

SLSD Elementary Buildings -Planning for the Future

## Problem:

- Hopewell needs \$12 million of repairs over next 10 years.
- Lower Milford needs \$3 million of repairs over next 10 years.
- How do we best address these needs and most effectively use our limited resources?
- Administration asked to gather additional data.

### Educational Research

Leah M. Christman

## Educational Impact of School Size

- Social Sciences studies with empirical evidence/research looked at:
  - **Economics** (Economies of Scale) *Medium size is better than small.*
  - Academic performance (generally standardized tests- some studies on "learning"- look at growth over time) Not much effect- class size and what occurs in the classroom is more important. Socioeconomic status is highest indicator.
  - **Social** (Social Capital- measure involvement, relationships, trust) *Inconclusive with many variables.*
  - Perceptions (Generally teachers and parents- work loads, time to know children, self-efficacy, value of this to the system) *Small is better- what is the* value of teacher/parent perceptions?
- "Existing research does not allow for clear calculations of the optimal school size across all of these different situations" (Harris, 2007).

## Educational Impact of School Size

- "Small" school is about building "community" and nurturing, personalization, engagement, and belonging more than actual school capacity. (Strike, 2008)
- Most research on school size focuses on High Schools and most Elementary focus is on class size.
- Most significant factor on achievement is socioeconomic status- no effect from size of school (400 elementary schools in S.C.)
- Many variables influence results- rural, suburban, urban, socioeconomic status, students with special needs, minority, atrisk, etc.

Ready & Lee, (2007) looked at k-1 and defined school size as- Small = under 275; Medium-small= 276-400; Medium = 401-600; Medium large= 601-800; Large = 800+.

- <u>Concluded that small is not always good, but</u> <u>large is generally bad.</u>
- Class size is a factor –Learning rates in small (under 17) and medium size (under 25) classes are similar. "Classroom context may be more relevant to learning than the larger school context."
- Effects must include social background, school composition, location and grade span.
- Literacy growth is similar between small & medium; Math slightly higher in small.
- No impact for Reading. Math higher in large 3-5 schools (600+) (Odom, 2009).

# Our Average Class Sizes

Small = -17; Medium= 17-25; Large= 25+

Building	Kindergarten			Building	First				
	2009	2010	2011	2012		2009	2010	2011	2012
HW	18	17.25	19.25	21	HW	17.5	20.5	21.6	22.3
LB*	15.5	15.5	21	22	LB*	23	19	19.3	23
LM	20.5	20.5	19.5	20	LM	21.5	19.5	21	21

Building	Second				Building	Third			
	2009	2010	2011	2012		2009	2010	2011	2012
HW	21	20.25	21	23	HW	21.5	22.25	20.5	21.75
LB*	20.6	24	21	23.6	LB*	22.6	22.3	24.3	22.6
LM	16.6	20	21.5	24	LM	21.5	26	19.5	22

\*Excludes Spanish Immersion

# Historical 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade Advanced/Proficient PSSA

Building	Reading			Building		Ma	ath		
	2009	2010	2011	2012		2009	2010	2011	2012
HW	90.6%	86.5%	88.9%	86.2%	HW	87.1%	91.0%	85.2%	94.3%
LB	92.5%	89.0%	84.3%	91.3%	LB	93.6%	92.3%	91.2%	92.3%
LM	95.4%	84.9%	97.3%	88.6%	LM	93.0%	86.8%	86.8%	88.6%

Scores = Average for building. Total 3<sup>rd</sup> grade enrollment varies. Not a good comparison

Building	Third Grade Class Size					
	2009	2010	2011	2012		
HW	21.5	22.25	20.5	21.75		
LB*	22.6	22.3	24.3	22.6		
LM	21.5	26	19.5	22		

## Educational Impact of School Size

- We have purposely reported our PSSA data as a grade level- not compared results in the three buildings- many variables- student needs.
- There is no statistical significance to differences in results on 3<sup>rd</sup> grade PSSA Math and Reading between buildings over time.
- Scores have fluctuated in all buildings and are not consistently dependent on smaller class size.
- Regardless of Board decision on 2 or 3 buildings, the administration does not anticipate any negative educational impact. We anticipate that our teachers, class size, curriculum process, and "community" feel of our buildings will remain unchanged.

