardo	Mark Meadows	Mary Schulz

Bond Committee Objective

"The East Lansing Board of Education has appointed a Community Bond Committee to review and evaluate our six elementary buildings. This work will help assure all buildings offer our students maximum educational opportunities and bring our aging elementary buildings on par with the quality of our high school and middle school buildings, which have undergone significant remodels in the past decade.

The committee's charge is:

1. *Review the current elementary facilities*
2. *Review historical data and past facilities studies*
3. *Review enrollment projections and*
4. *Develop options for presentation to the Board of Education on November 28, 2016."*

"The work of the committee is to: gather available information about the physical plant issues with our elementary facilities including the physical characteristics of the sites where these buildings are located (size, quality of soils, traffic patterns and safety, playground areas, overall suitability and functionality); review educational programming needs for now and the foreseeable future; look at enrollment projections including non-resident enrollment; review bond capacity; consider community input from the community survey; and evaluate other pertinent issues."

Process

The East Lansing Board of Education (Board), Community Bond Committee (Committee) met 12 times in public session to address these matters and formulate the committee recommendations.

The Committee heard presentations from the following organizations and individuals, which influenced the assumptions and recommendations of this report:

- Richard Pugh, E.L. Public Schools Director of Finance: *Enrollment and projections.*
- Christian Palasty, Director of Technology and Media Services, East Lansing: *Technology needs, projections and financing.*
- The Teacher-led Pre-K/Early Childhood Committee of the Board of Education (Pre-K Committee): *Pre-K, special education and early childhood needs; facility recommendations and status.*
- Brian Reeve, E.L. Pubic Schools, Operations, Maintenance Supervisor: *Facility needs, safety, considerations and condition.*
- R.J. Naughton, PFM Financial Advisors: *School bond financing, capacity and estimated millage.*
- Gary Steller, Clark Construction: *Construction process and timelines.*
- Jeff Hoag and Steve Merriman, GMB Architects and Engineers (GMB): *Design concepts, space programming process and space estimates.*

The Committee also acknowledges the input of the ELPS elementary teachers, East Lansing community and members of the Board of Education. We thank ELPS Superintendent, Dr. Robyne Thompson for her valuable insights in working with the committee throughout its deliberations and Gail Gillengerten for providing administrative support throughout this process. We also thank Dori Leyko, Director of Curriculum, who attended Committee meetings and made a substantial contribution to the deliberations.

The individuals listed above made themselves available to the Committee through the meeting schedule and made substantial contributions to the deliberations. Finally, members of the Committee were also able to tour all of the elementary sites, which provided valuable insight into the discussions.

The Committee agreed to this report on November 23, 2016.

Findings

Review the Current Elementary Facilities, Historical Data and Past Facilities Studies

The committee reviewed both the historical and current facility studies, including GMB and Tower Pinkster. Using the information from the site tours and facility studies, a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) Analysis for each building was developed. *(See Appendix 1 – Building Condition SWOT Analysis).*

Committee members were able to tour all six elementary facilities with Brian Reeve, E.L. Pubic Schools, Operations, Maintenance Supervisor, who provided detailed information on each site. Committee members who toured the facilities reported on their impressions about each facility to the larger Committee.

Based on the available data and inspections, the consensus of the committee was that considering the substantial long list of needs, the five buildings currently in use will need renovations that will replace all but the existing walls and roof structure of the facilities. Mold and asbestos abatement will be required and substantial water infiltration issues will need to be addressed, otherwise mold will continue to develop due to water seepage through the floors and tunnel systems. Several of the schools require sprinklers systems in whole or part. Many schools have serious plumbing concerns and inadequate restrooms. A renovation of this magnitude will create a refreshed school but the overall footprint will remain in the same configuration.

The Red Cedar School, the oldest facility, was found to be the building in the best condition, with the highest quality construction. This building has features that allow it to be remodeled into a modern learning environment with opportunity for expansion in the future if needed. Its high ceilings, preserved woodwork, and other attributes made it the best candidate for renovations and to include modern heating and cooling and other systems.

