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To: School Board District 518  
Superintendent John Landgaard

Date: December 18, 2012

Contained within is the Worthington Public School District’s ‘Space Utilization Analysis Study’ conducted by our firm. The report is a narrative of the critical aspects of the work of the community-based Facilities Task Force; a committee organized to participate in the study process. It also contains information from an in-depth analysis of facility utilization conducted by ATS&R. The contents of this report contain summaries of the four (4) meetings of the committee as well as ‘highlights’ of information given to the Task Force as a part of the review process as well as outcomes from the open public meeting.

To assist the Board in its review of this report, an ‘Executive Summary’ has been included as well as important tables, graphs, diagrams and illustrations that were used throughout the process to assist the Task Force in reaching its conclusions.

Important decisions lie ahead for the Board and administration. It is our opinion that given current enrollments and likely continued growth, the current school facilities will not provide adequate space to meet the educational needs of the children in your community.

We want to thank you, the Board and Superintendent, for providing us with the opportunity to participate in this very important initiative. We wish you the very best as you work to provide your children and community with leadership.

Respectfully Submitted,

David M. Maroney AIA/NCARB  
Partner, ATS&R
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Executive Summary

The School Board and administration of the Worthington School District 518 asked that a comprehensive review of its facilities be conducted; utilizing a community-based task force in an effort to ensure the review process would be transparent and inclusive. The charge of the task force was to, “...review all data related to current facility uses and potential uses and develop a set of ‘best case scenarios’ that would ensure the cost efficient and educational effectiveness of all school facilities...”

A thorough review of the current scheduling practices utilized at the middle school and senior high school was conducted. A review of enrollment trends, both historical and projected was also completed. Building capacities were updated based upon current room utilization and interviews were conducted with students and members of the faculty and administration in each of the four (4) buildings currently used by the District.

Through this careful examination of all pertinent variables related to facility utilization, and from the work of the Task Force, it was found that:

- Each of the three (3) buildings currently in use by the District for K-12 education are at, near, or beyond capacity when considering the desire to maintain current class size levels in the elementary and middle level school buildings and the present array of course offerings at the senior high school.
- The growth in student enrollment is as a result of both an increase in the population in the Worthington community and the attractive nature of programs and services that draw students into the District from neighboring schools through open enrollment.
- The scheduling practices currently being used at both the middle school and the senior high school efficiently use available instructional space.
- Classroom expansions, especially at the middle school, have not been accompanied by expansion of core areas such as gymnasiums, cafeterias, or large gathering and common areas for students.
- There currently exists classroom ‘deficiencies’ in the senior high school including a lack of adequate science lab space to support the science curriculum, music practice/performance space and areas for technology utilization in support of instruction.
- Many classroom sizes at both the middle school and senior high school are significantly below recommended guidelines.
- None of the current buildings has space set aside for staff development.
From their work, the Task Force has identified three (3) possible resolutions that would address the space and educational deficiencies in the District. Those three options include, i) the construction of a new intermediate school for grades 3-5 on the Prairie Elementary School site, ii) the construction of a new high school for grades 9-12 on a new site and iii) the construction of a new intermediate school for grades 4-5 on the Prairie Elementary School site. The Task Force created a list of positives and negatives for each option. After reviewing the entire body of work, the consultants developed a fourth option for the Board to consider. All four (4) options are listed in detail within the content of this report.

The project costs and related tax impact on the community for each option varies. However, the findings of this study suggest that if the Board and community desire to maintain class sizes and course offerings, steps such as those recommended within this report needs to be taken.
Section I: Overview of the Planning Process

The superintendent of the Worthington Public schools, under the direction of the School Board, established the Facilities Task Force to assess the current space utilization challenges facing the district due largely to increases in the student population. The charge of the task force was to, “review all data related to current facility uses and potential uses and develop a set of ‘best case scenarios’ that ensure the cost efficient and educational effectiveness of all school facilities.” Task Force membership included twenty-four (24) representatives from the community, school district, administration and board. Members of the Task Force are listed in Appendix A of this report. The Task Force came together in a series of meetings planned, and designed, to lead toward the development of a set of recommendations that would be forwarded to the School Board for its review and action as deemed appropriate. The Task Force met in a series of four (4) meetings. The content of those meetings is highlighted below.

**Agenda Overview (all Meetings)**

- Meeting 1 – Introduction /Committee Organization /Begin Planning
- Meeting 2 – Facility Capacity /Education Impact /Technology
- Meeting 3 – Options /Costs /Possibilities
- Meeting 4 – Recommendation Formulation for Board

**Community Outreach**

Each meeting was set up to provide Task Force members the opportunity to listen and learn about the current conditions of their schools. This information was provided by the facilitators who conducted multiple interviews of building administrators, staff and students and carried out a thorough analysis of the current scheduling practices utilized throughout the district. At each meeting, Task Force members also participated in small and large group activities leading to the set of recommendations contained in this report. A summary of each meeting can be found in Appendix G.

Each section of this report responds to a question raised within the Request for Proposal. The final section contains the Task Force facilitators’ findings and recommendations for board consideration.
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Section II: Worthington Public Schools’ Utilization Analysis

The Worthington Public School District currently operates in four (4) buildings; each on its own site. Prairie Elementary School is 148,000 square feet and located on the largest district site; fifty-five (55) acres. It lies on the southwest end of the community. Worthington Middle School is 134,428 square feet and is located on the west end of the community. The middle school site size is fifty-two (52) acres. Worthington High School is located in the heart of the community. It is 158,775 square feet and sits on a twenty-three (23) acre site. The Alternative Learning Center and Community Education are in the West School Building. This building is 36,350 square feet. It is located in the west central part of the community. An aerial view of the school district is shown in the illustration below.

Illustration 1: Aerial View of Worthington School District

The study sought to answer the question of whether or not the current utilization of its schools is efficient, or whether the space can be more effectively utilized. It also sought an answer to the question of whether or not there is enough space to accommodate a growing student population and if not, what might be the best means of resolving the problem. A careful review of the scheduling system used in each building was conducted. Diagram 1 below is a graphic display of the current scheduling practice used at Worthington High School (WHS). The diagram is a basic ‘foot print’ of the high school and shows the detail of how each room in the school is being utilized at any given time of the day. WHS operates on a four (4) period daily schedule. A number (0-4) has been placed over each classroom and instructional space. A “0” means that there is no time within the four (4) periods of the day in which the room is vacant and/or could be used for additional classroom instruction. The diagram shows that the majority of existing rooms are scheduled for classroom instruction for all four (4) periods of the school day. The exception is in the specialized classrooms such as agriculture, industrial technology, woods and family consumer science.
Diagram 1: ‘Footprint’ of Worthington High School

The ability of WHS to fully schedule certain regular education classrooms is due to the creation of a ‘teacher planning hub’; the conversion of one classroom (212) into teacher workstations that provide preparation and planning space for faculty while their rooms are occupied by other classroom teachers.

Table 1 shows the number of sections that are taught in various subject areas and the number of classrooms needed. The classroom utilization rate is 85%, which meets ‘industry’ standards. It is important to note that the high school currently functions with nineteen (19) ‘regular education’ classrooms. There are seven (7) that have been dedicated to special education and an additional twenty-five (25) are used for special instruction.
A basic floor plan for Worthington Middle School (WMS) is shown in Diagrams 2 and 3. Diagram 2 shows the clustering of grades into common areas. Diagram 3 shows the room utilization schedule. WMS teachers are afforded two (2) preparation and planning periods throughout the day. Currently, the WMS schedule provides teacher work space within their ‘own’ rooms for all teachers. Based upon the seven (7) and eight (8) period day currently used in the middle school, rooms are considered to be ‘fully occupied’ the entire day if there is a ‘2’ in their space. The diagrams also cite specific unique uses for various rooms within the building.
Table 2 below shows how the middle school is scheduled. It should be noted that the current level of room utilization at the middle school is approximately 76%. This compares to the high school utilization rate of 85%. The primary difference in the utilization rate is due to the scheduling of preparation time in regular education classrooms at WMS compared to the use of the ‘teacher hub’ at the senior high school.

Diagram 4 below is a graphic representation of room utilization at Prairie Elementary School.

Based on data received September, 2012/13 Master schedule Semester 1 / Quarter 2 - 2012/13 school year

Table 2: Classroom Utilization at Worthington Middle School
Currently all spaces that are designed to be regular education classrooms are being used for that purpose. One of the rooms especially designed to be used for activity based learning such as art is used for other purposes. Only one remains open for purposes it was originally designed for. These rooms are scheduled by the teachers/administrators. It is projected that within two (2) years, these rooms will be required to serve as regular classrooms; eliminating available space for project-based classroom activities.
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Section III: Worthington Public Schools Capacity Analysis

The Worthington School District is experiencing growth in its student population. Table 1 in Appendices A shows student enrollments for the past ten (10) years as well as projected enrollments over the next five (5) years. Beginning in the school year 2005, through the current year, the district has experienced an average annual enrollment increase of approximately 4.2%. The rate in the increase in enrollment is projected to continue; although at a slightly lower rate of 3.4% annually.

Table 3 shows the current grade configuration at each school. At the bottom of the table is the current enrollment in each school, as well as enrollments based upon the projected increases in students as shown in Table 1 found in Appendices B. It is important to note that based upon the space analysis and current facility utilization (including maintaining current class size levels and program offerings) each of the buildings will be beyond capacity within the next three (3) years. It is also important to note that both WHS and WMS already exceed their student enrollment capacities.

![Graph 1: Current/Projected Building Capacities](image)

Table 3: Current/Projected Building Capacities

Graph 1 on the following page provides more detail related to the projected growth in student population at Prairie Elementary School. The projected growth data has been developed by the Worthington District Administrative Team. It is based upon the historical changes in student population over the past ten (10) years, and is conservative in nature.

At Prairie Elementary, if the district wishes to maintain its current class size ratios, the building will exceed its capacity as early as the 2014-2015 school year.
Graph 1: Projected Student Enrollments at Prairie Elementary

Graph 2 shows the same lack of space at the middle school and an inability to absorb future growth. If the district wishes to maintain its current class size ratios and curriculum, the building currently exceeds its capacity.

Graph 2: Projected Student Enrollments at Worthington Middle School
Graph 3 shows the space capacity as compared to enrollment at the senior high school. As cited previously, the current student enrollment already exceeds the building capacity.

