



DECEMBER 2017



Table of Contents

- 1 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**
PAGE 2
- 2 PURPOSE & PROCESS**
PAGES 3-7
- 3 DATA & FINDINGS**
PAGES 8-11
- 4 RECOMMENDATIONS**
PAGES 12-18

Acknowledgements



DeJONG RICHTER/Cooperative Strategies would like to express our gratitude for the opportunity to work with the Worthington Community and the Worthington Board of Education, District Leadership, Faculty, and Staff. A special thank you to the members of the Long Range Facilities Planning Task Force for your time and commitment, working toward the continuous improvement of the facilities for the students of Worthington.

WORTHINGTON BOARD OF EDUCATION

Jennifer Best
Julie Keegan
Marc Schare
Sam Shim
Charlie Wilson

WORTHINGTON SCHOOLS LEADERSHIP

Dr. Trent Bowers, Superintendent
Jeff McCuen, Treasurer
Randy Banks, Assistant Superintendent
Jeff Eble, Director of Business Services
Vicki Gnezda, Director of Communications
Timothy Gehring, Facilities Director
Jeff Maddox, Director of Certified Personnel
Angie Adrean, Chief Academic Officer
Patrick Callaghan, Director of Elementary Education
Dr. Neil Gupta, Director of Secondary Education

Jay Addy
Kevin Ault
Sam Biglin
Mick Box
Cristina Brandt
PR Casey
Audrey Clumm
Jon Cook
Maggie Crozier
Ryan Dalcolma
Rachael Dorothy
Matt Dumas
Joe Dunn
Pamela Fair
Jennifer Flint
Jennifer Fralic
Lisa Fuller
Curran Gimeson
Dan Girard
Angie Gussler
Rich Hagopian
Carol Hasbrouck

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Mark Hill	Brian Morgan
Carrie Houk	Tracy Najera
Nikki Hudson	William Northrup
Terrie Huston	Sarah Novak
Jim Janosik	Randy Ohlemacher
Kevin Johnson	Tom O'Leary
Dreama Justice	Michael Passella
Lori Kallas	Jen Reis
Nathan Kellenberger	Rebecca Romano
Holly Keller	Jenny Saunders
Rick Kellner	Bob Scheetz
Kathleen Kelly	Jay Scott
Steve Kolwicz	KJ Shannan
Marya Kowal	Doug Small
Trish Laughman	Kim Stamolis
Anne Lenzotti	Pate Stegman
Joyce Lewis	Glennon Sweeney
Amy Lloyd	Margie Toy
Cynthia MacKenzie	Heather Van Syckle
Kathy McClintock	Molly Yeager
Patrick McElroy	Kim Zupfer
Glenn Moog	

Purpose



The mission of Worthington Schools is to empower a community of learners who will change the world. School facilities have significant influence on the experience of a student's experience in education, but also serve as a center of community for neighborhoods across Worthington. The purpose of conducting this facilities plan is to create a roadmap of capital improvements that will address aging facilities, balance of enrollment, and create appropriate capacity for future enrollment.

Process

The facilities master planning process conducted for Worthington was intentionally conducted to balance data with the expectations of the community. The following outlines the facility master planning process.

Data Collection/Analysis

Facility Conditions

This study utilized the facility condition assessment information as provided by the Ohio Schools Construction Commission [OFCC]. In 2015 the OFCC conducted school by school facility condition assessments to determine on a systems level the overall condition of each facility in the District. The assessment provided overall costs for repair/renovation of facilities that determined a facilities condition index [FCI] or numerical rating of the cost of renovation vs. replacement of each facility.

Enrollment Projections

Cooperative Strategies conducted a 10-year enrollment projection study to determine the estimated number of students in Worthington Schools in the future. The projection methodology is a cohort survival methodology that utilizes historical enrollment, live birth data matched to mother's address (within the school district boundary), and building permit data. This projection was based on where students live and not where they attend, as this model is seen as an accurate model for school facility planning as it is separated from influences on school enrollment such as program locations and Board policies.



Data Collection/Analysis

Capacity Analysis

In July 2016 Cooperative Strategies also conducted a school-by-school analysis to determine the enrollment capacity of each facility. School floor plans were also analyzed and compared to the school walk throughs in an effort to be more accurate in the room by room analysis. Another layer of accuracy was added by then digitizing the floor plans of all school facilities and overlaying the each school's master schedule to then conduct an hour by hour utilization of all educational spaces in each school.