The Qualities of a 21st Century Learning Environment

Based on the input of expert presenters, facility tours and the Bond Committee's own experiences, we have found that in their current form, our six elementary schools do not provide the characteristics of modern, 21st Century Schools. Based on the Committee's review and other resources on 21st Century classrooms, a comparison of the current environment to a 21st century learning environment include:

Current, 50-Year-Old Facilities	21st Century Learning Environment
Students in rows or tables.	Classrooms have a variety of learning spaces with various purposes, such as maker spaces, lab spaces and teamwork spaces.
Students generally work independently.	Students work collaboratively in pairs, and different size groups.
Learning spaces are confined to the classroom.	Learning space is expanded outside the classroom to the outdoors, campus, community, collaborative rooms, media centers, and multi-class spaces.
Classrooms were more teacher–focused, and the teacher was the provider of information.	Spaces are student-centered, and students move to different activities.
Students are passive learners.	Students are active learners and require space to explore, research, design and create.
Curriculum is taught by subject.	Curriculum is integrated, interdisciplinary, and connected to students' interests, experiences, and the real world.
Student performance was based on paper/pencil assessments.	Student performance is based on evidence of learning through assessments, projects, presentations, and other forms.
Textbooks and other print resources were the primary source of information.	Multiple forms of media are used as sources of information.
Students with disabilities were segregated in building, if they were educated at all.	Students with disabilities attend school along with their non-disabled peers, requiring space to accommodate adaptive equipment, wheelchairs and sensory needs.
The demographics of the community were less diverse than today, nor were all needs accommodated.	The community and the East Lansing student population are diverse with a great variety of needs that often require more space, including: intervention, English learning, Title I and other needs.
Source: Above portions of this table were sourced from: 20th vs 21st Century Classroom. 21stcenturyschools.com/20th-vs-21st-century-calssroom.html.8/11/16	
Construction does not easily accommodate well-insulated space or modern, efficient heating and cooling systems.	Walls, windows and ceilings designed to accommodate energy efficient systems and heating and cooling.
Entrance to the building unimpeded.	Entrances to the building driven past the main office for security and other needs.
Sites assumes pedestrian and bus traffic and accommodates minimal interaction.	Sites must accommodate substantial parent-car traffic, buses, and pedestrians with minimal conflict.
Classes are small, with narrow halls, low ceilings and basic box construction with little consideration for special needs students.	Facilities require a substantially larger amount of area, for a modern learning environment, including meeting American with Disabilities Act requirements.

Review Enrollment Projections

The Committee has reviewed district-wide enrollment projections. *(See Appendix 2 – Enrollment Data)* Based on the enrollment data and projections, the Committee assumed the K-5 enrollment would be maintained at approximately 1,630 elementary (resident and School of Choice) students. It should be noted that the provided projections are predicated on the district's SOC population being adjusted to maintain the current population, which will keep the middle school and high school populations at the current enrollment.

We believe that, between reasonable projections of residential student growth and the flexibility in the size of our School of Choice student population, there is no need to plan for growth in the elementary school student population at this time. There is a cost to carrying unneeded space into the future. With that said, it would seem to be prudent to design a school or two to be expandable in the future if conditions appreciably change.

ELPS provides K-5 education in its elementary buildings. There are other populations of students it also serves, including Developmental Kindergarten and Early Childhood Special Education with a population of approximately 55 students.

These issues were further explored in a presentation by a committee member with experience in economics and population projections. *(See Appendix 3 – Section Distribution)*

The Committee was told that the district has no plans in the near (or middle) term to increase the student body size of either the middle or high school. The Committee was also told that in order to maintain the current AP course offerings at the high school, the current high school enrollment level of approximately 1,165 students must be maintained.

