

## **Jeffco Facilities Usage Committee- Meeting Notes**

Meeting held April 6, 2009 from 3:30- 5:30 pm.

### **Opening of Meeting/Overview of Previous Meeting**

Cheryl opened the meeting and instructed everyone to put this meeting's materials in Tab 2.

Justin then introduced the elected committee co-chairs, Phillip Infelise and Bob West. They will be leading meetings once the committee moves past the data presentation phase. He also reminded the committee that meeting notes are available on the website; these will not be printed. He asked that the committee staff be alerted if there are any changes that need to be made to these.

Justin then gave a brief overview of what was covered at the last meeting. At the March 16 meeting, the committee talked about the committee mission and charge, district historic enrollment, and school size and configuration. He then explained that this week's meeting will be focused on district staffing procedures, student achievement/assessment, school choice, and capacity.

Additional housekeeping: The committee webpage is up on running on the district website; contact info is included on the website if they have any questions. Meetings materials will be sent out with more lead time in the future; should be at least the weekend before.

The webpage address is:

[http://www.jeffcopublicschools.org/business/facil\\_plan\\_design\\_const/facilities\\_usage/index.html](http://www.jeffcopublicschools.org/business/facil_plan_design_const/facilities_usage/index.html)

Justin then reminded the committee that the meeting norms were at the front of the binder and asked that committee members review them and send in any comments/corrections/additions by next meeting. These will be finalized at the end of next meeting. Two additional norms that have already been added are (1) cell phones should be turned off during the meeting and (2) that the committee members are professionals, so they should feel free to take brief breaks as necessary.

### **District Staffing Procedures**

Information was provided to the committee about district staffing procedures by Peg Kastberg (Community Superintendent), Irene Griego (Community Superintendent), and Marci Jasek (Sr. Budget Analyst). Community Superintendents are in charge of allocating staffing to all of the schools. They meet regularly with the budget office. They also meet 2-3 times a month to talk about staffing.

Peg Kastberg presented; the first handout was "Slide 4- Jeffco 2009/2010 Elementary Allocations" which shows the district allocations for that school level in each job category. The same sheets were provided for the middle school and high school allocations.

## Jeffco Facilities Usage Committee- Meeting Notes

Meeting held April 6, 2009 from 3:30- 5:30 pm.

The question was raised as to whether the per student figures listed under "instructional/ operational allocation" included any technology fees paid by parents. Peg responded that any funding from parents would be above this amount.

It is also noted that teachers and funds are separate, so per pupil amounts are above staffing figures.

Peg then directed the committee to look at the 11" x 17" document "Elementary School Planning Tool" that follows is the actual elementary staffing allocations by school. She said that while allocations are based on the October count, the district collects info about enrollment 3-6 times a year from principals to monitor if staffing allocations are appropriate. The total Full Time Equivalent (FTE) budget for that school, based on the allocations from the previous charts, is the middle column. The next column is "total teachers allocated by school," this is the number of teachers actually allocated. These two figures differ because classes do not come in even breaks, for example instead of two classes of 20, there could be more in one that requires different staffing. The district banks additional allocations to cover these circumstances so it can allocate extra staff to schools that have that need.

The question was asked as to what "bubble schools" as noted on the School Planning Tool are. They are high need schools that do not qualify for Title 1 funds, so the district tries to allocate extra staffing if possible to these schools. For example, some bubble schools are able to offer full-day kindergarten through these extra allocations.

Peg noted that the purpose of these documents is to be as transparent as possible. These allocation worksheets also help principals plan for the next year. She also said that the district staffs according to what the budget allows them to do; they consider all school needs submitted by the principals, prioritize these needs, and then do what they can to hopefully help support these needs. Sometimes additional allocations are postponed until after school starts once kids are in the school. She also added that school of choice can be an issue if they are unsure of where parents will ultimately send their kids.

A committee member asked whether school of choice had a significant impact or if just created minor estimation problems. While schools technically don't have waiting lists, it still creates uncertainty about enrollment. Cindy noted that it could be an issue if there is a large choice enrollment. While schools are required to allow any students to choice in if they have the room, they will not add temporary buildings which could be a detriment to another school. This is not the only variable that affects enrollment projections, for example people move. Cindy said that according to a study, the primary reason families choose to send their student to a school other than their home school is due to childcare availability and then programs. If there are any additional questions about this please send them to the committee email address.

## Jeffco Facilities Usage Committee- Meeting Notes

Meeting held April 6, 2009 from 3:30- 5:30 pm.