Graph 3: Projected Student Enrollments at Worthington High School

Currently, two (2) of the three (3) buildings serving the K-12 student population exceed the recommended capacity for each building. Within the next three (3) years, if the district does not take action, all three of its buildings will exceed capacity; resulting in either an increase in class sizes and/or a reduction in course offerings.
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Section IV: Worthington Public Schools’ Scheduling, Curriculum Offerings, Class Sizes and Non-Traditional Options for Accommodating Growth

Scheduling approaches used at the middle school and senior high school are markedly different. The junior high school utilizes a seven (7) period day for students in grade six (6) and an eight (8) period day for students in grade seven (7) and eight (8). Its fifth grade essentially operates in a self-contained setting. Students at the middle school benefit from electives in the areas of physical education, industrial technology, art, computer, and family consumer science. They also have the opportunity to participate in band, orchestra and/or choir. These electives are made possible, in large part, through the use of this schedule. The senior high school operates on a four (4) period schedule. This schedule is a common practice at the secondary level across the state and nation because it provides sufficient time for hands-on classroom experiences in industrial technology, fine arts and the sciences. It also provides a more constructive way for students to complete assignments efficiently and effectively while under the ‘tutelage’ of the classroom instructor. Furthermore, the four (4) period day gives opportunities for students to have extended electives when compared to a six (6) or seven (7) period day. Prairie Elementary operates in a ‘self-contained’ classroom model. Students are released from their homeroom teachers to participate in physical education, music and technology/library. Prairie also utilizes, on a limited bases, the practice of ‘co-teaching’ as a means of improving student achievement.

A survey was completed by the members of the Facilities Review Committee. One question in the survey was related to the current curriculum offerings and class sizes in the Worthington Schools. Complete survey results are contained in Appendix D. The results of the question on the survey directly related to the subject of curriculum are shown in Graph 4. The results strongly suggests that members of the Task Force believe the current student to teacher ratios must be maintained at their current levels and that course offerings at the middle school and high school should all remain in place. The Task Force expressed a belief that the breadth of curriculum serves as a means of continuing to attract students from area schools through the open enrollment process.

Graph 4: Committee Program Priorities
There does exist other ‘non-traditional’ scheduling options utilized by school districts that face space constraints due to increasing student enrollments. One such option was examined by the consultants and presented to the Task Force for its review and comment. It was the option of implementing a year-round school calendar. Table 4 is a generic example of a year-round a calendar. This scheduling model breaks the student body into four (4) equal groups and rotates the school year for each group around a “45-15” calendar. In this arrangement, during any forty-five (45) day cycle, only three (3) groups of students are in school at any one time. The fourth group is on a ‘break’ for a period of three (3) weeks.

![Year-Round School Calendar](image)

**Table 4: Generic Year-Round School Calendar**

There are several important things to note (both of a positive and negative nature) about such a calendar.

a. Only two (2) groups (Groups 3 and 4) attend school without experiencing a ‘break’ during their quarter classes.

b. There is no time in which all students are in school. This creates scheduling problems for students involved in extra-curricular activities.

c. The schedule in Table 4 assumed that only the senior high school would adopt such a schedule; increasing the likelihood of problems for families in scheduling activities such as vacations and daycare.

d. The working contracts for some employees would need to be extended (i.e. cafeteria workers, office staff, teacher aides).

e. Savings in costs for materials and supplies most likely would decrease.

f. There is evidence to suggest that student achievement may improve for some learners; minimizing the effect of the extended time off during the summer.

Another alternative sometimes utilized to alleviate crowded conditions is the use of a split shift schedule. In a split shift schedule, half of the student body attends school in the morning and the other half in the afternoon. School wide classes such as band, orchestra and choir are typically scheduled in the middle of the day (the ‘end’ of the day for the morning students and the ‘beginning’ of the day for the afternoon students). There are several other points to consider in this model.

a. As in the case of the year-round school, the scheduling of after-school extracurricular activities is difficult to do.

b. Many high school classes are ‘singletons’; offered only once during the day. This creates difficult scheduling challenges.

c. Class periods are shortened. For WHS this schedule would essentially eliminate the benefits of the four (4) period day.
Section V: Recommendations by the Task Force

Prior to its fourth meeting, the Task Force was given a survey to complete. The full set of responses to the survey is included in Appendix D and E. The first half of the survey (Appendix D) provided Task Force members with the opportunity to respond to a series of questions intended to measure the level of consensus regarding perceived shortcomings of the current facilities that had been cited and discussed in the Task Forces’ first three (3) meetings. The second half of the survey (Appendix E) presented various building options that might remedy existing inadequacies. A description of the impact for each option is contained in the narrative of the questions associated with each graph. Graph 5 shows the composite results of the Task Force analysis of various building options.

Graph 5: Facility Options for Consideration

Through the use of the survey and following a comprehensive Task Force review of each option, the ten (10) options were reduced to four (4) at its fourth and final meeting. In its fourth meeting, the Task Force developed a set of advantages and disadvantages to four (4) options. (Note: the statement contained in Graph 5, cited three (3) options as being the most viable by Task Force members. However, several Task Force members asked that a fourth option be considered; a return to a K-6, 7-9 and 10-12 alignment.) The return to a junior high grade configuration was eliminated as a result of a ‘forced choice’ process. The results of the Task Force’s analyses of each of the final three (3) options as cited in Graph 5 are listed below Tables 5,6 and 7 that follow.
**Table 5: Option 2- New Intermediate School**

This **Option 2** calls for the closing of West School. The ALC program would relocate into the senior high school and Prairie Elementary School would become a Pre-K/2 school. It would also house the community education program. A new intermediate school for grades 3-5 would be constructed on the Prairie Elementary site to accommodate up to 750 students. The middle school would revert back into a 6-8 building. In so, the ‘core’ spaces of the gymnasium and cafeteria would be ‘right-sized.’ An addition would be added onto the high school site; expanding its capacity to 1000 students. Additional property would be purchased adjacent to the high school to relieve some pressure on parking.

The Task Force’s assessment of this option is as follows:

**Advantages of Option 2:**

- Additions to the high school address the essential space needs
- The ALC relocates to WHS allowing for the sharing teachers and some resources
- West will be closed
- It will bring both community education and the collaborative into Prairie Elementary
- Grades 3-5 is a good grade configuration
- The new intermediate school will be constructed on school owned property; no additional costs for land acquisition
- The number of regular education classrooms in the district will expand from 164 to 192
- The amount of square foot per student increases to 192
- This option is less costly than the option to construct a new high school
- Operating costs are less than other options
- There is room for growth under this proposal
Disadvantages of this Proposal:
- The purchase of additional property to accommodate the expansion at WHS will displace people from their homes
- It will likely increase annual operating costs by up to $440,000 per year
- It still costs $37.2M
- It would fail to address the need for improvement of high school football field
- Larger buildings will require a longer time to construct

**OPT 3A: CE, PK-2 / 3-5 / 6-8 / 9-12, ALC**

- **West Learning Center**
- **Prairie Elementary (K-4)**: PK-2 1,115
- **Worthington MS (5-8)**: 3-5 int 760
- **Worthington HS (9-12)**: 6-8 MS 650

**NEW High School (9-12)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current 12/13</th>
<th>Projected 15/16</th>
<th>Projected 17/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PK-2</td>
<td>746 +</td>
<td>779 +</td>
<td>829 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 int</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8 MS</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>652</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>730+98</td>
<td>806+60</td>
<td>819+60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Option 3A - New High School

**Option 3A** calls for the construction of a new senior high school on a yet to be determined site. Grade configurations change. The middle school would become an intermediate school for grades 3-5 and the senior high school would become the ‘new’ middle school. Some modifications of the senior high school would be made as a part of this plan. The composite analysis of this option follows.

Advantages of Option 3A:
- It supports 21st century learning
- Building ‘flexibility’ to accommodate the teaching/learning process is optimized
- It creates the most amount of new classroom space
- The construction of new facilities would be less disruptive to the learning process than renovation of existing spaces
- It will provide the perception that the community puts ‘kids first’
- It addresses all current deficiencies in a single step
- A new high school would be a ‘state of the art’ facility
- It would bring both community education and the collaborative into Prairie Elementary
- West would be closed
- It would provide more options for student growth over time
- Science labs and overall WHS square footage would be expanded
Disadvantages to this Proposal:

- The initial cost of the project are high (2)
- On-going operating costs associated with adding square footage to the district
- We have an excess levy renewal coming up
- This will not be perceived positively by the public (viewed as Taj Mahal)
- The purchase of land and associated costs have not yet been identified and would need to be done prior to the community vote
- We would have to work with the city and county to address infrastructure costs

**OPT 4A: (PK-3)/ 4-5,CE / 6-8 / (9-12, ALC)**

Table 7: New Grade 4-5 Option

*Option 4A* calls for the construction of a new intermediate school on the Prairie Elementary School site. Different from Option 2, this new intermediate school would be for grades 4-5. It would also provide an addition onto the senior high to address current inadequacies. The composite analysis of this option follows.

Advantages of Option 4A:

- This option is the most cost effective
- It will utilize land we already have versus having to purchase
- It keeps the 9th grade at WHS (whereas options 8 and 8A do not)
- Upgrades of the athletic field expand its utility
- Keeps space that will be lost due to additions at WHS
- Expands the science and music areas by up to 50,000 sq.ft.
- Eliminates West School
- ALC joins WHS making staff collaboration easier
- Opportunity to convert West School site into soccer fields
- Overall less expensive both in construction as well as in operations
- The 5th grade returns to Prairie creating a ‘true’ middle school
- It is a ‘timely’ fix
Disadvantages of this Proposal:

- The overall amount of square feet per student does not change
- Construction during the school year could create major disruptions
- It may not be enough additional space to accommodate future growth
- Splitting the buildings (creating a new intermediate facility) may require additional staffing (i.e. administration, counselors, support staff etc.)
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Section VI: Finance Considerations

The survey of the task force indicated a clear consensus around the question of facility costs and community tolerance of an additional levy. This result is shown in Graph 6. From the response to the question, the overwhelming concern for the costs to the taxpayer, when coupled with the relative cost of each project as shown in Graph 7 below and the apparent ‘popularity’ of the most expensive Option (shown previously in Graph 5) presents the Board and administration with its greatest challenge in moving forward with a decision.

Graph 6: Task Force Perceptions of Tax Impact

Graph 7 shows the projected cost differences between the three options considered by the Task Force to be the most viable. Of the three (3) options, the construction of a new senior high school on a new site is the most costly. The difference in the costs associated with the construction of new intermediate schools is caused primarily because of the square foot differences. Option 4A, creating a grade 4-5 intermediate school, adds less square feet to the district than does Option 2.