The Committee was made aware of and discussed some potential business ventures the Superintendent and members of the Board of Education may be interested in that would utilize portions of district-owned facilities. The district is looking to provide Pre-K services. In addition, the district was approached by Michigan State University to utilize some facility space for infant/toddler care for Michigan State University faculty and students. Currently, the Red Cedar Elementary building is not is use. This asset could be brought back into usage for either or both of these or other potential programming ventures. However, the Committee was not asked to consider these potential opportunities in its recommendations.

Construction Estimates

New Construction:
With input from GMB, Clark Construction and other resources, members of the Committee with experience in architecture, facilities, economics and other disciplines were able to estimate the costs for building five new elementary schools. **It should be noted that these estimates were made for discussion purposes. A more formal estimate created by GMB and Clark Construction will be needed for the creation of a formal bond proposal.** The estimate below is for five new replacement schools, which could replace: Donley, Glencairn, Marble, Pinecrest, and Whitehills to achieve a 21st century learning environment.

The estimates for building these new elementary schools with modern learning environments:

- Small, 290 pupil schools: $13.5 million to $15.0 million per school
- Medium, 350 pupil schools: $15.2 million to $16.9 million

The estimates above include the following:

- Complete construction of modern schools in one or two-story configurations with average cost finishes and systems. Also includes additional specialty areas and a larger amount of area per student.
- Construction costs between $185 and $196 per square foot.
- Demolition and remediation of existing schools: $500,000 (GMB high range estimate - as needed)
- Furniture and furnishing allowance: $440,000 (GMB estimate)
- Site work: parking lots, grading, etc.: $400,000 to $1,000,000 (GMB range)
- Playground equipment: $150,000 to $200,000 (GMB range - as needed)
- Storm water retention: $100,000 to $200,000 (GMB range)
- Soil stabilization: $250,000 to $500,000 (GMB range) Site specific and upper limit not known due to lack of facility project details and soil characteristics.
- Architectural and construction fees.
- Approximately 12% design and construction contingencies.

Renovation Costs:
Renovations costs are more difficult to estimate, but a recent GMB estimate to fully modernize the Red Cedar School determined that a full renovation, which will replace all but the major structure components and add a small expansion, will exceed $9 million. This extensive renovation would include: all new heating and cooling systems, roof, windows, remediation, a small addition for the entryway, electrical system, finishes, technology and substantial site improvements.

Total Estimated Costs:
The Committee evaluated various student enrollment estimates in the cost projections for five replacement schools. However, the final enrollment of the replacement schools and the possible use of Red Cedar school for Pre-K and other programming will be determined by the Board and district leadership. The cost estimates below will also be impacted by operating costs and the distribution of students throughout the elementary schools, as determined by the Board. Two potential scenarios are illustrated below:

Scenario 1:	
Five new, smaller schools:	$67.5 million to $75 million
Renovation of Red Cedar:	$9 million
Total:	$76.5 million to $84 million
Scenario 2:	
Two small, three medium schools:	$72.6 million to $80.7 million
(similar to current district configuration)	
Renovation of Red Cedar:	$9 million
Total:	$81.6 million to $89.7 million

The Committee noted that the cost projection for the 2011 bond was significantly less than the

estimates for rebuilding and renovating the six schools outlined in this report. We note that this is likely due to two factors. First, the 2011 bond amount was predetermined and limited and we believe design and programmatic decisions were likely underestimated. Second, construction costs have increased since 2011.

Bond Capacity

Based on the presentation of R.J. Naughton, East Lansing Public Schools is not likely to reach its full bond capacity based on current proposals being discussed. The determining factor will be a decision by the community on what it chooses to afford. Further, the Committee desires a bond proposal that is fiscally responsible to East Lansing taxpayers and creates 21 century learning environment where all our students receive the best educational experience.

To illustrate the impact of bonding on East Lansing's property taxpayers, the PMF Group provided the below table.