Another committee member asked whether the elementary allocation based on 43.4, which is what it appears to be in the spreadsheet, and not differentiated by grade? 43.4 used for budgeted allocation then the district considers what the actual grouping of students is by grade, then compare these groups to the targets and make adjustments to meet these targets under total teacher allocation. The spreadsheets do not show the underlying math.

A committee member asked whether the district allows split grades or multi-grade classrooms and the answer is yes.

Irene then discussed the staffing study that had been done previously. After this study the district believed that a weighted system was the right direction to move toward but it was equally important to them to maintain the staffing allocation process already in place. They thought that putting in a weighted system with limited resources would take away from equity so it was important that they maintain levels in staffing categories. If there was more money then a weighted system could be used to add additional staffing. In a weighted system, weights are given for special needs categories, like at-risk or special education. Ultimately, the district decided that they could not use the study recommendations at the time. The study was based on running professional judgment panels to consider the staffing needed to meet NCLB 100% proficiency requirements by 2013-14. Two areas that the district found to be understaffed were instructional coaches and counselors.

Cindy added that when you have fixed resources to have a weighted system that gives additional allocations to schools in need, you would have to pull resources from other schools. She said that the study is still very much alive and the district would reconsider the study if additional funding became available. The study said that the district was staffing appropriately for accreditation, but not for adequacy (meeting proficiency requirements). The district would need more resources for special needs students.

Justin then clarified how the professional judgment panel process worked. These panels did not look at how to staff specific school districts, but instead how to adequately staff a school district of a certain size; Jeffco would be similar to a district considered by the very large district panel.

A committee member then asked whether this study included any comparison to other districts in the country. Justin explained that these types of studies are state specific and designed to determine the resources needed to meet specific state standards, so there could be differences that the study needs to be tailored to take into account. He noted that adequacy studies are based on the work of national experts who create prototype schools that should work in any state. The study in this state was based on asking Colorado educators to meet specific Colorado education requirements.

Another committee member asked whether school test performance was also considered to determine what students are at-risk in addition to the definition

## **Jeffco Facilities Usage Committee- Meeting Notes**

Meeting held April 6, 2009 from 3:30- 5:30 pm.

based on free lunch and if money could be targeted using that definition. This study did not and Cindy added that this was just starting to be looked at across the country.

The committee member also asked if stimulus money was being considered. Cindy said that another group is making recommendations about how to use that money and options being considered include using the funds to retain jobs, fund an increase professional development and provide additional money for special education. She also clarified that stimulus dollars have restrictions and that a large portion of those funds are targeted to Title schools.

Another committee member asked if this money would be used for underperforming schools. She said she believes that new Title I dollars will go to the highest need schools and only a small percentage will be available for district-wide use.

Irene added that Title schools will have additional staffing and sometimes require more space because they have more people there to meet the needs of the students.

### **School Boundaries and School Choice**

Cheryl presented school boundaries by the regions that were reviewed at the March 16 meeting; please refer to maps in the binder. She said that the committee will be considering these boundaries as they work. She added that on the district website, you can enter an address and find out what home school boundary it is in.

A committee member asked why there was an area that was not labeled with where those students go. Cindy Stevenson responded that these students have a choice of school to attend; most likely this decision was made during past school boundary changes. Cindy added that boundary decisions are not rational, but that they try to do their best. Justin also noted this is not unusual, there are pockets in other districts that do not have a defined home school; this is based on historical and political influence.

It was also explained that boundaries only really mean what school the community will get busing to, but since there is school of choice they are not required to go to that school.

Cheryl then presented on school choice. She said that Peg touched on school choice before and that committee members can refer to the official district policy in the packet. Additional information is available though the Board Policy webpage. For a student to choice into a school, space has to be available and the student has to be able to get to the school because transportation is not provided.

Cheryl indicated that choice statistics are provided in the Choice Enrollment Data Report available in this week's material by elementary, middle and high. Moving

## Jeffco Facilities Usage Committee- Meeting Notes

Meeting held April 6, 2009 from 3:30- 5:30 pm.

from left to right across the columns, this report provides: school name, grade level, region, Exceptional Student Services (ESS) or other programs, official enrollment; students within boundaries; students within the boundary that attend the home school; number of student that choice out; number of students that choice in from other schools within Jeffco; number of non-resident students that choice in from other districts; choice out as a percentage of the students in the boundary, and number of students that choice in as a percentage of the enrollment. The committee is reminded that boundaries really are just a transportation grid because of school choice.

A committee member asked that if the figures for students who choice out include students that are either home schooled or going to a charter. A committee staff member said that these students are only included in the counted in the choice figure if the district knows their address.

Another committee asked if they will be able to see capacity for these schools; this will be looked at in the next section of meeting.