Graph 7: Comparative Costs of Three Options
A comprehensive costing of each of these options is contained in Appendix F. Table 8 below illustrates the potential cost impact of each option. The cost is based upon a home value of $125,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Impact / Ranges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$125k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of opts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Project Cost Comparisons

Should the Board consider moving forward with one of the Task Force recommendations, a decision to present a bond levy to the public will be influenced largely by three (3) factors. The first is recognition of the local economy. Schools across the state have had to face the realities that an economy in a recession is not one where support for a new initiative such as the construction of new facilities, even one where there is agreement for the need, is easily passed. The economy now appears to be in a recovery. However, the continuation of the recovery remains uncertain and bringing forward a bond levy at this time is challenging. The question of timing related to an economic recovery is difficult.

The second factor is the long-term plans for the renewal of the current operating levy. While the tax impact of an operating levy is different than a bond levy, communities often times see these two initiatives inseparable. The Worthington community’s perception of the value of the operating levy and its willingness to support both a continuation of that levy and the addition of a bond levy is a question the Board will need to reflect upon. The District finds itself in a very enviable position with a relatively large fund balance and an operating levy that in two (2) of the past three (3) years the Board has chosen not to levy to its maximum limit. Based upon our own analysis and estimates of potential future operating costs related to an expansion in the total square feet of facilities, the District is in a position to seek a bond levy without asking the public to increase the amount of the levy; at least in the short-term foreseeable future.

The third and final factor influencing your decision is necessity. It is important to note that even if the Board made an immediate decision to move forward with one of the preferred Options, alleviation of the shortage in classroom space would still be at least one (1) school year away and more likely two (2). Appendix G provides graphic information related to timelines should the Board choose to move forward. The current growth in student population and the inability of any of the four (4) facilities to adequately meet the instructional needs of a growing population places the Board and administration in a difficult position. The need for additional space is very real and needs to be addressed. Communicating to the public the interrelated nature of all three (3) of these factors will be critical to successfully moving forward.
Section VII: Findings, Recommendations and Final Thoughts

The Facilities Utilization Project began with consultant interviews of key school administrators on September 25th and continued through the community forum on December 10th. Inside that timeframe, additional interviews were conducted with school administration, faculty and students. Four (4) meetings of the Facilities Utilization Task Force were also conducted. A careful analysis of the current school scheduling practices was conducted by the consultants as well as a review of the current use of technology. The Board and school administration requested that an outside consulting group be contracted to make short-term and long-term recommendations to move forward. It is as a result of this very careful analysis of the Worthington Schools, that the following findings have been made supporting the recommendations that follow.

Findings:

1. The actual building capacity of Worthington high school is 700 students, not the 900 students previously listed. The calculation of capacity is based upon a careful review of the high school master schedule including its course offerings and class sizes, and a comparison of instructional space at the high school using accepted Minnesota room size standards.
2. WHS has dedicated an increasing percentage of their ‘regular’ classroom space to special programs such as ELL and the creation of computer labs.
3. The WHS administration and staff have recognized the inadequacy of space and have created a ‘Teacher Planning Hub’ in an effort to maximize room utilization for instructional purposes.
4. The breadth of curriculum offerings at WHS has attracted students from surrounding school districts and increased its enrollment.
5. The ratio of science labs to science classrooms at WHS is below accepted norms.
6. Access to technology at WHS is not viewed to be adequate by either faculty or students.
7. WHS does not provide an adequate student ‘commons’ space.
8. Not all faculties at WHS have professional work space for classroom preparation.
9. There is no space for professional development at WHS.
10. The Middle School underwent an expansion of classrooms in the recent past to alleviate shortage of instructional space. This expansion did not include expanding core areas such as the cafeteria, student commons, and gymnasiums. This has resulted in overcrowded conditions in the cafeteria, conflicts in the scheduling of the gymnasium and overcrowded conditions in the main corridor areas; especially during school dismissal.
11. There is no space for professional development at WMS.
12. The middle school operates a ‘self-contained’ fifth grade program and a grade six (6) through eight (8) middle school program.
13. WMS lacks sufficient computer labs for teachers/students to access throughout the day.
14. At Prairie Elementary School, there is insufficient space for hands-on activities in curriculum areas such as art and science.
15. There will not be enough classrooms for ‘regular education’ instruction at Prairie within the next two years.
16. There is a clear consensus among the Task Force that every effort must be made to maintain current class sizes in the elementary/middle school and the breadth of course offerings at WHS.
17. Task Force members, along with faculty and administration, believe that the changing nature of education will require greater time for teachers in developing skills in the use of technology and other new teaching methodologies.

Consultant Recommendations:

Worthington Public Schools is in need of expanding its space. Population growth and the changing nature of education are the two (2) primary drivers of this need. While the advent and use of technology will impact how teachers deliver instruction and students learn, there must still be a place for students to go to. In other words, technology should not be looked at as a way to diminish the need for additional space.

Providing opportunities to learn through the incorporation of hands-on activities and collaboration were evident in interviews of administrators, faculty and students and reinforced and recognized by the Task Force. Adequate space for these kinds of educational activities is currently not present in sufficient levels in any building.

Through the examination of current space utilization, several solutions might be considered as ‘short-term fixes’ to address existing inadequacies. These ‘fixes’ may include:

1. Reducing the number of computer labs at both WHS and WMS and using them as regular classrooms. This can be accomplished by creating mobile labs, more commonly referred to as ‘computers on a cart.’ This practice is used in many schools across the state and nation but has distinct drawbacks and limitations.

2. Reducing the number of classrooms at WHS devoted to special classes such as ELL. This can be accomplished by creating smaller learning spaces within some of the classrooms; freeing up additional classroom space.

3. Repurposing classrooms at the senior high school that are currently underutilized. These rooms (identified in Diagram 1) include the ag lab, industrial technology and woods.

4. Creating additional teacher ‘Hubs’ at WHS and eliminate teacher preparation/planning in their classrooms at WMS.

None of these options remedy facility issues such as a shortage of science lab space at WHS or the inadequate ‘core’ space at WMS in areas such as the cafeteria or gymnasium. However, they do provide critically needed instructional space in the general education subject areas for the next several years.

The Task Force has identified three possible options for the Board to consider if it chooses to take steps to provide the space required to meet burgeoning enrollments and educational enhancements through the construction of new facilities and building additions. Each of these options has merits and can stand alone as a good resolution of the space needs should the Board select one.
Graph 8 below suggests that the simple majority of Task Force members believe the construction of a new high school may be the ‘best’ route to pursue. However, the next two (2) options viewed to be the most viable both recommend the construction of a new intermediate school.

The consultants, after careful review of these two (2) options recommended by the Task Force, believe that the most cost efficient and educationally effective way to move forward may be found in combining them; bringing the best of both into the design and construction. This combined approach has been laid out and shown in Table 9.

Table 9: New Intermediate Combination of 2/4A
This plan, similar to option 2 and option 4A, creates a new intermediate school. A side by side comparison of the three (3) options is shown in Table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 4A</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prairie Addition</td>
<td>16,000 sq/ft</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Intermediate</td>
<td>Grades 3-5</td>
<td>Grades 4-5</td>
<td>Grades 3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior High Addition</td>
<td>105,000 sq/ft</td>
<td>76,500 sq/ft</td>
<td>102,200 sq/ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remodel</td>
<td>51,280 sq/ft</td>
<td>49,000 sq/ft</td>
<td>49,200 sq/ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@ H.S.</td>
<td>10,700 sq/ft</td>
<td>24,200 sq/ft</td>
<td>24,000 sq/ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@ H.S.</td>
<td>10,000 sq/ft</td>
<td>@ M.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.5 acres @ H.S.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic Turf</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Football Field</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Costs</td>
<td>$37.2</td>
<td>$32.2</td>
<td>$36.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Comparisons of Three (3) Construction Options

As noted, we believe this Option is more viable than either Option 2 or Option 4A and should be given consideration as an Option in addition to the three (3) recommended by the Task Force.
Final Thoughts:

As consultants, when asked by a school Board to come into their District and analyze the use of their facilities, it’s our responsibility to ‘uncover’ things that haven’t yet been considered. Our involvement in this project has produced results based on an even greater in depth study of the utilization of each of your spaces and the detailed interaction with your community Task Force group (one noteworthy discovery was the difference in the student capacity of the High School at 700, in lieu of the prior reporting of 900). Our findings confirm most of what you, the Board and administration, already knew. Your facilities are ‘tight’ and don’t currently provide adequate instructional space in a variety of areas, and are indeed changing each year to accommodate the continued growth in your student population. Building administrators already maximize, through their scheduling processes, the use of classrooms. There are additional steps that can be taken such as those contained in our set of recommendations above, that will provide temporary solutions to your crowded conditions. But those steps potentially compromise some of the program offerings at the senior high and possibly the effectiveness of teacher planning/preparation time as well. These crowded conditions will only get worse in the coming years as the student population grows.

The Board, administration and community will need to come together to resolve these issues. However, there appears to be a dichotomy in thinking related to how to resolve them. It is largely for this reason that as consultants, our recommendation is contrary to what the Task Force and community seem to desire. What consistently comes out at the ‘top’ of everyone’s thoughts when thinking about addressing the lack of space is the construction of a new high school on a new site. However, as much as that appears to be what is ‘wanted,’ as shown on the Task Force survey, and in numerous public meetings, as well as the numerous ‘side bar’ conversations held between the consultants and various members of the Task Force, all favoring this direction qualified their preferred outcome with the comment, “...but the community won’t support it...we can’t afford it...”