SCHOOL DISTRICT OF THE CITY OF EAST LANSING
PROPOSED SCHOOL BUILDING AND SITE BONDS

SUMMARY OF IMPACT OF BONDING ON PROPERTY TAXPAYERS

		Estimated	Estimated Initial Tax Increase*											
Table	Bond Amount	Increase in Debt Levy	$90,000 Taxable Value	$100,000 Taxable Value	$110,000 Taxable Value	$120,000 Taxable Value	$130,000 Taxable Value	$140,000 Taxable Value	$150,000 Taxable Value	$160,000 Taxable Value	$170,000 Taxable Value	$180,000 Taxable Value	$190,000 Taxable Value	$200,000 Taxable Value
Tabl_15a	$58,400,000	1.795	$161.55	$179.50	$197.45	$215.40	$233.35	$251.30	$269.25	$287.20	$305.15	$323.10	$341.05	$359.00
Tabl_16a: Bonds issued in 2 Series, 1 Year apart														
	74,000,000	1.795	161.55	179.50	197.45	215.40	233.35	251.30	269.25	287.20	305.15	323.10	341.05	359.00

* Based upon Taxable Value (defined as the lessor of: A) assessed value [1/2 of true cash value]; or B) the prior year's Taxable Value, less losses times the rate of inflation plus additions, whichever is less).
For example, a person with a 'Taxable Value' of $130,000 (which would be a market value of at least $260,000 or more), would have an increase in taxes of approximately $233.35.
NOTE: If taxpayer itemizes deductions on federal income tax return and/or qualifies for the State homestead property tax credit, the "net" tax increase would be less than shown above.

PMF group also demonstrated that as much as $100 million of bonds could be issued and paid over longer terms to keep the impact on the property taxpayers similar to those illustrated above.

Community Survey

A community survey was conducted and the results were shared with the Committee. *(See Survey Results at: http://elps.k12.mi.us. At the Bond Information tab.)* The community survey provided valuable information. Even though no direct question was asked about the number of elementary (K-5) school facilities, this issue was discussed in various ways (directly and indirectly) throughout the survey by several respondents. Some committee members conducted a SWOT looking at the options of having 4, 5 or 6 facilities for K-5 education *(Appendix 4 - Number of K-5 Buildings SWOT).*

Community members were asked whether they would support a bond proposal. 75% of respondents said they would support one and 15% would not support one.

Assumptions

Following data gathering, the Committee concluded that several assumptions and facts needed to be stated to place the evaluation into perspective.

1. The School District should provide the best educational experience for all ELPS students in facilities conducive to 21st century learning.
2. Any bond proposal must be fiscally responsible for the taxpayers/residents of East Lansing.
3. The current physical condition of each building requires immediate attention. Doing nothing is not an option. The District must renovate or build new.
4. Deferring investing in our schools will cost the district more money in the long run because we face the need for immediate repairs at many of the facilities, the cost of operating the dated facilities is very high, and the current facilities are negatively affecting our current educational environment.
5. Flexible modern, shared spacing needs to be included in renovation plans or new building plans.
6. The middle school and high school are assumed to be the right size for the current enrollment, and for the purposes of this report are assumed will not be expanded or reduced.
7. For the purposes of this report, elementary schools should continue to be programmed K-5; however the facilities should be designed to allow for flexible future programming over the useful life of the building.
8. Student safety is a top priority.
9. In a two-story building, first grade and younger student programming must be held on the first floor, by state regulations.
10. Current buildings were not built to accommodate current levels of pedestrian, vehicular and bus traffic. Traffic flow and parking must be considered.
11. The District should assume 1,630 K-5 elementary students will be enrolled in our elementary schools and build or renovate accordingly. Enrollment projections are stable. The schools of choice student population should be balanced to properly maintain the current population of elementary, middle school and high school students.
12. Pre-K programming is desirable and should be accommodated in some ELPS facilities sometime in the near future.
13. Bond financing will be needed to renovate and/or rebuild the District's elementary facilities.

Committee Evaluation

The recommended bond amount is dependent on the number of facilities and whether to build new or renovate and expand current facilities. The Committee is unanimous in its evaluation regarding the sites. The Committee's charge was to evaluate all 6 elementary facilities.