## Transportation

Todd Bergey

## Current Transportation Runs & Costs by Building

						Avg. # of	
					Avg.	students	
				Avg. of	Student	on 72	Cost per
			Longest	Longest of	Time on	passenger	student
	# Buses	# Vans	Run	all runs	bus	bus	per year
нw	6		46.16	38 min.	19 min.	43	\$467.00
LM	5	3	46.26	44 min.	22 min.	29	\$976.00
LB	7		54.00	42 min.	21 min.	41	\$494.00
IS	16	1	48.30	39 min.	20 min.	42	\$533.00

## # of Students Distance from School



## Transportation and Population Density



## Estimated Transportation Costs of Closing One Building

- If Lower Milford closes and all students bused to Hopewell:
  - Anticipated reduction of 2 buses- possibly 3 (\$100- \$150 thousand savings each year)
  - Ride times reduced for many students due to efficiencies
  - Ride times increased for some students remain within policy
  - Potential to utilize vans for outliers to reduce run times
- If Hopewell closes and all students bused to Lower Milford:
  - Anticipated increase of 2 -4 buses- \$100k to \$200k increase each year
  - Ride times increase for many students due to population density

#### Finances

Jeremy Melber

## Current Cost per Student

#### 2012-2013 SCHOOL COMPARISON

	HOPEWELL	LIBERTY BELL	LOWER MILFORD	INTERMEDIATE
avg # of students	302	323	184	735
Totals	\$2,094,945	\$2,186,040	\$1,551,902	\$4,903,287
Cost per Student:	\$6,936.90	\$6,767.93	\$8,434.25	\$6,671.14

## Current Cost per Student

#### 2011-2012 SCHOOL COMPARISON

	HOPEWELL	LIBERTY BELL	LOWER MILFORD	INTERMEDIATE
avg # of students	307	337	174	725
Totals	\$2,208,419	\$2,274,234	\$1,579,759	\$4,732,728
Cost per Student:	\$7193.55	\$6,748.47	\$9.079.07	\$6,527.90

# Options

Option A – Develop a 10 year capital plan repairing Hopewell and Lower Milford

Option B – Repair Lower Milford then demolish Hopewell

Option B1 - Add Capacity to Liberty Bell and Lower Milford then demolish Hopewell

Option C – Renovate Hopewell then close Lower Milford

Option D – Demolish Hopewell, build a new building and close Lower Milford

Option D1 - New Hopewell to house 500 Students then close LM

Option E – Demolish Hopewell, build a new building and repair Lower Milford

٠

	Option B	notion B1	Option D	notion D1	Option E
Total Capital Cost	\$3.5M	\$12M	\$15M	\$17M	\$17M
Yearly Bond Costs	\$100K	\$400K	\$490K	\$550K	\$550K
Operational Cost Savings	\$450K	\$450K	\$733K*	\$717K**	\$50K
Net Yearly Cost	\$350K savings	\$50K Savings	\$243K Savings	\$167K Savings	\$500K
Tax Impact	None (future needs)	Inc. \$79.36 (future needs)	None	None	Inc. \$110.22
K-3 Student Capacity	586	950	688*** (HW=52k)	950 (HW=60k)	930
Future Expansion Options	Possible	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Disruption to Educational Programs	Medium	Medium	Low	Low	Medium

Busing costs added to all operational savings

- Lower Milford Roof adjustment -\$17,000/yr
- \*\*Additional square footage energy costs \$2/sq'
- \*\*\* With greater efficiency, building will increase capacity- 688 is current

## Current 5 Yr. Budget

- Current 5-year budget calls for the following tax increase:
  - 2014-15 .167 Mills \$46.85 increase to Average Taxpayer
  - ♦ 2015-16 .25 Mills \$70.13 increase
  - 2016-17 .25 Mills \$70.13 increase
  - ♦ 2017-18 .10 Mills \$28.05 increase
  - Total .767 Mills \$215.16 increase
- With these increases we would still need to cut \$916,000 within 5 years
- With a \$15 million bond for building projects and the same tax increases, we would need to cut \$1,738,000

### Budget Impacts

- In order to maintain the same budget structure and limit cuts to \$916,000 we would need the following Tax Increases:
  - 2014-15 .25 Mills \$70.13increase
  - 2015-16 .33 Mills \$92.57 increase
  - 2016-17 .33 Mills \$92.57 increase
  - <u>2017-18 .25 Mills \$70.13 increase</u>
  - Total 1.16 Mills \$325.40
- Average tax bill would increase from current \$4,311.29 to \$4,636.67 over 5 years
- Whether \$916,000 or \$1,738,000, cuts will need to come from staffing, programs, extra-curricular.