Therefore our recommendation is to give primary consideration to Options 2, 4A or the ‘Combination Option.’ The cost of these Options range approximately 20 to 30% less than the cost of a new high school. This difference will be perceived to be significant and will have a commensurate lower impact on the taxpayer. Communication will be critical to the success of a bond levy campaign; recognizing the thoroughness of the investigation undertaken by the Board and administration in arriving at its decision. Sharing the many findings of the work of the Task Force will be equally important to this effort.
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Appendix A: Task Force Committee Members

The community based Facility Utilization Task Force was comprised of twenty-five members of the community, school faculty, staff, administration and school board. Members of the committee met in a series of four (4) public meetings to review data collected by the consultants and to discuss the current and future challenges of the school buildings. Committee members are listed below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Jane Janssen</td>
<td>Parent/Human Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Amy Ernst</td>
<td>District Technology Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Nate Hanson</td>
<td>Asst. Principal at ALC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Lori Dudley</td>
<td>Home Executive/Parent/School Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Mark Shepherd</td>
<td>Attorney/Community member/School Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Jeff Luke</td>
<td>Middle School Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Josh Noble</td>
<td>Elementary Principal/Parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Gordon Moore</td>
<td>Parent/Judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Paul Karelis</td>
<td>High School Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>David Rezny</td>
<td>Asst. High School Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Gary Hoffman</td>
<td>Retired/Community Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Diane Graber</td>
<td>Retired/Community Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Sharon Johnson</td>
<td>Community Education Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Sheryl Hoekstra</td>
<td>Elementary Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Jennifer Weg</td>
<td>Parent/Facilities Committee Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Grant Sorensen</td>
<td>Community Member/Dentist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Patty Moser</td>
<td>ALC Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Rebecca McGaughey</td>
<td>Middle School Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Stephen Schnieder</td>
<td>County Engineer/Parent/School Board member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Doug Brands</td>
<td>High School Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Bjorn Bakke</td>
<td>Middle School Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Joel Wiltrout</td>
<td>Attorney/Community Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Linden Olson</td>
<td>Retired Farmer/School Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Heidi Meyer</td>
<td>Elementary Asst. Principal/Parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Jorge Lopez</td>
<td>Parent/Construction Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Gretchen O’Donnell</td>
<td>Parent/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Jenny Anderson/Martinez</td>
<td>Parent/Human Resource Director for JBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Greg Raymo</td>
<td>Community Member/Bank President</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Enrollment

The Task Force was presented with information related to the growing student population in the Worthington Public Schools. An examination and discussion about the causes of the population shift as well as the dependability of predictions for on-going growth were a part of Task Force discussions.
Anticipated average annual growth is expected to exceed 4% over the next five (5) years.

Based upon an analysis of building capacities, current enrollment places the district at capacity levels.
Appendix C: Building Utilization

Along with capacity, the Task Force reviewed the current educational adequacy of each building. All buildings lack proper space for the changes that are taking place in education today. Some of those inadequacies are highlighted in the building footprints found in this appendix.

As noted in the diagram, the current room configuration at Prairie Elementary does not provide space for hands-on learning experiences where students can work on a project in a collaborative manner and teachers have the ability to leave projects areas set up for the next day or next class. Congestion at the building entryway is also a problem during before school drop-off and afterschool pick up times.
The middle school does not have enough computer lab space. The core areas of the gymnasium and cafeteria have not been expanded to accommodate the growing student population. The end result is that students can no longer utilize the gymnasium following their lunch to expend energy with friends and get important exercise.
The Worthington Senior High School is presently operating beyond its student capacity. The science classrooms do not have enough lab classrooms to properly support their activities. There are an insufficient number of regular education classrooms. The music area does not properly provide for adequate practice areas for students and the current space used for orchestra is undersized.
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Appendix D: Survey - Part I

After the Task Force held its third meeting, an electronic survey was given to each member. The first part of the survey sought to determine the level of agreement around the critical issues of deficiencies in current educational space. Nearly 90% of the Task Force Members were able to respond to the survey. The questions and a graphic display of the responses to each are contained within this appendix.
More than half of those who responded to the survey either strongly agree or agreed that the middle school needed to change some of its room utilization to better accommodate the integration of technology into the learning process. Fewer than 25% disagreed.

The vast majority of those who responded to the survey either strongly agreed or agreed that the high school needed to change some of its room utilization to better accommodate the integration of technology into the learning process. Less than 15% disagreed.
The vast majority of those responding to the survey feel that the current classroom configurations in all of the buildings are not design to provide space for different learning styles (i.e. hands-on, collaborative). Less than 15% disagree.

A very large majority of the respondents believe that the core spaces at WMS such as the gymnasium and cafeteria are adequate to meet the growing student population. Less than 15% disagree or strongly disagree with that statement.
While the majority of Task Force members agreed that the current gymnasium and cafeteria are in need of expansion, nearly 24% are uncertain of the potential need to expand this space.

The high school now utilizes one room to serve as a teacher planning hub. This efficient use of space is recognized by the majority of Task Force members.
Throughout the planning process, Task Force members expressed a belief that the community supported the closing of West, and assumed it would be done following a previous facility project. They continue to believe strongly that this facility should be taken ‘off-line.’

The Task Force response to this question was overwhelming. Maintenance of current class sizes in the elementary and middle levels is viewed to be highly important. Similarly, keeping in place the array of offerings at the high school was seen to be of equal importance.
Those responding to the survey either strongly agree or agree that current and future enrollments are creating challenges to the school administration and staff in finding adequate and appropriate space for teaching.

The middle school underwent facility upgrades; creating more classroom space for the growing student populations. Left out in the expansion of the middle school was a comparable expansion of core areas such as the gymnasium and cafeteria. Less than 5% of Task Force members responding to the survey believed the current core areas at the middle school were adequately sized.
Members of the Task Force were evenly divided on the question of whether or not there is a need for additional space at Prairie Elementary to accommodate hands-on learning instruction.

After reviewing the current space allocation at the senior high school, responders to the survey recognize that the science classrooms do not have the appropriate number of ‘labs’ to support instruction. Currently there is only one science lab classroom and five (5) instructional classrooms.
Worthington High School has converted seven classrooms into computer labs. Because many of those rooms have classes scheduled into them throughout the day, access by classroom teachers in areas such as English, social studies and math is limited. Scheduling is particularly difficult during the period of the school year when students are taking required state standardized tests. Task Force responders were ‘split’ in their view of this concern.

The music program is growing and a source of pride to the school and community. Task Force members recognized that the current space used by this program is inadequate; the orchestra rehearses in a classroom too small for its size and rehearsal space for students is less than adequate.
The final question in the first portion of the survey focused on costs related to addressing the perceived shortcomings of the buildings. Virtually 100% of the Task Force members either agreed or strongly agreed that whatever solution the school board might choose to pursue, it must be viewed by the public to be reasonable and demonstrate clear educational benefits.
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Appendix E: Survey - Part II

Over the course of the first three planning meetings, Task Force members were provided with information related to how efficiently the schools were currently utilizing existing space as well as how well the classrooms were meeting the changing ways that students were learning and teachers were instructing. The second part of the survey sought Task Force thoughts and ideas regarding a set of possible ways to resolve agreed upon space deficiencies in Prairie Elementary, Worthington Middle and Worthington High School. A number of possible ‘solutions’ were identical to those developed by the superintendent and Board and presented to the public during the previous school year. Several solutions were also included for Task Force consideration that had been developed by the planning consultants. These solutions were based upon their own assessment of possible building needs based upon the work of the Task Force and student and faculty interviews. This appendix contains the results of the responses to the survey.
The first option called for constructing additions onto each of the three (3) buildings; Prairie Elementary, Worthington Middle and Worthington Senior High School. Only 21% of those responding believed that implementing this option was a good way to go.

The second option would create a new intermediate school for grades 3-5 located on the Prairie Elementary School site. Community Education would occupy some of the vacated space in Prairie. 53% of those responding believed that this approach was a good way to go. It also includes upgrades and expansion at the high school.
The large majority of Task Force members believed that the ‘best’ route to follow was the construction of a new senior high school on a ‘yet to be determined’ site. This result was consistent with the result of the previous surveys conducted by the superintendent and Board in the winter and spring of 2012.

Option 3B, along with the option 3C called for the construction of a new senior high school, but to use the vacated mall site to carry-out this project. Very few of those responding believed that either this approach, or the approach described in 3C below were viable and should be pursued.
Options 3B and 3C had the ‘highest’ disapproval ratings when compared to all other options.

Proposal 4A was similar to proposal 2; both suggested the construction of a new intermediate school on the Prairie Elementary School site. This proposal differed from proposal 2 in the grade configuration; proposing a 4-5 school rather than a 3-5. It also proposed locating the Community Education programs be incorporated into this site. Survey results placed this option at the same level of acceptance as the high school option.
This option was very similar to option 4A. The primary difference was the amount of renovation/expansion at the senior high school was reduced in an effort to reduce the overall cost of the project. This approach was soundly rejected by the committee.

Option 5 was the only option that kept the West School site ‘on-line’ for the near future. Only 20% of the Task Force who responded agreed with this approach; reinforcing the earlier question of the survey related to the importance of closing West.
The unique approach to this proposal was to ‘flip-flop’ the uses of the senior high and middle school. Worthington Middle School would become the senior high school and Worthington High School would become the middle school. Only 15% of those responding believed that this option had validity and should be pursued.
Appendix F: Cost Variation for Building Options

Contained with this appendix, is a breakdown of costs associated with each of the Options (2, 3A, 4A and Combination). A comparative analysis of 2,3A and 4A is shown in the first Table. A summary of costs for each Option has been included in subsequent Tables.

The Dollar amount indicated is in millions of dollars (example $ 37.2 M) these costs are referred to as “project costs”. This means that all costs which are required for each option are included: Construction Costs for the new building(s) / addition(s) and /or remodeling are included; as well as Fees, services, allocations for Furniture / Fixtures / Equipment, Technology infrastructure, Contingency allowance for unknown project conditions. The Project Costs are projected to allow for a Bid date of June 2013. Annual construction inflation should be considered for bid dates later than that at a rate of 3.5% per year.

The Project Costs are based on Construction square foot pricing typically associated with this type and quality of construction. They are based on the preliminary information available and in the case of the New High School estimate can vary based on actual type of program space (multi-use type or specific use facilities) and development of the site with respect to athletic grade facilities. Through the actual development of a final program and site configuration these costs can be adjusted.
A cost comparison of the three (3) preferred Options of the Task Force is shown in the combined graph and table below.

It shows that Option 3A, the construction of a new senior high school, will add more square feet of instructional space to the District than either option 2 or 4A. Option 3A increases the total square footage by approximately 23%. It can also be seen from the table below the graph that the construction of a new high school will provide up to 205 square feet per student as compared to 191 sq. ft. for Option 2 and 182 sq. ft. for Option 4A. It should be noted that the proportional increase in square footage results in additional resources required for operation (noted in blocks of 5, 10 and 20 year periods).
A more detailed look at each Option is presented on the following pages.

