



Long Range Planning Committee Meeting Notes

Meeting 5: Tuesday, November 29, 2016

- **Welcome**

Tim McClure, District Architect & Planner, opened the meeting with welcoming the committee members and reviewing the agenda for the evening. This evening is when the committee will begin to work together in small groups and the administration gathers feedback from committee members.

- **Meeting 4 Review**

Mr. McClure reviewed the content presented in Meeting 4, including the overview of the technology department and the athletic department and their needs. Meeting 4 also provided an overview of the comprehensive facility assessment that studied existing conditions of every NISD facility and identified deficiencies at each. These items will be prioritized with each campus principal and the district Facilities Team and brought to the committee next meeting for consideration.

- **Long Range Plan Discussion**

Mr. McClure began the long range planning discussion by reviewing the philosophical shift that occurred back in 2011 regarding school capacities. At that time, an assessment was done of the district's school sizes and feeder pattern model and it was concluded that the best route for the district was to change from a 650 student elementary to an 850 student elementary. The savings from the M&O side for personnel was a total of \$3.3 million between 2011-15 and projected to be \$21.3 million between 2016-20.

- **Feeder Pattern Model**

Mr. McClure showed the committee a diagram of the district's current feeder pattern. The current feeder pattern model includes six elementary schools of 850 students that feed into two middle schools of 1,200 students that feed into one high school of 3,200-3,400 students. Our current high schools sit at about 2,500 capacities, which are where we are beginning to feel the capacity strain, as we grow closer to the full potential of the feeder pattern model. Mr. McClure explained that expansions to our high schools need to be considered as growth occurs in their respective feeder patterns.

Question: Would you ever stray from this plan and have larger elementary schools?

Answer: No, because the numbers will not work with the capacities of the middle school and feeding three elementaries per middle.

Question: Looking at the assessment reports, there are mentions of recommendations regarding TEA sizes. What do they recommend for this?

Answer: TEA does not regulate or set standards for school sizes. They set standards for classroom sizes, library sizes, student to teacher ratios, etc.

Question: Justin Elementary has a capacity of 650 students and is landlocked. How do you make it fit this model?

Answer: There are some of our older facilities that will not fit this model. The attendance boundaries will be kept to keep the enrollment at 650. However, there could be other solutions. We've added an enormous amount of square footage in new schools over the past decade but have not increased administrative square footage at all. One solution we are exploring, for example, is to build a new Haslet Elementary, which is one of our oldest campuses, and make the existing campus an administrative annex.

Mr. McClure reviewed the facility forecast for new schools and school expansions based on growth projections over the next 10 years. The committee agreed that these new facilities and expansions are must-do projects as part of the Long Range Plan.

Question: Will this timing fluctuate?

Answer: Yes. We feel very confident about the ones that are forecasted sooner, but they can all certainly shift sooner or later depending on how accurate the growth is to the projections. We know they are needed, it's just a matter of exactly when they will be needed that can adjust slightly.

Question: I missed the demographer's report; I notice there are not any expansions for the elementary schools on the far west side. When would those need to be considered?

Answer: I anticipate that we will start to see some of that move forward next time we are planning for a bond. The growth projections don't show that it's needed at this time.

Question: Regarding school standards, how do you factor in renovating 25-year-old schools to bring up to today's standards?

Answer: That is an important discussion. A lot of that will be resolved in the deficiency report. The committee will also need to consider standards set for educational delivery and how we are using the facility for collaboration, etc. Later in the meeting, we will be asking you to list for us additional needs you feel should be considered.

Question: How long do you watch enrollments, at Granger Elementary for example, before you decide you need to do something regarding overcrowding? Or is it pretty locked at that enrollment of about 920?

Answer: For Granger, specifically, we have capacity at a school very nearby. It has stayed consistent at just over 900 and it is pretty locked in at that maximum enrollment because its built-out. We will be able to balance the feeder patterns and bring that number down without expanding that campus.

Question: On the new middle schools, the first one would be to relieve Chisholm Trail, the second would be for Medlin, and the third is Tidwell?

Answer: It is hard to say on the third one. We will have to watch how fast developments come online.

Question: Do we have sites for new schools in the large developments that are planned?

Answer: We have a donated site up in the Harvest community. We are currently in talks with most of the large developments. We have a high school site up west. We just recently purchased a new high school/middle school site near Cabela's. We have about three more land purchases in the works that should be completed by February. There will need to be funds designated in this bond that will go hand-in-hand with new schools.

Question: Isn't Beck Elementary already at 850 students? Why does it need an expansion?

Answer: Yes. It's not that they are getting more kids. They are currently about 10,000 square feet below where they should be and the students are crammed in. We need to provide 4 or

more classrooms. There is room for expansion on the site. We are currently looking at the front of the building on the north side. It won't compromise play spaces.

Question: At Northwest High School, my student's class size was about 850 and I know there has been some larger ones a few years back. What is the capacity at Northwest HS? I don't see it on the list for an expansion.

Answer: Its capacity is 2,400. Eaton High School took many kids from Northwest when it opened. The need for an expansion is not in sight yet. The developments we see coming in this area are just now beginning the zoning/permitting process. Remember it takes 18 months before we see families moving in and then at least another five before we begin to feel it in the upper grade levels.

- **Prioritization**

Mr. McClure reviewed the prioritization process that will be utilized by the committee. Four factors have been identified for the committee to use in rating potential projects: Urgency of Need, Benefit to Students, Benefit to Community, and Value. The committee confirmed they agree with these factors. A weight will be assigned to each factor depending on how the committee ranks these factors.

- **Ranking Factors**

An online poll was conducted for the committee members to rank order the four factors in order of what they believe is most important when considering the priority of a potential project. The first ranked factor was Benefit to Students, with Urgency of Need as a very close second. The third factor was Value and the fourth was Benefit to Community. After discussion, it was determined that the committee would like the administration to apply the weight to the factors based on the true results of the poll. Those will be provided next meeting as the committee works in small groups to rate potential projects.

- **Potential Projects**

Mr. McClure reviewed the listing of potential projects from each focus area that has been previously presented to the committee – Fine Arts, CTE, Athletics, Safety and Security and Technology. He asked the committee to work at their tables to discuss the list of projects and add anything they feel is missing. He explained that the goal is to not focus on the details tonight, but to get a final listing of potential projects for consideration. The committee members spent the remainder of the meeting discussing the provided project listing and making notes on other things they feel are needs that should be addressed.

- **Closing**

Mr. McClure closed the meeting at 8 pm and collected each group's notes, which will be compiled and vetted before next meeting with the other projects.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, December 13, 2016 at 6:00 p.m.