#### Additional Items to Consider

Leah M. Christman

## Additional Considerations

- Safety/Security Emergency Infrastructure of of 3 Municipalities & Response Times (Police, fire, snow removal, medical access)
- Public Sewer/Water- Current lack of- versus potential for future growth
- Population Growth & Demographic Study
  - -1%, LM; 5% UST & Coopersburg (Avg. 4% growth)
  - Our historical growth based on 3<sup>rd</sup> day enrollment:
    - ▲ LB 2.65%
    - ♦ HW 0.67%
    - ▲ LM .086%
    - Total elementary growth over 11 years is 1.14%.
    - 5 year average growth at the IS since opening is 0.741%.
- Disruption of other buildings with additional options being offered

# Other Options Considered

• Keep all buildings- Cost and sustainability.

• Move students to different levels?

- ♦ LM= k-6; LB= k-3; Close HW; IS= k-6 from HW and LB's 4-6
- LM= k-4; LB= k-4; Close HW; IS= k-4 from HW and  $5^{th}$  &  $6^{th}$  grade
- $\bullet \quad Move \ 6^{th} \ to \ MS$
- Move 9<sup>th</sup> to MS and 7<sup>th</sup> to IS and 4<sup>th</sup> to elem.

Administrative concerns about all the work that has been done to build curriculum- pacing alignment, PD, teaming, culture and traditions as primary, intermediate and MS focus. Is it wise to recreate all of the work of the past 5 years by reconfiguring multiple levels and potentially impact successes our students are experiencing?

Change takes 3-5 years to see results.

Feasibility of Enlarging Liberty Bell & Lower Milford

Danielle Hoffer

#### References

Berry, C. (2007) School consolidation and inequality. *Brookings Papers on Education Policy*, No. 9, pp. 49-75. (2006/2007) Brookings Institution Press

Carpenter, C. (2006). The relationship of public elementary school size, student achievement, and per pupil expenditures in South Carolina. *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, 99-99 p. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/305279501? accountid=10559. (305279501).

Dee, T., Ha, W., & Jacob, B. (2007). The effects of school size on parental involvement and social capital: Evidence from the ELS: 2002. *Brookings Papers on Education Policy*, No. 9, pp. 77-97. (2006/2007) <u>Brookings Institution Press</u>

Harris, D. (2007) Class size and school size: Taking the trade-offs seriously. *Brookings Papers on Education Policy*, No. 9, pp. 137-161. (2006/2007) <u>Brookings Institution Press</u>

Kim, J. (2007). The relative influence of research on class size policy. *Brookings Papers on Education Policy*, No. 9, pp. 273-295. (2006/2007) <u>Brookings Institution Press</u> Konstantopolos, S. (2011). How consistent are class size effects? *Evaluation Review*, 35 (1) pp. 71-92.

Loveless, T. & Hess, F. (2007) Introduction: What do we know about school size and class size? *Brookings Papers on Education Policy*, No. 9, pp. 1-14. (2006/2007) <u>Brookings Institution Press</u>

Odom, N. M. (2009). Elementary school student achievement: An analysis of school size and student achievement. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, 156. Retrieved from http:// search.proquest.com/docview/89202301?accountid=10559. (89202301).

Ready, D. & Lee, V. (2007). Optimal context size in elementary schools: Disentangling the effects of class size and school size. *Brookings Papers on Education Policy*, No. 9, pp.99-135. (2006/2007) Brookings Institution Press

Schrag, P. (2007). Policy from the hip: Class size reduction in California. *Brookings Papers on Education Policy*, No. 9, pp. 229-243 (2006/2007) <u>Brookings Institution Press</u>

#### References

Shaw, L. C. (2008). An analysis of elementary school size in North Carolina: When does a small school become too small? ProQuest Dissertations and Theses,164. Retrieved from http:// search.proquest.com/docview/304535072?accountid=10559. (304535072).

Strike, K. (2008). Small schools: size or community? *American Journal of Education*, Vol. 114, No. 3, (May 2008), pp. 169-190 Published by: <u>The University of Chicago Press</u>

White, S. M. T. (2005). *The relationship of school size and school climate in public elementary schools in South Carolina. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, , 186-186 p. Retrieved from http:// search.proquest.com/docview/305416352?accountid=10559. (305416352).