**OPT 2: (CE,PK-2) / 3-5 / 6-8 / (9-12,ALC)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Remodeling</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Remodeling</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Remodeling</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Development</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition of existing building</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost assoc.w/ conversion of existing bu</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Development Costs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Site Value</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Purchase / Development</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Bond Cost Sub Total     | 37.2 | 100%
| Bond Issuance Costs     | -    |    |
| TOTAL BOND REFERENDUM COST | 37.2 |    |

City Development Costs (estimated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PK-2 / CE</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12 / ALC</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Intern</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW TOTAL</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**$ 37,200,000**  Total Project Cost

- 59% New Construction / Additional SF
- 34% Addition(s)
- 6% Remodeling
- 1% Site Purchase / Development
OPT 3A: CE, PK-2 / 3-5 / 6-8 / 9-12, ALC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Remodeling</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Remodeling</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor remodeling</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Development</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition of existing building</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost assoc. w/ conversion of existing building</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Development Costs</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Site Value</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Purchase / Development</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Cost Sub Total</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Bond Referendum Cost</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Development Costs (estimated)</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$46,800,000 Total Project Cost

90% New Construction
0% Addition(s)
1% Remodeling
9% Site Purchase / Development * (actual proposed site is not known at this time, allowances have been included for purchase price per acre / as well as utilities / unknown conditions)
OPT 4A: (PK-3) / 4-5,CE / 6-8 / (9-12,ALC)

Addition 12.0
New Construction 16.1
Major Remodeling -
Moderate Remodeling 3.1
Minor remodeling -
Technology -
Site Development 1.0
Demolition of existing building -
Cost assoc. w/ conversion of existing bu -
District Development Costs -
Existing Site Value -
Site Purchase / Development -
Bond Cost Sub Total 32.2
Bond Issuance Costs -
TOTAL BOND REFERENDUM COST 32.2
City Development Costs (estimated) -

$32,200,000 Total Project Cost
50% New Construction / Additional SF
37% Addition(s)
10% Remodeling
3% Site Purchase / Development
The ‘Combination Option’ is shown below.

### OPT 2/4A: (PK-2,CE)/ 3-5/ 6-8/(9-12, ALC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Remodeling</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Remodeling</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor remodeling</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Development</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition of existing building</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost assoc.w conversion of existing bu</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Development Costs</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Site Value</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Purchase / Development</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Cost Sub Total</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Issuance Costs</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL BOND REFERENDUM COST</strong></td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City Development Costs (estimated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC K-2 / CE 3-5</td>
<td>779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12 / ALC</td>
<td>1,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,668</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Project Cost**

- 59% New Construction / Additional SF
- 33% Addition(s)
- 8% Remodeling
- 0% Site Purchase / Development

$36,500,000
Appendix G: Construction Timelines

Information within this Appendix illustrates, in real time, that solutions acted upon by the Board will not alleviate the crowded conditions in each building for at least one more school year.

These timelines are intended to be examples for the two varying approaches showing the basic timing of the following:

1. Design
2. Bidding
3. Construction
4. Building Occupancy

The first series responds to a possible Referendum / Project start date of April 2013, while the second series works with a November 2013 date.
April 2013 Referendum / Project Start Series Timelines:

**Project Schedule - Option 2/4A (facilitators option)**

**Worthington School District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10-Dec-12</th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>2013 (YR 1)</th>
<th>2014 (YR 2)</th>
<th>2015 (YR 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>April Ref</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New School - 3-5 (Opt B) - 760 students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Renovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HS Add 4A - 9-12 (Opt C) - 1,000 students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Renovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prairie (PK-2) - 1,052 students (MS - as is)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Renovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROJECT COST</strong></td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 2 and Option 4A are similar

**Project Schedule - Option 3A**

**Worthington School District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10-Dec-12</th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>2013 (YR 1)</th>
<th>2014 (YR 2)</th>
<th>2015 (YR 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>April Ref</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New HS - 9-12 (Opt D) - 1,000 students</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Renovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prairie HS as is</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Renovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HS alt - convert to MS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Renovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROJECT COST</strong></td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10-Dec-12
November 2013 Referendum / Project Start Series Timelines:

### Project Schedule - Option 2/4A (facilitators option)

**Worthington School District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10-Dec-12</th>
<th>2013 (YR 1)</th>
<th>2014 (YR 2)</th>
<th>2015 (YR 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nov Ref</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Building Design</td>
<td>Building Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Interm. - 3-5 (Opt 2) - 780 students</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Renovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Add (6+) - 9-12 (Opt 4A) - 1,000 students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Renovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie (PK-2) - 1,052 students (MS - as is)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Renovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Cost</strong></td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 2 and Option 4A are similar

### Project Schedule - Option 3A

**Worthington School District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10-Dec-12</th>
<th>2013 (YR 1)</th>
<th>2014 (YR 2)</th>
<th>2015 (YR 3)</th>
<th>2016 (YR 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nov Ref</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Interm. - 3-5 (Opt 5) - 780 students</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Renovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie / MS as is</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Renovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS alt - convert to MS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Renovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Cost</strong></td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.0% 1.0% 1.0% 2.0% 1.6% 2.1% 2.6% 1.9% 3.2% 3.2% 3.2% 2.7% 2.7% 2.7% 4.1% 4.3% 4.3% 4.2% 4.2% 3.1% 3.1% 3.2% 3.6% 4.0% 4.0% 4.0% 4.8% 4.8% 3.3% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 1.0% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 1.0% 1.0%
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Appendix H: Meeting Notes

Contained within this appendix are the notes taken from each of the four (4) meetings of the Facilities Task Force.
Worthington Public Schools’ Space Utilization and Educational Planning  
Conducted by ATS&R

The superintendent of the Worthington Public schools, under the direction of the School Board, has established a planning task force to assess the current space utilization challenges facing the district due largely to increases in the student population. The charge of the task force is to, "review all data related to current facility uses and potential uses and develop a set of 'best case scenarios' that ensure the cost efficient and education effectiveness of all school facilities." Task force membership is in excess of thirty members including representatives from the school board, school administration, faculty and staff, businesses and community members at-large. The task force will come together in a series of meetings planned and designed to lead toward the development of a set of recommendations that will be forwarded to the School Board for its review and action as deemed appropriate. Contained within this document are the outcomes of a variety of activities taskforce members participated in throughout the planning process.

Meeting One-

Intro / Committee Organization - 1

- Introductions / Purpose of the Committee
- Group Norms
  - Small / Large Group Activity
  - Consensus
- Current Situation
- Community Assets
  - Small Group Activity
  - Educational Futures
- GEMS: Space Utilization / Capacity Study
  - Sample of the Study Findings
- Educational Context
- “Your” Needs / Questions

In an effort to ensure that taskforce members’ expectations were met by the facilitation team, participants were asked to state what they hoped might be an outcome of the planning process. Below are those expectations.

Expectations of the Planning Taskforce Members

- Be informed and stay in the loop
- Collaborate and come up with ideas and solutions
- Understand the process of reaching a conclusion
- Get the word out into the community
- See what the issues are
- See what the public response to facilities might be
- Hear from the community
- Figure out how to develop a consensus around our needs
- Understand what timelines we might face
- See where we might ‘go’ regarding our facilities
- Cost of possible facilities
- Where are we going?
What are our needs?
Do we really need new facilities?
What are our space crises?
Become better informed
How can we collaborate?
Learn about the needs and options
What are the needs of future generations?
See what is best for us
Broader view of community/school interrelationships

Following this exercise, the task force was asked to identify, from the long list of expectations, key themes that might help them to focus their work in upcoming meetings.

**Key Themes from Task Force Expectations**
- People want the ‘facts’
- People want to be informed
- Communications is important
- Cost of facilities and the impact on ‘me’
- Answer the questions of ‘are our space issues real’
- Community wants to know whether space issues are truly ‘needed’
- Consider timelines
- How do alternatives affect educational growth

**Facilitators’ Comments** - It would appear that for the outcomes developed by the taskforce to be successfully implemented; they must be effectively communicated, ‘fact-based’ and include economic ramifications.

The task force was asked to look at what they perceived to be school and community assets; qualities that would assist them in their efforts to move forward in planning new facilities. The list of assets was generated through the use of small group discussions and large group presentations. The task force was divided into six (6) working groups for this activity. Below is the list of strengths. Strengths follow by a number in parentheses indicate that more than one group identified it as an attribute.

**Perceptions of School/Community Strengths**
- The overall quality of our education
- The quality of our teachers and staff (5)
- The quality of our administrators (2)
- The work of our school board (2)
- The variety of our programs offered to our students (5)
- Current investment in our school facilities
- Growing student population (4)
- Our diversity (4)
- Extra-curricular and co-curricular programs
- Community’s overall support of its schools (2)
- Quality of life in Worthington
- Fine arts programs
- Shared partnerships with businesses, community service organizations and the post-secondary
- Fiscal management
- Beautiful, well designed elementary school (2)
- Recognized quality of services for a diverse population
- Existing facilities are well maintained (2)
- Availability and utilization of technology (2)
- Strong agricultural community
- Growing community (2)
- Good economic development
- Positive school community relations
- Positive changes in our open enrollment
- A community of forward thinkers

**Facilitators’ Comments**- *The most often cited positive attributes were the i) quality of teachers and staff and ii) the educational opportunities provided to students. The growing student population and the changing nature of the student population were also cited as strengths.*

At the same time task force members were asked to identify the strengths found within the school/community, they were also asked to identify weaknesses. Below is the list of weaknesses.

**Perceptions of School/Community Weaknesses**
- Unstable nature of our economy
- The level of our existing debt
- Lack of trust stemming from the current use of West (4)
- Lack of adequate space in our schools (2)
- Lack of housing in the community (2)
- Disengagement of our community in this issue (3)
- Reliance on one major business as an economic generator (2)
- Public’s perception of current mandated tests
- Growing population
- Needs of our diversity (2)
- Long-term viability of sustaining our growth
- Our poverty level is increasing (2)
- The average income of households in our community is low (2)
- Age-grouping currently in place in our middle school
- Seemingly ineffective communications between and among our diverse populations (i.e. seniors/youth....)
- Condition of administration building
- Task force committee does not represent the community
- Rapid nature of changes in our community’s demographics
- Lack of knowledge of the ‘facts’
- History of the past projects
- Existing operating levy

**Facilitators’ Comments**- *When compared to the list of strengths, there did not appear to be a strong ‘consensus’ set of ‘negative attributes’ that evolved out of the small group discussions. The one negative that generated the most discussion was the on-going utilization of West School; which was viewed as*
having a negative impact on the level of trust within the community. Other concerns which elicited multiple responses were related to the economic ‘health’ of the community and growing diversity.