Based on the review of the condition of the six sites, as outlined above, the following is the Committee evaluation.

- Each facility site should be considered independently as to whether to build new or remodel and expand the current facility.

- Based on the construction cost data the Committee received from GMB Architecture and Engineering, the difference between new construction and a renovation with expansion will save no more than 25%. Renovation for most sites will not fully achieve the 21 century learning environment provided with new construction.

- The Red Cedar School, while currently closed, is in the best condition of the current schools, with the highest quality construction and features that will allow it to be remodeled into a 21st century learning environment. Red Cedar School can be renovated.

- Most of the sites are smaller than ideal for modern buildings. In an ideal situation, the lot sizes for each school would range from 12 to 14 acres. The lot sizes of Whitehills and Glencairn are less than half of the ideal site size. The maximum student populations of these sites are less than the other 4 sites. These two sites can be rebuilt to accommodate smaller student populations than the other sites. Soil conditions at the Glencairn site will need to be addressed.

- Demolition and construction activity can be phased in a manner that allows some existing facilities to remain in operation to house elementary students from schools on sites that cannot accommodate two buildings.

Future Committee Activities

The Committee members are deeply appreciative of the confidence the Board has placed in them. During the course of the Committee deliberations, the Committee has obtained substantial knowledge and expertise relative to the six elementary sites within the East Lansing School District. The Committee therefore recommends that after the Board concludes its own deliberations and if it recommends that a bond be put before the voters of the School District, this Committee be reconstituted with the same membership as a Bond Implementation Committee, to oversee the demolition, reconstruction and renovation of the District's elementary facilities and make further recommendations to the Board.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Building Condition SWOT Analysis

Donley Elementary	Glencairn Elementary	Marble Elementary	Pinecrest Elementary	Red Cedar Elementary	Whitehills Elementary
Built: 1951 *Renovated: 1991* *Square Footage: 42,120* *Acreage: 19* *Student Enrollment as of 9/2016: 283* *Exterior rating: 4.83/10*	*Built: 1952* *Renovated: 1991* *Square Footage: 35,560* *Acreage: 5.3* *Student Enrollment as of 9/16: 303* *Exterior Rating: 5.5/10*	*Built: 1952* *Renovated: 1993* *Square Footage: 44,440* *Acreage: 8* *Student Enrollment as of 9/16: 359* *External Rating: 5.6/10*	*Built: 1960* *Renovated: 1991* *Square Footage: 44,740* *Acreage: 8.15 (Tower Pinkster)* *Student Enrollment as of 9/16: 412* *External Rating 5.3/10*	*Built: 1948* *Renovated: 1991* *Square Footage: 45,360* *Acreage: 10* *Student Enrollment as of 9/2016: 0* *External Rating 5.0/10*	*Built: 1963* *Renovated: 1991* *Square Footage: 38,970* *Acreage: 5.5* *Student Enrollment as of 9/16: 326* *External Rating 4.8/10*
Strengths/Opportunities: • Site is large and meets size recommendations. • Lot site can accommodate construction during the school year. • Gym is in good shape. • Can improve learning environment for students. • Eliminate portable units. • Majority of flooring is in fair condition except for corridors & classroom walk-off areas. • Majority of walls are painted – concrete masonry unit – in fair to good shape. • P/A Systems are integrated into phone	Strengths/Opportunities: • Upper and lower elementary playgrounds are separate; equipment appears very new. • Centrally located near a large student population.	Strengths/Opportunities: • Playground equipment appears to be newer and in good condition; adequate open space for play fields. • Doors/Hardware: 1990's additions in "good" condition.	Strengths/Opportunities: • Playground equipment appears to be newer and in good condition; adequate open space for play fields.	Strengths/Opportunities: • Playground equipment appears to be newer and in good condition; minimal open space for play fields; exterior courtyard utilized for play space. • Potential opportunity to partner with MSU for Early Childhood education programming.	Strengths/Opportunities: • Paving is in good condition. • Playground equipment appears to be newer and in good condition; some open space for play fields.

system as part of recent tech bond. • Doors/Hardware: 1990's additions are in good shape.					