Program Review

Cooperative Strategies met with District and school level leadership to discuss programs that are offered at each grade level and how those programs influence the use of facilities. Meetings were held with elementary, middle, and high school principals and athletic directors, instructional leadership from special education, pre-k education, career & technical education, alternative education, ESL, core educational programs, and physical education.

Community Engagement

Community Task Force

The Facilities Planning Task Force was assembled to provide a diverse citizen representation of schools, neighborhoods, school organizations, professional organizations, and civic organizations across the District. This group of approximately 60 citizens met a total of ten [10] meetings during the process to review data, community feedback, develop options/scenarios, and provide guidance for the final recommendations.



Community Engagement

Community Dialogues

There were a total of four [4] broad based community meeting events conducted over eight nights. The community meetings allowed the broader Worthington community to examine data findings, review options/scenarios and provide feedback that provided guidance on the direction of the facilities master plan. These community meetings allowed the planning team and the task force to have insight on the expectations of the community thus shaping the ultimate recommendations for the long range facilities plan. The following is an overview of each of the meetings:

Meeting #1- Educational Future's Conference, Process, & Community Expectations

Approximately 820 citizens participated in the first community meeting by either attending 1 of 3 meetings or completing the online survey. This meeting outlined the current state of school facilities and provided an overview of the data being used to develop the facilities master plan. Participants were asked to rate their perception of the condition of facilities and how that impact future educational delivery in the schools. Community members also provided feedback on what they believed would be the biggest challenges in this process and what their expectations of the plan would be.

Meeting #2- Planning Framework

Approximately 320 citizens participated in this community meeting by either attending 1 of 2 meetings or completing the online survey. This meeting focused on planning framework that would help shape options/scenario development moving forward in the process. Citizens provided feedback on when should buildings be replace instead of renovating, when should boundary changes be considered, appropriate enrollment sizes for schools, program impacts of planning, and grade configuration. The results from this meeting helped shape the planning framework for decisions moving forward.

Meeting #3- Options/Scenarios

Approximately 500 citizens participated in the third round of community meetings either by attending 1 of 3 meetings or completing the online survey. This meeting focused on the facility planning options developed based on data and previous community feedback. The options provided an opportunity for the community to review scenarios that explored different grade configuration options, actions to facilities, and to balance high school enrollment in the future.



Community Engagement

Community Dialogues

Meeting #4- DRAFT Recommendations

Approximately 300 citizens participated in the fourth round of community meetings either by attending 1 meeting or completing the online survey. This meeting presented a DRAFT of the preliminary recommendations for both a K-5 and K-6 grade configuration facilities plan. The community was provided an opportunity to ask a panel that included the Superintendent, Treasurer, and Consultant, a number of questions regarding the process, data, and the plan. The results from this meeting was instrumental in narrowing the scenarios to get to a final recommendation.

Educational Framework

A critical element of development of options was creating the framework or “rules to plan by” as established by community feedback, Task Force input, and by the data. The following outlines the framework established for this process:

- Plan Must Address Aging Facilities
- Plan Must Deal with Enrollment Growth, but Prepare for any Future Decline (Don't Overbuild)
- Boundary Enrollment Must Align with Facility Capacities
- Feeder Patterns Must Align with Enrollment/Capacities
- Must Provide Demographic Balance
- Plan Must Provide Flexibility
- Plan Should Look at Balancing High School Enrollment



Options Development

The options developed for this plan contained a series of scenarios focused on the primary objectives of this plan: aging facilities, balancing enrollment, and providing capacity for the future. A 2-day internal planning session was conducted with District staff, consultants and Task Force representation, that reviewed data and community feedback to then apply it to the planning framework. The result of the session was an options packet that outlined four scenarios, two that changed the grade configuration of the District from a K-6 elementary grade configuration to a K-5 configuration, and two options that maintained the current grade configuration.

All options provided considerations for how to improve the condition of facilities through renovations or replacement and how to balance the future high school enrollments to be closer to the same enrollment in future years. All of the options also considered the financial capability of the District to implement each of the options. This options packet was then put before the Task Force for review and edit before being presented at the third round of community meetings.