Following two brief presentations, the first related to the process used by the facilitators to conduct its space analysis and the second related to the changing nature of education, task force members were provided with the opportunity to ask any question that they might have; questions that might influence their ability to successfully complete their responsibility. Below is the set of those questions.

**Questions to be answered:**

- What changes have taken place in education over the past 50 years- how does it look different?
- Are there options that might help us to address our space issues other than brick and mortar?
- How does our education system interact with our community in relationship to recreational needs?
- What do our administrators and teachers see as critical needs for changes in our facilities?
- How to we plan for, and accommodate, the unknown?
- What is the vision for the future?

**Facilitators’ Comments** - These questions appear to suggest that more information will need to be gathered as this process moves forward. Thoughts and ideas of faculty and staff are important as is the need to develop a greater sense of what education might look like in the future and how that might influence facility design and utilization.
Worthington Public Schools’ Space Utilization and Educational Planning
Conducted by ATS&R

On Monday, October 8th, the second meeting of the district’s facility planning team was held in the high school media center. The meeting began at 6:30 p.m. and ended at approximately 9:00 p.m. Below are notes from this meeting as well as notes from a series of meetings conducted by the committee facilitators in interviews with students and teachers conducted prior to the meeting.

Facility Capacity / Educational Impact – Meeting 2

- Review committee charge
- Respond to Committee Questions Mtg. 1
- Engage with GEMS findings
  - Elementary
  - Middle School
  - High School
  - West Learning Center
- Presentation and discussion related to 21st century education / Educational Context (i.e. impact of technology on instruction practices)
- Brainstorm options based upon information gathered and provided

Committee members were provided an in-depth analysis of their current facility utilization by committee facilitators. This analysis included a careful review of how each school was scheduled throughout the day, and the subsequent impact on room utilization. In addition, the analysis provided committee members with data related to the efficiency of room utilization as compared to other similarly sized school districts. Finally, information was provided to the committee regarding classroom and site sizes in relation to state recommended guidelines. (Note: The presentation given to the committee members containing this information can be found on the District’s web site.)

Following the presentation of this information, committee members were asked to talk about what they had ‘heard.’ This was done in a small group setting. (Note: There were seven (7) groups formed for this exercise, each containing from three (3) to five (5) people.) Each group was asked to identify up to five (5) ‘takeaways’ from the information presented. They were also asked to identify what, if any, implications they might have on school facilities. Below is a consolidation of the thoughts and ideas developed by each small group. Results were reported out to the committee as a whole at the end of the meeting.

‘Takeaways’ from the Comprehensive Facility Review Presentation

- Using our current scheduling model, we are at our buildings’ capacities.
- Our existing facilities are at the ‘low end’ of recommended state guidelines relative to classroom sizes. (4)*
- Given the current enrollment trends and projections, within three (3) years we will be facing significant space issues. (3)

Implications for Our Facilities

- There are ways to improve the efficient use of our existing space.
- We will need to add more space in our buildings if keeping our class sizes low remains a priority.
- We can add some students to our buildings if we improve the efficiency in the use of our buildings.
The stairwells at the senior high school create congestion problems during passing time and are slightly below current recommended safety guidelines.

When additions were added onto the senior high school and the middle school, core instructional areas such as gymnasiums, music and cafeteria were not expanded to accommodate enrollment growth. (3)

The efficient use of space (such as locating teachers in central work areas) can lead to inefficient use of teacher time.

The current use of our classrooms is heavily impacted by the number of ‘special’ classes that we now offer. (i.e. special education, ELL etc.)

We are currently being very efficient in the way that we schedule and use our existing facilities. (2)

Guidelines related to the recommended size of classrooms, stairways etc. change.

There is a direct correlation between the size of the classroom and the class size (students in a class). Classrooms that are smaller in size and less than state guidelines are less capable of accommodating increases in the number of students in the room. (2)

When talking about our facility utilization, we must take into consideration what ‘21st Century’ education will look like. (2)

We must think about what our projected enrollments will be when planning any facility changes.

In thinking ahead, we must consider the suggested building capacities against our reality of what the community wants and feels we need. (2)

Some specialized spaces in our high school are underutilized when compared to the ‘regular’ classrooms such as math, social studies etc.

We presently have excessive site size at both the middle school and elementary school and less than adequate size at the senior high school.

How much longer can we continue to be creative in how we schedule and use our buildings? When will begin to lose programs for our students?

As a district, we may have to decide on our priorities: continuing to offer a variety of courses at WHS or focus on core subjects as a means of improving room utilization efficiencies.

We need to know more about how technology might influence our space utilization challenges.

We must keep in mind that our specialized courses and variety of options helps us to ‘attract’ students through open enrollment.

We need to know more about how technology might influence our space utilization challenges.

In all that we do, we must be considerate of costs to the community.

The affordability of possible solutions may be impacted by the need to meet current state guidelines related to classroom size etc.

The diversity of our student population mandates that we keep class sizes low.

There remains strong community support for continuing to have small class sizes.

We need time to plan for our future if our enrollment trends continue to grow.
The status quo is not a sufficient plan for our senior high school.

Some subject areas such as math, science, band and choir currently have insufficient space for their programs at WHS. (2)

We must still take a careful look at programs such as early childhood, community education, special education and the integration collaborative when assessing our facility needs for the future.

*Notes the number of small groups that had the same or similar takeaway.

Facilitators’ Comments- Based upon the most frequently cited ‘takeaways’ from the GEMS analysis there appears to be a clear understanding that the majority of classrooms at both the middle school and senior high school are below accepted state guidelines. There is an equally strong recognition noted in the ‘implications’ that both class size (related to the number of students in a section/class) as well as course offerings are important attributes of the district that should remain as priorities. There also appears to be a consensus that growing enrollments are creating a ‘crunch’ in each building and that past school expansion to accommodate enrollment growth did not taken into consideration the need to expand not only classroom space, but core areas such as gymnasiums, cafeterias, restrooms and specialized rooms such as science labs (at WHS) and activity rooms (for elementary students). Several groups, when considering ‘implications’ for the future, noted that whatever solution(s) were generated, it needed to take into consideration the economic impact on the community. Moving forward, communications to build understanding, both internally with faculty and staff and externally with the community at large will be critical.
As noted, the facilitators spent time prior to the meeting, interviewing students, faculty and staff from Prairie Elementary, the Worthington Middle School and Worthington High School. The purpose of those meetings was to gather additional information for the task force members to consider. Below are highlights of some of the comments made by students from each building when asked to identify all the good things about their buildings as well as things they felt were less than adequate. They were also asked to share their thoughts about technology and how it is being used. Finally, they were asked to put on their ‘creative hats’ and share their ideas about what changes in their school might look like. (Note: From four (4) to six (6) students were in each group.)

What They Said: Prairie Elementary Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Assets</th>
<th>Building Deficiencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ The cafeteria is large and serves good food.</td>
<td>✓ We don’t like having to share our lockers in our classrooms with other students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ The playground has four (4) separate play areas.</td>
<td>✓ We could use more laptops in our classrooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ The hallways are spacious and open.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ We have a large gym for us to use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ The drop off areas for our parents is good and safe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Ideas- 1. We would like to have a place where we can come together and play games such as chess during lunch time. 2. We need more ‘activity’ rooms where we can do hands on things such as taking ‘stuff’ apart and putting it back together. 3. We could use more room for science labs to do experiments. 4. It would be nice if we could replace our books with Nooks and/or Kindles; it would save a lot of space in our lockers and rooms. 5. The hallways are long; we could have moveable floors!

What They Said: Worthington Middle School Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Assets</th>
<th>Building Deficiencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ We like that our grades are physically located in close proximity to reduce the need to walk far within the building.</td>
<td>✓ Our lunchroom is too small to accommodate everyone comfortably.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Our locker bays are secure.</td>
<td>✓ After school, when everyone getting ready to leave the building at the same time, the hallways are overcrowded and congested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Every classroom has a Smart Board and our teachers are making good use of them.</td>
<td>✓ Our locker bays are too congested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Our computers are fast.</td>
<td>✓ We do not have enough computer lab space; especially during the time we’re taking state required tests.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Ideas- 1. Find a way to increase the size of our lunchroom.
What They Said: Worthington High School Students

Building Assets

✓ Our school is centrally located within our community.
✓ The ‘lobby’ space outside of the gym and adjacent to the office is a great place to gather with friends and to just ‘talk.’
✓ The student ‘flow’ throughout the building is good.
✓ We now have air conditioning in our classroom areas.
✓ The front of our school looks nice.
✓ Our gymnasium is full of history and has ‘character.’
✓ Our media center is well planned and open to students. It provides a place to access technology, work in small groups or independently. It is open both before and after school.
✓ Most of our classrooms have Smart Boards. They are well used by our teachers.

Building Deficiencies

✓ We don’t have practice rooms for either band or orchestra students.
✓ We have too few science labs.
✓ Our lunch lines are too long.
✓ Our computer labs are not always accessible and require a long ‘lead’ time for our teachers to be able to use them.
✓ Our existing stairwells become bottlenecks during hall passing time.
✓ We do not have enough space for our math and English classes.
✓ We do not have enough gymnasium space to accommodate all activities during the winter season.
✓ We lack an adequate number of students’ restrooms and their locations are not readily accessible to students in all parts of the building.
✓ Most of our problems with congestion and classroom space occur in the two-story addition.

New Ideas- 1. We need to expand our gymnasium space, science lab space and student restrooms. 2. We need to pay more attention to how students learn (their differences) and create more space for individualized (private) learning and small group activities. 3. We need greater access to computers. 4. Consideration should be given to expanding the use of Nooks and Kindles and creating one-two computer ratios. 5. Consideration should be given to adding another wing onto our school.

The facilitators also spent time prior to the meeting, interviewing faculty and staff from Prairie Elementary, the Worthington Middle School and Worthington High School. The purpose of those meetings was to gather additional information for the task force members to consider. Below are highlights of some of the comments made by staff from each building when asked to identify all the good things about their buildings as well as things they felt were less than adequate. They were also asked to share their thoughts about technology and how it is being used.
What They Said: Prairie Elementary Staff

**Building Assets**
- ✓ The building is fresh and bright. We’re fortunate to have such a nice building to work and teach in.

**Building Deficiencies**
- ✓ As the student population has grown, teachers in special programs such as RTI have had to move their instruction into large ‘activity’ areas outside of classrooms or in smaller rooms not designed for instruction.
- ✓ We could more space for student activities.