Donley Elementary	Glencairn Elementary	Marble Elementary	Pinecrest Elementary	Red Cedar Elementary	**Whitehills Elementary**
<u>Weaknesses/Threats:</u> • Site drainage concerns at south end; grade slopes toward building. • Roofing: +/- 60% of roofing in need of replacement in 5-7 years. • HVAC retrofitting issues. • Windows are in need of replacement. • Moisture concerns – summer mold. • Doors/Hardware: earlier phases – "poor," door knob hardware doesn't meet barrier free standard. • Existing ceiling tiles are worn, sagging in certain locations and low in height. • Ventilation/Mechanical /Plumbing/Power/Fire/ Lighting all need to be upgraded or replaced. • Portable units/classrooms. • Pedestrian safety issues/bus crossing.	<u>Weaknesses/Threats:</u> • Attempt to separate bus and vehicular traffic, but not enough room on site to do this effectively. • East side paving is in need of replacement. • Parking lot has no drains. • This lot is 5.3 acres; very undersized for this population. A minimum of 12 acres is recommended for this population of 202 students. (School Facility Assessment 4/4/2011). • Site conditions – Low area floods every spring. Poor soils. Gym addition had severe foundation issues. Future additions not recommended (School Facility Assessment 4/4/2011). • Significant grade changes to the west. • Very little room for site improvements. • Very little onsite parking. • Parking lot has no drains. • Roofing: +/- 40% of roofing in need of replacement in 5-7 years.	<u>Weaknesses/Threats:</u> • Attempt to separate bus and vehicular traffic, but traffic shares common entrance, causing interference. • Location of office is remote relative to parking/drop-off/pick-up. • North side paving is in need of replacement. • Very little room for site improvements to the East/South. • Very little onsite parking. • Roofing: +/- 20% of roofing in need of replacement in 4-7 years. • Masonry cracks and missing mortar. • DEFS soffits require general maintenance (painting). • Windows are in need of replacement.	<u>Weaknesses/Threats:</u> • South side paving is in need of replacement. • Attempt to separate bus and vehicular traffic, but each zone is undersized for its use; Pinecrest Drive becomes one-way during pick-up; disruptive to through traffic. • Parking lot should have another exit • Roofing: +/- 45% of roofing in need of replacement in 2-3 years, +/- 40% of roofing in need of replacement in 5-7 years. • Masonry cracks and missing mortar. • Windows are in need of replacement. • Exterior joint sealants and caulking needs. • Recommend replacement of	<u>Weaknesses/Threats:</u> • Buses drop off on street – not ideal. • Very little room for site improvements to the east and north. • Very little onsite parking. • Roofing: +/- 60% of roofing in need of replacement in 3-7 years. • Masonry cracks and missing mortar. • Windows are in need of replacement. • Wood soffits should be painted and/or clad w/metal soffit panels. • Exterior joint sealants and caulking needs. • Recommend replacement of majority of exterior doors/frames. • Portable units.	<u>Weaknesses/Threats:</u> • Traffic Flow: Attempt to separate bus and vehicular traffic, but each zone is undersized for its use. • Significant grade change to the west. • Very little room for expansion on this site; some space to work with at SE corner. • Very little onsite parking. • Roofing: +/- 65% of roofing in need of replacement in 3-5 years. • Windows are in need of replacement. • Exterior joint sealants and caulking needs. • Recommend replacement of majority of exterior doors/frames. • Portable units.