Recommendations Development

Final recommendations for this plan were developed after several internal district work sessions, meetings and surveys with school level leadership, Board of Education work sessions, and several additional Task Force meetings. The recommendations presented are a culmination of nearly 16 months of planning, approximately 20 public meetings, and countless meetings/communications with staff and consultants.

Data Findings



Condition

A facilities condition assessment was conducted by the Ohio Schools Construction Commission (OFCC) in 2015 to analyze the physical condition of each facility. The assessment included a system by system analysis of both age and condition of each system and provided a condition rating for each building.

Findings from the assessment provided a cost estimate of what it would cost to renovate each facility. The cost of renovation was then compared to the theoretical replacement of a like square footage building in order to create a facilities condition index [FCI]. The FCI is an indicator of whether a building should be renovated or replaced base on systems and conditions alone, it does not take into consideration educational appropriateness of the facilities or the enrollment/utilization of the building. The OFCC recommends that when a building exceeds 2/3rd the renovation cost vs. replacement costs the building is a candidate for replacement.

The adjacent chart indicates the findings of the OFCC.

School	Year Built	FCI
Bluffsvew Elementary	1991	27%
Brookside Elementary	1964	81%
Colonial Hills Elementary	1955	77%
Evening Street Elementary	1963	70%
Granby Elementary	1988	47%
Liberty Elementary	1981	64%
Slate Hill Elementary	1991	32%
Sutter Park Elementary	1986	49%
Wilson Hill Elementary	1962	74%
Worthington Estates Elementary	1968	78%
Worthington Hills Elementary	1970	47%
Worthington Park Elementary	1988	64%
Elementary Average	1976	59%
Kilbourne Middle	1939	60%
McCord Middle	1986	44%
Phoenix Middle	1969	60%
Worthingway Middle	1996	64%
Middle Average	1973	57%
Linworth High	1918	88%
Thomas Worthington High	1951	69%
Worthington Kilbourne High	1990	56%
High Average	1953	71%
District-wide Average	1971	61%
Source: OFCC Assessment		

Data Findings



Enrollment Projections

The enrollment projections for the Worthington Schools included in this report were developed using the cohort survival methodology and Cooperative Strategies' custom enrollment projection software, S.T.E.P. [Student Trends & Enrollment Projections]. The projections presented in this report are meant to serve as a planning tool for the future, and represent the most likely direction of the District. Enrollment projections were developed by analyzing the following data:

- Live Birth Data (Based on Mother's address, and by School District boundary)
- Historical Enrollment by school by grade by boundary
- Census Data
- Building Permits

The Worthington Schools enrollment R has increased by 877 students since the 2012-13 school year. Based on the cohort survival methodology, enrollment is projected to increase over the next ten years.

As seen in the chart below it anticipated in the next 5 years that the District will increase enrollment by approximately 700 more students. The growth will be approximately be the same across grade configurations, therefore the capacity for all grade levels will have to be considered for recommendations.

Projected Enrollment - Recommended - District-wide

Grade	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27
PK	245	245	245	245	245	245	245	245	245	245
K - 6	5,437	5,528	5,523	5,556	5,636	5,698	5,754	5,827	5,822	5,855
7 - 8	1,472	1,541	1,667	1,739	1,680	1,630	1,661	1,651	1,715	1,763
9 - 12	2,933	2,979	2,977	3,085	3,229	3,378	3,447	3,474	3,447	3,389
UG	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
other1	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
Grand Total	10,108	10,314	10,433	10,646	10,811	10,972	11,128	11,218	11,250	11,273

Source: DeJONG-RICHTER

Data Findings



Capacity

The following tables illustrate the capacity and 2015/16 enrollment for each facility. The capacity report provided to the District provides the process and methodology by which capacity and utilization of each facility is determined.

The table indicates the capacity of the building based on how it was designed to be used (Building Capacity) and how the building is currently being used (Program Capacity), which indicates how programs impact the use of a facility driven by both district curriculum goals and students needs.