What They Said: Worthington Middle School Staff

**Building Assets**
- ✓ Our computers are fast.
- ✓ The separation of grades within our building works well.
- ✓ Every classroom has a Smart Board and our teachers are making good use of them.

**Building Deficiencies**
- ✓ We have no ‘unused’ classrooms at this time.
- ✓ There is no ‘multi-purpose room where large numbers of students can gather to learn and do activities.
- ✓ Some rooms that are now being used for classrooms were not originally designed for that purpose. They lack in appropriate size and functionality.
- ✓ We do not have enough computer lab space; especially during the time we’re taking state required tests.
- ✓ We lack sufficient space immediately adjacent to our classrooms to conduct small group learning activities with our students.
- ✓ There is an inadequate amount of physical education space. Our health room is too small.

New Ideas- 1. Find a way to increase the size of our ‘core’ areas such as our lunchroom, gymnasium, restrooms, cafeteria and special needs classrooms.
What They Said: Worthington High School Staff

**Building Assets**

- We have good space for some of our course electives in industrial tech and ag.
- Our technology works well within our buildings.
- Our faculty has worked well together to maximize the use of our space such as the creation of the teacher ‘hub’.

**Building Deficiencies**

- We currently have six (6) science teachers assigned to five (5) science rooms and only one (1) science lab to serve this discipline.
- Our current gymnasium space sometimes has three (3) classes in a two (2) classroom space.
- We cannot efficiently get the one (1) mobile computer lab onto the second floor of the classroom wing because the elevator is not dependable.
- As we continue to gain in enrollment, the current gym, locker rooms, media center and cafeteria are all too small to accommodate that growth.
- Because of the need to schedule students/classes into a limited number of classrooms, some teachers do not have appropriate space for class preparation. (i.e. one teacher noted that he preps at a table in the school lobby)
- There is no space in the current locker rooms for coaches to change. Storage space for uniforms and equipment is also inadequate.
- We do not have sufficient or adequate space for related service providers. (i.e. appropriate testing areas for special education assessments.)
- Current student lockers are too small and many are not properly operating. Students are sharing locker space.
- Current restrooms need to be refurbished.
- We do not have enough space for our math and English classes.

**New Ideas**

1. We need to expand opportunities for students/staff to become engaged in the use of technology driven interactive instruction. (i.e. internet/television)
2. We need to find ways to provide adequate space for science labs, computers (technology) and core areas such as cafeteria, music and gyms.
Facilitators’ Comments- When examining the thoughts and ideas expressed by students and by faculty and staff in their respective buildings, there are a number of common threads that can be identified. For example, even though there is consistent agreement, and a common thread, between students and staff at Prairie Elementary School that it’s a really nice place to work and learn, both agree that the building provides less than adequate space for activity or project based instruction. Similarly, at the middle school, both the students as well as the faculty appear to be in agreement that the current arrangement of keeping students within close proximity of their age mates is a positive asset. On the other hand, common threads of deficiencies identified by both groups included the lack of adequate space in core areas such as the lunchroom and gymnasium thereby reducing the opportunities for students to gather and interact with one another. Also, the lack of sufficient access to computer labs was also a common thread between students and staff. At the senior high school, one overarching thread appears to be in the sheer imbalance between building assets and inadequacies. The students did cite building ‘amenities’ such as location and the presence of good places for students to gather. However, the strongest common threads between the students and faculty centered on building deficiencies, citing areas such as the, i) lack of adequate science lab space, ii) the location and number of student restrooms, and the iii) lack of access to computer labs.
Worthington Public Schools’ Space Utilization and Educational Planning
Conducted by ATS&R

On Tuesday, October 23rd, the third meeting of the district’s facility planning team was held in the high school media center. The meeting began at 6:30 p.m. and ended at approximately 8:30 p.m. Below are notes from this meeting.

**Options / Cost / Possibilities – Meeting 3**

- Listening
- Review
- Presentation and discussion related to 21st century education / Educational Context (i.e. impact of technology on instruction practices)
- Review existing options currently under consideration
- Brainstorm Alternatives for further consideration

To begin the meeting, the committee was provided with the facilitators’ responses to two (2) questions previously asked by committee members. At its first meeting, the question was asked, ‘when considering what needs to be done to our schools to accommodate growth in student enrollment, what do our teachers believe we need to do?’ Based upon interviews, the facilitators provided the synopsis shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From the Elementary School</th>
<th>From the Middle School</th>
<th>From The Senior High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The building is fresh and bright.</td>
<td>• We need to find a way to increase the size of our ‘core’ areas such as our lunchroom, gymnasium, restrooms, and cafeteria.</td>
<td>• We need to expand opportunities for students and staff to become engaged in the use of technology driven interactive instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We’re fortunate to have such a nice building to work and teach in.</td>
<td>• We need better learning space for our special needs classrooms.</td>
<td>• We need to find ways to provide adequate space for science labs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• We need to find ways to provide more student and staff access to space for computers (technology).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• We need to find ways to provide more space for core areas such as cafeteria, music and gyms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• We need to find ways to provide more space for teacher preparation and teaming.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It should be noted that there was a high level of satisfaction from elementary teachers with the current space as evidenced by receiving a response from only one teacher representative at that school. Responses to the adequacy of space at both the middle school and the senior high school were given by six (6) to eight (8) teachers from each of these two buildings.

The second question that was raised at the first meeting centered on the idea of just ‘how has education changed in recent years creating a crunch in space when the current size of graduating classes is smaller than graduating classes in years past. In response to that question, committee members listened to a brief presentation that illustrated the changing nature of education and the increasing expectations to meet the ever changing needs of a changing student population. Those changing needs were illustrated in the chart below.

**Education is an ‘Evolving’ Process**

```
At no time in history have schools been asked to prepare students for as many careers that do not yet exist!
```

Following the response and subsequent discussion of these two questions, the committee watched a brief video entitled, “the changing paradigm of education” and was asked, “what were some of the major ‘takeaways’ from the video and previous facilitator presentation and what, if any, impact might it have on school facilities”? Below is the responses of the committee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the major takeaways?</th>
<th>What are the possible implications for our facilities?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology is ever-changing and having an impact on education.</td>
<td>Self-contained classrooms may not be conducive to 21st century learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a lack of flexibility in our current educational system (i.e. length of school day/year) and in our age/grouping of students as they pass through school.</td>
<td>We currently have ‘shortcomings’ in the capabilities of our wireless network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training and ‘buy-in’ is important to whatever changes lie ahead.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unless we consider changing what we do, kids will increasingly be less likely to ‘buy into’ their school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following a presentation related to the changing nature of 21st century education, societal expectations and after ‘seeing’ a video of some of the thoughts and ideas that Worthington students had related to the adequacy of their schools, committee members were asked to work in small groups to reflect on everything that they had ‘read, heard and seen’ and once again identify their major ‘takeaways’ for the evening as well as possible ‘impacts’ on existing facilities. Below is a composite of the small group responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The major takeaways for Worthington’s educational future</th>
<th>The likely impact on existing Worthington schools.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ There is a need to increase our technology. (2)</td>
<td>➢ There exists a need for more ‘specialty’ spaces. (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ There remains a level of uncertainty in what 21st century education might look like.</td>
<td>➢ We lack sufficient space for our existing extra-curricular programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Professional staff development is a necessity as we transition into 21st century learning. (2)</td>
<td>➢ Continued enrollment increases are creating space problems for us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Collaboration at all levels of learning will become increasingly important.</td>
<td>➢ Collaborative space is essential for student learning.(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Students will drive our change.</td>
<td>➢ Social space is important for our students. (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Space and learning will increasingly become more ‘flexible’ in nature.</td>
<td>➢ We will need space for professional collaboration and planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Teaching strategies will change.(2)</td>
<td>➢ Space will need to become more flexible and adaptable in nature.(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Education is a constantly changing process.</td>
<td>➢ In anything that we do, cost must be a factor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Programs need to continually modify and/or change in order to meet student needs.</td>
<td>➢ Our infrastructure (outlets etc.) needs to be upgraded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Technology- should it dictate how we teach and students learn?</td>
<td>➢ Room set ups and size must be more variable; creating opportunities for students and teachers to work in a variety of group sizes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ In whatever we do, teacher buy-in (unions) is important.</td>
<td>➢ Technology access should be set up in such a way that it is available anytime/anyplace/anywhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Consideration must be given to educational alternatives such as year-round school, and modifications to start and end times of the school day.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ We must be more open to alternatives such as PSEO, ‘College in our Schools’ and on-line learning alternatives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Creativity will be important in the future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout the meeting, a variety of thoughts and comments were shared by members of the committee; serving to build a broader understanding of what education, and Worthington schools, might look like in the future. Among the comments made:

• “...we currently start school in the fall and end in the spring. What would the school year look like if we allowed students to begin and end at any time during the year....”?

• “...the amount of information our students are exposed to everyday creates an ‘information overload’ and offers everyone a challenge in how to process and manage it...”
• “...the current system of educating our children lacks flexibility and fails to recognize differences in how students learn, and the rate of their learning...”
• “...our educational system is full of artificial ‘endpoints’ such as graduation from high school or college...and we should be promoting a system of life-long learning...”
• “...standardized testing is hampering our ability to focus on, and develop, 21st century skills such as creativity and collaboration...”
• “...we have to be sure that we don’t just listen to the kids when we are planning any changes in our facilities...”
• “...information on the web is not always reliable...we must teach kids how to sort out information and determine what is ‘true’ and what is not...”
• “...texting as a form of communication can lead to the development of a whole new language and undermine the development of good writing skills such as the proper use of punctuation, sentence structure and spelling...”
• “...the advent of technology and the emerging expectations of a 21st century workforce will require that we pay attention to, and teach, a whole new set of skills such as collaboration and creativity....”

Out of the various group discussions, two (2) questions were raised, i) how much learning takes place outside of the classroom and ii) if we provided laptop computers for every child, would the pressure on the existing computer labs at Worthington High school be alleviated and allow us to use that space for other purposes?

