

# Long Range Planning

Minutes June 14, 2004

Bold indicates those in attendance

Present: **Anne Shipe, Paul Matherne, Carol Hurt, John Herrmann, Dean Riddick, Linda McRaven, Michael Coppola, Donnell Smith, Diane Behrens, Al Reaser, Lisa Glass, Willie Smith,** Jackson Zimmerman, Wayne Cilimberg, Tom Foley

Dr. Behrens opened the meeting thanking the committee for their work and for being there tonight. She explained what the agenda and focus would be for this meeting.

**Welcome**

Mr. Reaser explained the CIP process pointing out the following:

**CIP Process**

- The overall capital planning cycle operates on a 2-year time frame.
- This is year one where new projects can be introduced.
- In year two only emergency projects or changes to existing projects can be included.
- The need for projects is determined by input from principals, central office and support services staff, and the Long Range Planning Committee.
- July 1, 2005 begins the new 5-year planning cycle.
- This committee recommends the revised CIP to the School Board, along with recommendations of potential redistricting that is needed to support the CIP and correct existing boundary issues. The actual redistricting process occurs as a separate process later in the year.
- The School Board prioritizes and approves future school capital projects and submits them to the County Executive's office and to the Technical Review Committee.
- These projects are then considered in light of available revenues.
- Capital projects expenditures come off the top of the projected revenue of before revenues are split between local government (40%) and the school division (60%) for the operational expenditures.
- The top priority for projects is to maintain the facilities that we have, such as roof replacement, HVAC, etc.
- The rate of debt service expenditure to general fund and school fund revenues should not exceed 10%.

Mr. Reaser went through each project in the CIP book for FY2004/05 – 2008/09.

The following questions were raised and data needs to be gathered prior to giving answers:

- What does 1% of the available revenue yield?

- Under the current rules is a new H.S. possible?
- Do we know what the optimal size for schools is?
- Do we know the numbers of students going out to private schools during middle school and returning to high school?
- What are the land and infrastructure requirements for elementary schools of 600, middle schools of 900, and high schools of 1500?

Mr. Reaser presented the report on adding on to existing high schools or adding a fourth comprehensive high school. The study was completed last fall and estimated costs were based on the market at that time. The complete report was given to the committee.

**High School Feasibility Study**

Mr. Reaser reviewed how school capacity is figured and informed the committee that new data will be presented on capacity because of some programming changes. For example, Woodbrook may be adding a Bright Stars class that will remove one classroom from the capacity for that school. Elementary school capacity is based on the number of classrooms available for regular classroom instruction and self-contained special ed classes at a reduced ratio of 8:1. Middle school capacity is based on the number of regular classrooms available and self-contained special ed classes at a reduced ratio of 8:1. High school capacity is based on the total number of classrooms available for regular instruction with the gymnasium counting as three teaching spaces. Self-contained special ed classrooms are figured in the capacity using the 8:1 ratio. Then the capacity is reduced by 15% to account for scheduling difficulties and class size variation.

**Review of School Capacity**

The committee requested parameters from the School Board on redistricting. A summary of the Board's discussion on February 21, 2004 was distributed to the committee. The committee was asked to review these parameters to see if more direction is needed.

**Direction from the School Board**

The Board did not approve the spot redistricting of Meriwether Lewis students to Henley. The following motion was made and approved.

**Spot Redistricting**

"I move that the School Board not approve a spot redistricting, outside of the administrative procedure, to eliminate the split feeder pattern for Meriwether Elementary at this time. Further, the Long Range Planning Committee should undertake an immediate review of split feeder patterns around the County and make recommendations to the School Board as to how to best eliminate some of these splits in response to our current enrollment and capacity projections as part of their review of the CIP and the upcoming capital projects that will expand our

capacity. This should be done in a manner consistent with the principles agreed to by this Board in February 2004."

Dr. Behrens distributed a letter from a citizen who requested that the Woodbrook split be looked at with other splits. We talked about the possibility of joining with Charlottesville City Schools for high school space. Dr. Behrens had a conversation with the superintendent who indicated Charlottesville High School did not have any space available.

**Letter from  
citizen  
Other**

A request was made for the power point presentation given to the Board from the last Long Range Planning Committee recommendations. Mr. Reaser indicated he would get that to all committee members.

A discussion about other structures for educating children was brought forward such as a K-8 school. The Office of Instruction will have to advise us on best structures.

Future meeting dates have been set. They are:  
July 5, July 19, August 9 and August 23

**Future  
Meeting  
Dates**

Meetings will begin at 6:00 and end at 8:30. Food will be provided.

Topics for the next meeting:

- New southern elementary school

Minutes submitted by E. Diane Behrens, Executive Director Support Services