• Library, Hallways and cafeteria too small. • Bus/vehicle traffic mixing during afternoon pick-up time, despite attempts to separate traffic. • Casework/Cabinetry: Mix of wood and plastic laminate; majority in the "fair" to "poor" range (water damage, hardware concerns). • Locker sizes vary; rusted bases, bent tops, 9" lockers have limited functionality due to size.	• Evidence of minor brick spalling/cracking; history of major foundation settling at gymnasium. • DEFS soffits require general maintenance (painting). • Windows are in need of replacement. • Exterior joint sealants and caulking needs. • Exterior cedar siding needs general maintenance (painting). • Portable units/classrooms.	• Exterior joint sealants and caulking needs. • "Poor" door knob hardware doesn't meet barrier free requirement; many existing wood doors should be replaced. • Ceilings: Existing 2x2 tiles are worn, sagging in certain locations; existing tectum ceiling panels in "fair" to "good" condition. • Lockers: Locker sizes vary throughout; tall relative to grade levels; when double loaded they create tight corridors; locker bases are rusted. • Curtains in open concept classrooms are acoustically inadequate. • Classroom sizes and configurations vary drastically throughout the building. • Recommend replacement of all major mechanical equipment. • Update all controls to DDC (trend – district standard).	majority of exterior doors / frames. • Very little room for site improvements to the east / south and north. • Very little onsite parking. • Portable units.		

		• Update ventilation to meet current mechanical codes. • Plumbing Systems: Combination of galvanized and copper piping, improper isolation between materials; replace all galvanized and check copper at joints. • Barrier free concerns at older toilet rooms; need additional fixtures to meet minimum plumbing code requirements. • Building isn't fully sprinkled; some limited use domestic heads. • Sanitary lines (in slab) are rotting; need to be replaced.			

Appendix 2 – Enrollment Data

STANFRED CONSULTANTS
ENROLLMENT PROJECTION
VERSION V-PC

PAGE 11
DATE 1-21-2016
ID 33010

EAST LANSING - FTE GEN ED(RES AND NON RES)

STANDARD UNIT LIMIT (X) 1.50

ENROLLMENTS BY GRADE GROUP - MOST LIKELY PROJECTED ENROLLMENT

YEAR	K- 3	4- 6	7- 9	10-12	K- 4	5- 8	9-12	K- 5	6- 8	6- 9
	K-12	1- 3	K- 6	7- 8	7-12	1- 6	K- 8	1-12	9-10	11-12
16-17	1066.	826.	868.	831.	1334.	1134.	1123.	1604.	864.	1156.
	3591.	784.	1892.	576.	1699.	1610.	2468.	3309.	567.	556.
17-18	1052.	805.	902.	819.	1317.	1141.	1120.	1585.	873.	1174.
	3578.	767.	1857.	601.	1721.	1572.	2458.	3293.	592.	528.
18-19	1039.	797.	910.	827.	1301.	1132.	1140.	1566.	867.	1180.
	3573.	757.	1836.	597.	1737.	1554.	2433.	3291.	613.	527.
19-20	1052.	770.	905.	862.	1293.	1107.	1189.	1555.	845.	1172.
	3589.	765.	1822.	578.	1767.	1535.	2400.	3302.	639.	550.
20-21	1059.	754.	881.	895.	1308.	1077.	1204.	1549.	836.	1145.
	3589.	768.	1813.	572.	1776.	1522.	2385.	3298.	635.	569.
21-22	0.	743.	872.	901.	0.	1057.	1208.	0.	808.	1115.
	0.	774.	0.	565.	1773.	1517.	0.	3290.	615.	593.
22-23	0.	751.	843.	895.	0.	1042.	1198.	0.	791.	1094.
	0.	0.	0.	540.	1738.	0.	0.	0.	609.	589.
23-24	0.	754.	826.	873.	0.	1028.	1173.	0.	779.	1079.
	0.	0.	0.	526.	1699.	0.	0.	0.	602.	571.
24-25	0.	758.	813.	864.	0.	1040.	1140.	0.	788.	1064.
	0.	0.	0.	537.	1677.	0.	0.	0.	575.	565.
25-26	0.	0.	822.	833.	0.	1046.	1118.	0.	791.	1076.
	0.	0.	0.	537.	1655.	0.	0.	0.	560.	558.
26-27	0.	0.	826.	816.	0.	0.	1104.	0.	795.	1083.
	0.	0.	0.	538.	1642.	0.	0.	0.	572.	532.
27-28	0.	0.	830.	807.	0.	0.	1092.	0.	0.	0.
	0.	0.	0.	545.	1637.	0.	0.	0.	572.	520.
28-29	0.	0.	0.	815.	0.	0.	1104.	0.	0.	0.
	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	573.	531.
29-30	0.	0.	0.	819.	0.	0.	1111.	0.	0.	0.
	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	580.	531.
30-31	0.	0.	0.	823.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	532.
31-32	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	539.