Facilitators’ Comments- The primary purpose of this meeting was to provide committee members with the opportunity to see the magnitude of changes that are taking place in education today. As noted in the illustration above, “…at no time in history have schools been asked to prepare students for as many careers that do not yet exist...” Like so many communities and school districts across the state and nation, much of Worthington’s school buildings were constructed in the second half of the 20th century and designed around an educational model quite different than the transforming model taking shape today. Based upon the discussion, there appears to be:

- An evolving recognition that there is at least, the need for existing school space to be used differently than it currently is. All buildings appear to lack adequate i) space for activity based instruction (‘...a place where we can take things apart and put them back together...’), ii) specialized space for labs, iii) space where students can gather, socialize and learn together and iv) access to technology.
- Recognition that an ideal solution would be to add more space either through additions to existing facilities or construction of new facilities.
- An acceptance that existing core spaces such as the cafeterias and gymnasiums at WMS and WHS have not been expanded as expansions took place in other parts of these buildings to accommodate growing student enrollments.
- A recognition that the ‘delivery model’ of education is changing and those changes have a direct bearing on the infrastructure and configuration of Worthington’s schools. (An example cited included the need for more flexible classroom space to accommodate different uses such as small group collaboration and independent learning.)
Professional development has become increasingly important for classroom teachers. Currently, there is a lack of space to provide teachers with common planning areas and/or professional growth; especially in the use and application of technology in the classroom.

The final portion of the meeting was spent reviewing the existing options for facility expansion. Those options were graphically shown to the committee (note the example below.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EC/ALC</th>
<th>Elem.</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>HS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area Learning Center</td>
<td>2 acres</td>
<td>55 acres</td>
<td>52 acres</td>
<td>13+10 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General CR - 23</td>
<td>student</td>
<td>185 sf / student</td>
<td>227 sf / student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ALC - 0)</td>
<td>Avg Class size - 23</td>
<td>Schedule 6.0/8.0(75%)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kindergarten - 8</td>
<td>General CR - 19</td>
<td>3.5/4.0(80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grade rooms - 41</td>
<td>Specialized lab - 19</td>
<td>General CR - 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie Elementary (K-4)</td>
<td>K-4</td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington MS (5-8)</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington HS (9-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current 12/13</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected 15/16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected 17/18</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee members were then asked to take time between the third and fourth meeting to ‘score’ each of the existing proposals (see the scorecard below). They were also encouraged to consider their own option based upon the information gathered in each of the three meetings. Time will be spent at the fourth and final meeting, evaluating each proposal utilizing the scorecard system using the small group to large group format. This process will result in the identification of several options selected through a process of consensus. These options will be taken into the community for its ‘review and comment.’ Following this input, a final set of recommendations will be prepared for the board.
Worthington Public Schools’ Space Utilization and Educational Planning
Conducted by ATS&R

On Tuesday, November 13th, the fourth meeting of the district’s facility planning team was held in the high school media center. The meeting began at 6:45 p.m. and ended at approximately 9:00 p.m. Below are notes from this meeting.

The committee members were presented with results from the electronic survey that they were asked to complete in the prior week. Twenty-two (22) of the committee members responded to the survey. The survey was divided into two (2) parts. The first set of fifteen (15) questions asked committee members to respond to ‘attitudes’ related to what needed to be done to upgrade school facilities. The second part of the survey described ten (10) options related specifically to what steps the district needed to take in order to effectively address the shortcomings of existing facilities. The responses to the ‘attitudes’ portion of the survey is shown in the table below.

---

When compared to all other concerns noted in the survey, the large majority of respondents believe the most important concerns to be:

1. maintaining class sizes and school electives
2. providing additional core space at both the middle school and high school.
It is apparent that costs for additional space (question 15) are viewed to be the most important factor to be considered in moving forward. This response was followed in importance by the need to consider maintaining low class sizes in WPS’s elementary school and the array of electives at WHS. Recognizing that there is a need for additional space at both WMS and WHS was also strongly noted.

The responses to the facility options are shown in the table below.

![Comparison of options chart]

Based upon the survey results, the option that received the most support was option 3A. This option was the construction of a new high school on a new site and conversion of the existing high school into a middle school for grades six (6) through eight (8). The current middle school would be ‘readied’ for an intermediate school for grades three (3) through five (5).

Through small and large group discussion, the advantages and disadvantages of this proposal were identified as follows:

**Advantages of Option 3A:**
- It supports 21st century learning
- Building ‘flexibility’ to accommodate the teaching/learning process is optimized
- Creates most amount of new classroom space
- Construction of new facilities will be less disruptive to the learning process than renovation of existing spaces
- It will provide the perception that the community puts ‘kids first’
- It addresses all current deficiencies in a single step
- New high school will be a ‘state of the art’ facility
- It will bring both community education and the collaborative into Prairie Elementary
- West will be closed
- It will provide more options for student growth over time
- Science labs and overall WHS square footage will be expanded
Drawbacks to this Proposal:

- The initial cost of the project are high (2)
- On-going operating costs associated with adding square footage to the district
- We have an excess levy renewal coming up
- This will not be perceived positively by the public (viewed as Taj Mahal)
- The purchase of land and associated costs have not yet been identified and would need to be done prior to the community vote
- We would have to work with the city and county to address infrastructure costs

As noted in the table above, two (2) other options were viewed more favorably than any of the remaining options. Those options were option two (2) and option 4A. It is important to note that those proposals are similar in nature, creating a new intermediate school on the Prairie Elementary School site and both provide for extensive renovations to the current WHS. The primary difference is in the changes in grade configuration.

Advantages of Option 2:

- Additions to the high school address the essential space needs
- The ALC relocates to WHS; allows for sharing teachers and some resources (2)
- West will be closed (2)
- It will bring both community education and the collaborative into Prairie Elementary
- Grades 3-5 is a good grade configuration
- The new intermediate school will be constructed on school owned property; no additional costs for land acquisition
- The number of regular education classrooms in the district will expand from 164 to 192
- The amount of square foot per student increases to 192 (2)
- This option is less costly than the option to construct a new high school
- Operating costs are less than other options
- Room for growth

Disadvantages of this Proposal:

- The purchase of additional property to accommodate the expansion at WHS will displace people (2)
- It will likely increase annual operating costs by up to $440,000 per year
- It still costs $37.2M
- Would fail to address the need for improvement of high school field
- Larger buildings will require a longer time to construct

Advantages of Option 4A:

- This option is the most cost effective
- It will utilize land we already have versus having to purchase
- It keeps the 9th grade at WHS (whereas options 8 and 8A do not)
- Upgrades of the athletic field expand its utility
- Keeps space that will be lost due to additions at WHS
- Expands the science and music areas by up to 50,000 sq.ft.
- Eliminates West School
• ALC joins WHS making staff collaboration easier
• Opportunity to convert West School site into soccer fields
• Overall less expensive both in construction as well as in operations
• The 5th grade returns to Prairie creating a ‘true’ middle school
• It is a ‘timely’ fix

Disadvantages of this Proposal:
• The overall amount of square feet per student does not change
• Construction during the school year could create major disruptions
• It may not be enough additional space to accommodate future growth
• Splitting the buildings (creating a new intermediate facility) may require additional staffing (i.e. administration, counselors, support staff etc.)

One of the options was created through an open-ended question on the survey. That option was to convert WPS’s grade configuration back into a K-6, 7-9 and 10-12 organization. In that option, the space problems of the senior high school were alleviated by moving grade 9 back into the middle school and either constructing a new intermediate school for grades four (4) through six (6) on the Prairie Elementary School site, or construct an addition onto Prairie Elementary and create a K-6 school building.

Since this proposal was first presented to the committee on the night of meeting four (4), there was no opportunity to rate the option against all others. However, through small group analysis, specific advantages and disadvantages were generated.

Advantages of Option 8:
• It utilizes existing property at Prairie Elementary
• Adding the ALC to WHS will more efficiently use teaching staff
• West will be torn down
• This option is the least costly
• The upper grades remain where the ‘extras’ are (gymnasiums, locker rooms etc.)

Disadvantages of this Proposal:
• The 9th grade is removed from WHS; graduation requirements would need to be evaluated
• Science lab space shortage is not fully addressed
• Some elective classes may be lost
• We only net an additional 50 seats
• We lose the middle school philosophy
• Departmentalization will be utilized at the 9th grade only
There was also one other option generated from the proposed reconfiguration above. Option 8A was the same as option 8 however, it recommended that West remain open and occupied by the ALC.

**Advantages to Option 8A:**
- It is the least expensive option
- It will result in less operating costs than other options
- It will create extra space in some of our school facilities
- Bussing costs will be reduced
- Fewer transitions for students
- Least disruptive to students

**Disadvantage to this Proposal:**
- It is still expensive
- There will be too many kids at Prairie
- There will be challenges in efficiently staffing this configuration of grades
- Taking the 9th grade out of the high school is probably not in the best interest of students

As one additional ‘charge’ to each small group, committee members were asked to discuss the possible advantages of moving the entire district onto a ‘year-round’ calendar. To help the committee understand what that might look like, the facilitators provided the committee with an overview and generic schedule of what a year-round school might look like. Each small group, when asked, reported that there was not any real interest in pursuing this option as a means of relieving class size and enrollment pressure on each building.

Following the small group analysis of each of the options, they were reported out to the entire committee. The committee was then asked to select the option(s) they viewed most favorably through the process known as ‘forced choice.’ Below are the final results shown graphically.
Facilitators’ Comments- This meeting represented the fourth and final meeting of the task force. The survey responses provided a level of clarity based upon its outcome. Summarizing, the survey, and activities in the last meeting underscored the importance of keeping the quality (small class sizes in the elementary school and a variety of electives at the senior high school) in place. It further recognized and acknowledged that there exists a shortage of space at both WMS and WHS. The issue that received the highest level of agreement among survey respondents was the importance of addressing inadequacies in the most cost effective manner possible. However, where the results of the survey and the activities of the last meeting create a ‘disconnect’ of sorts is that the solution most widely supported as indicated both through survey results as well as the forced-choice activity was also the most costly. Constructing a new senior high school and renovating existing facilities is estimated to increase costs by more than 47% when compared to the second option viewed most favorably and nearly 26% when compared to the third option viewed most favorably. Reconciling this difference will be the greatest challenge to successfully moving forward.
On Monday, December 10th, the open meeting with the community was held. The meeting began at 6:30 p.m. and ended at approximately 7:30 p.m. Fewer than ten (10) members of the community attended the meeting. Others who attended the meeting included representatives from the Task Force, School Board and District Administration.

The facilitators presented a brief overview of the information that had been studied by the Task Force along with the set of three (3) options created by the Task Force. They were then given the opportunity to ‘weigh-in’ on the option they believed was the preferred pathway forward for the Board. Overwhelmingly, those in attendance chose the option of construct a new senior high school on an undetermined site as the best option.