Cheryl said that staff chose 40% as arbitrary cut point to show what schools are at higher end, not based on any district policy. She added that programs may drive choice in and out, so a school can be both a high choice in and a high choice out school.

A committee member asked that as the committee looks at moving programs would they be able to see what the proportion of the student population for that school would be moved. Yes, they will be able to see this later.

Cheryl also provided a clarification to the enrollment information provided at the March 16 meeting. The Green Mountain Elementary School enrollment figures differ from previous figures handed out because staff moved the preschool enrollment to the Irwin-Green Mountain facility which is where those students are actually housed.

A committee member said that she was trying to figure out if there are any assumptions that can be made about choice in schools, thinking about special programs like if GT programs have large choice in, and challenge program attract smaller groups. The committee member said that it would be helpful to see what part of choice in population is tied to specific program.

Cindy said that the district has done a choice study before and that again the top two reasons were childcare and programs.

Cheryl said that they will be able to see choice figures as related to programs in greater detail later.

Cheryl then went on to explain that there was no average choice in and choice out figure; those numbers were all over the board. The next slide showed what number of elementary, middle and high schools are above 40% choice in and out.

## Jeffco Facilities Usage Committee- Meeting Notes

Meeting held April 6, 2009 from 3:30- 5:30 pm.

### Building Capacity

Pete Doherty presented on building capacity. Pete defined capacity for the committee; capacity is the optimum number of students that a building can reasonably accommodate to deliver a specific program. This figure is different than what is considered for code purposes. Capacity is calculated by the way space was designed to be used, not the way it is currently used. He said this figure only includes permanent buildings, not temporary buildings or cottages.

For elementary schools capacity includes general classrooms, but not rooms for specials such as gym, music and art. For a 900 square feet (SF) classroom, 24 students fit comfortably, so this is the assumed average. This average is lowered for smaller classrooms.

For middle schools, this calculation gets more complicated. Middle schools are set up with teams, so capacity calculation based on "core team instructional suite" which is 3 general classrooms, 1 science lab, and 1 flex space room. These suites will have 5 teaching stations with 28 students so one suite can accommodate around 140 students. Exploratory rooms are not included in calculation, because these are not additive spaces.

For high schools, the capacity calculation is based on the number of teaching stations and a utilization factor for each type station. To figure out these utilization factors the district looked at class schedules for all high schools in 2007, then counted the number of classrooms for each subject in each school, averaged those figures to get a utilization figure for each subject station. High schools have a factor for general classroom stations (math, language, social studies), one for science stations, and one for all of other types (electives). A general classroom has a factor of 86% which is the norm that they were shooting for. If they can utilize those rooms at a higher level, their capacity can go up, under that, the capacity goes down.

Pete referred the committee to slides 37-39 which provide elementary, middle and high school capacity statistics.

Pete was asked what percent capacity he felt was optimal. He said that it is tough on schools to be at 100%, instead in the 80-89% range is best because it gives flexibility; there are class population variations that need to be accommodated. In this week's materials are these capacity figures by school; it also shows temporary and cottage usage.

Justin further clarified that capacity % is enrollment divided by permanent design capacity not including temporaries or cottages. Other space available at that school that is not used in denominator.

A committee member asked how art and music rooms were considered in calculations and was concerned that schools might have multiple rooms that

## **Jeffco Facilities Usage Committee- Meeting Notes**

Meeting held April 6, 2009 from 3:30- 5:30 pm.

would not be counted correctly. Each elementary school is assumed to have only one classroom for each special.

Another committee member asked how special education classrooms were counted. Pete said that if the students are in that room all day then that classroom is counted in capacity, but resource rooms would not count. The committee member was concerned that some programs can only handle fewer students than the average, so there needed to be caveats about the capacity at those schools. Cheryl said that this can be looked at in closer detail later, right now just getting the highest level picture.

Another committee member asked if the staff could project capacity. Justin said that you could divide projected enrollment by permanent design capacity to see projected usage. Permanent design capacity does not change unless there is classroom construction. The committee can see these figures combined with other elements at a later date, this is only the overview to see what data is available.

The question was raised as to whether they will be considering when a school was built or when it had a recent addition and what age that school would be assigned. Pete said that they have an effective age of the building that they could show which would give the age of a building based on when it had renovations and the condition of the building. Cheryl reminded the committee that the capital study that is going on now is looking at how much facility need is at schools and that hopefully they will get this information in the fall so the committee can see it later.