Appendix 3 - Section Distribution

- How can the current 68 classrooms be distributed across various numbers of elementary buildings?
  - The model below allows the school district to consider potential options for the distribution of K-5.
  - Listed below as Schools A through F.
- All are various options, all of which assume we want to retain K-5 configurations.
- If the school district were to move away from all schools being K-5, it would open up many more potential configuration options.
- Here is the rationale behind these potential options:
  - 1 – Six Schools Option: Uses six schools, keeping 2 classes per grade in as many schools as possible. Implication: School F cannot maintain 2 sections of each grade K-5.
  - 2 - Five Schools Option A: Uses five schools, building two sizes of schools. A and B are similar to Pinecrest, and D through F are similar to Whitehills or Glencairn.
  - 3 – Five School Option B: Uses five schools, keeping more buildings of similar size.
  - 4 – Four School Option: Uses four schools if the school district wants to have 3 sections per grade, delivering schools of 432.

	Sections/School					
Options:	School A	School B	School C	School D	School E	School F
1 – Six Schools Option:	12	12	12	12	12	8
2 - Five Schools Option A:	16	16	12	12	12	0
3 – Five School Option B:	14	14	14	14	12	0
4 – Four School Option:	18	18	18	14	0	0

Appendix 4 - Number of K-5 Buildings SWOT

NOTE: This is a plan for # of buildings, this does not address new construction versus renovation – just total # of buildings
Assumptions: The community highly values Academics. The Committee should make recommendations that have long-term sustainability.

	4 Schools	5 Schools	6 Schools
Weaknesses/ Threats	• Boundaries would change • There would be 2 district owned sites that could be used for other purposes (e.g., Pre-K Programming, City Parks & Rec, Other Specialized Programming) – but unknown • Community response may be negative based on previous experience	• Some schools may only have one section per grade o Little flexibility in classroom assignments o Less ability for teachers to collaborate with their peers • Possibility of not relieving overcrowding issues in some buildings • One district owned site that could be used for other purposes (e.g., Pre-K Programming, City Parks & Rec, Other Specialized Programming) – but unknown	• Larger operating costs than currently being spent-approximately $400,000 • Some schools may only have one section per grade o Less flexibility in classroom assignments o Less ability for teachers to collaborate with their peers • Itinerant teachers would have to travel during the day • Boundaries would change • Construction/renovation costs will be higher • Community response may be negative (based on previous experience)
Strengths/ Opportunities	• Less operating costs- According to the FY2015-16 E.L. School Operative cost, each of the current elementary schools has an operating cost between $393,498 and $479,013 annually. A significant portion of this expense could be eliminated or devoted to programming by running fewer schools. o Savings could cover needed technology costs without the need to pursue an additional bond o Savings could be used for programming, training, or other needs	• Boundaries would remain the same • Operating costs would remain the same	• Smaller schools may feel more homey

	• Students are more likely to know others in their classes when they transition to the Middle School
	• K-5 buildings could be approximately the same size
	  o More likely to ensure programming equity
	  o More flexibility in classroom assignments
	  o Likely to have 3 sections per grade
	  o More likely to have smaller class sizes
	  o Teachers would have the ability to collaborate daily with their peers
	  o Itinerant teachers would be full time at one building
	• K-5 building construction costs could be a little less (Lower amount to bond)		