### **Student Achievement**

Carol Eaton (Exec Director, Instructional Data Services) then presented on student achievement. She explained that there are many different measures for gauging student performance so she will be giving an overview so that they can decide later what data may be meaningful for their work. She showed that there is a continuum of assessment that ranges from formal measures, like CSAP, to informal measures, like classroom observation. She said that you need a body of evidence to determine how students and schools are doing. There is also behavioral data and survey data available.

State assessments are: CSAP, which is taken in grades 3-10; ACT, taken by all 11<sup>th</sup> graders in four areas (reading, writing, math and science); CSAP A (Alternative) for special education students, taken in grades 3-11; and CELA (Colorado English Language Assessment), which can be taken in any grade to assess language acquisition. Additional data available includes attendance data (goal of 95% attendance) and discipline incidence data as well as three surveys: a student "make your voice heard" survey which is done every two years; "welcoming environment" parent survey, that they are just tabulating results from this year; and a Jeffco employee survey.

## Jeffco Facilities Usage Committee- Meeting Notes

Meeting held April 6, 2009 from 3:30- 5:30 pm.

She reminded the committee that they need to look at multiple data points and consider trends over time. She said that CSAP is not the only measure and that need to look at different sources in conjunction with CSAP to draw conclusions. There are three accountability systems to think about: (1) CO accreditation, (2) school accountability reports which gives school ranking based on CSAP and ACT and (3) NCLB, which under this is AYP and Annual Measurable Achievement Objective (AMAO). Please refer to the handout "School list from Jeffco's annual report."

A committee member was concerned about school's having poor scores because of non-performance related reasons, such as a large number of parents opting out. Carol said that this is why it would be important to look at accountability ratings summary multiple years, to look for trends which would help overcome flukes.

A committee member asked why high schools had much lower percentages of indicators being met. Carol explained that AYP has over 50 indicators in it that school can be held accountable. She said that a school would not be held accountable for any subgroup that would have less than 30 students being measured. So size is an issue, at the high schools because of their size they are held accountable for all of these indicators, while a small elementary school might not have to meet as many indicators.

Carol then explained the new Colorado Growth Model, which is a way to look at schools progress based on how students should be growing compared to their academic peers. This model is just like a pediatric growth chart with students ranked on where they are in the growth percentile. This means that a student's performance on a test will be compared with that of students who scored the same on the prior years test. They will be then compared to see how their growth from year to year compared to students that started in the same place and given a percentile rank according to their comparative growth. To get a school growth score they pick the median growth score of all the school's students and that becomes the schools median growth score. Schools are then ranked accordingly.

A committee member asked how this is affected by opt-outs. Carol said that for a score to be included, there would have to be a score available, so opt outs would not be included.

Schools are then mapped on a quadrant grid, that shows growth and performance. The four quadrants would be high performance, high growth; high performance, low growth; low performance, high growth; and low performance, low growth- this would be the quadrant to be concerned about. There is a link in the power point that shows this growth chart for entire state and they can select individual schools, pick school level and subject. The size of dot equals enrollment.

A committee member asked whether historical growth model data was available. Carol said that this was a new measure so only two years of data was available.

## **Jeffco Facilities Usage Committee- Meeting Notes**

Meeting held April 6, 2009 from 3:30- 5:30 pm.

Carol concluded her presentation by saying that there are a lot of measures available to gauge student achievement and encouraged the committee to look at multiple measures and consider them over time.

### **Meeting Closing/ Final Questions**

A committee member asked whether the district was considering going to four days a week like some other school districts were discussing. The district has officially addressed this in the SuperNews portion of the newsletter (monthly). This information will be forwarded to the committee.

Another committee member said she was impressed with amount data being shared and wondered if any of it was confidential. Justin responded that everything that has been shared will be posted on the committee's webpage, so any data shared will become available to the public at some point. For now, staff will not post the information on the webpage until it is presented at the committee meetings and Justin asked that the committee not share the information until it is posted on the webpage for the general public.

A committee member asked whether the data will be provided in native form, such as in Excel so that they can sort and manipulate the data themselves. Justin said that it will only be in PDF so if there are any suggestions for what data the committee would like to see calculated or together, these should be passed to committee staff they will handle it.

The question was raised as to whether growth data for the schools will be made available. More information could be provided once the committee determines what is really needed so unnecessary data is not generated.

Another committee member asked whether the meeting notes will include action items for when committee members request certain information. Justin said that all questions will be written down and addressed at some point.

A committee member requested that a glossary be provided for acronyms. On a similar note, another committee member asked what ESS was. This stands for Exceptional Student Services.

Bob said that Phil will be running the next meeting, and that he will not be here. He then thanked everyone for being there.

Meeting adjourned at 5:30 pm.