School Name	2016-17 Enrollment	Program Capacity	Program Utilization	Building Capacity	Building Utilization
Bluffsvew ES	458	525	87%	550	83%
Brookside ES	344	366	94%	450	76%
Colonial Hills ES	392	425	92%	425	92%
Evening Street ES	580	500	116%	500	116%
Granby ES*	438	550	80%	550	80%
Liberty ES	498	531	94%	650	77%
Slate Hill ES	546	556	98%	525	104%
Sutter Park Preschool	256	475	54%	575	45%
Wilson Hill ES	481	550	87%	625	77%
Worthington Estates ES	626	698	90%	775	81%
Worthington Hills ES	450	550	82%	550	82%
Worthington Park ES	413	550	75%	550	75%
Kilbourne MS*	372	624	60%	643	58%
McCord MS*	498	620	80%	643	77%
Worthingway MS*	391	597	66%	620	63%
Phoenix MS	159	NA	-	597	27%
Worthington Kilbourne HS	1,160	1,854	63%	1,974	59%
Thomas Worthington HS	1,586	2,037	78%	2,088	76%
Linworth Alternative HS	176	NA	-	161	110%

*Program capacity was developed using 2016-17 master schedule

Data Findings



Capacity

The table illustrates the capacity base on seats in the District, but does not necessarily reflect the number of classrooms that are actually being used. Because student cohorts do not come in equal enrollment numbers, it is difficult to match the number of seats that get used in a building to the number of rooms that get used. For example, if the recommended class size for an elementary classroom is 28 (see example below) and there are 65 students in that grade cohort, the district would not put 28 students in two classrooms and 9 in the other, they would obviously be distributed equally. Because of this reason, the utilization of rooms can be different than the utilization of seats.

The adjacent table is an example of how a building may reflect an overall utilization of 87% due to number of seats in the facility, but due to the cohort enrollment of each grade, applying class size policy the overall classroom utilization is 100%.

Overall in the District, during the 2016/17 school year, based on this methodology, there was one [1] classroom unused among all elementary schools in the District.

Bluffview ES				
Grade Level	# of Students	# of CR Needed @28 per class	# of CR Need Rounded up to not exceed 28 per class	Actual Number of Classrooms
Kindergarten	65	2.3	3.0	21
1st	64	2.3	3.0	
2nd	65	2.3	3.0	
3rd	68	2.4	3.0	
4th	69	2.5	3.0	
5th	63	2.3	3.0	
6th	64	2.3	3.0	
	458	16.4	21	
Program Capacity	525		Room Utilization	100%
Utilization %	87%			

Recommendations



These recommendations are a result of a year plus long process that entailed much time and effort in a collaboration between Worthington Schools and the community. The original goals have been clear: provide relief of utilization at the elementary schools due to increased enrollment, and improve the condition of an aging infrastructure. A third goal became apparent in the process and that was to make an effort to balance the enrollment at the two high schools in order to provide equitable programmatic offerings at each facility. Moving forward called the ABC's of facility planning:

- A: Aging Facilities
- B: Balance High Schools
- C: Capacity for all students

A. Aging Facilities

In September 2015, the State of Ohio (Ohio Facilities Construction Commission of OFCC), conducted a facility condition assessment of all Worthington School's facilities. The findings indicated nearly \$210 million of condition needs across the District. Worthington Schools has historically been diligent in maintaining facilities through funding and planning, but like almost all school districts it is difficult to keep up with and get ahead of an aging infrastructure.

The recommendation put forth addresses infrastructure all grade levels committing nearly \$45 million to middle school condition improvement, approximately \$15 million to elementary systems, equipment , and technology upgrades, and begins to address the condition of Thomas Worthington HS.

The construction projects for the middle schools will address nearly \$30 million of identified condition needs for those facilities, also extending the building life of Kilbourne and McCord Middle Schools. The new construction at both Worthingway and Perry middle schools will address both capacity and improved condition matters.

By continuing a planned capital/maintenance schedule (identified in the following pages), elementary schools will receive approximately \$15 million in systems upgrades, equipment renewal, and technology upgrades. There will also be nearly \$4 million invested into high school infrastructure at Thomas Worthington, Worthington Kilbourne and Linworth schools.

Recommendations



B. Balance High Schools

Enrollment projections indicated that by school year 2022/23 the enrollment at Thomas Worthington HS will reach nearly 2,000 students while the projected enrollment at Worthington Kilbourne in the same time will reach just over 1,400 students. This difference in enrollment poses two challenges:

1. Utilization of facilities: At 2,000 students Thomas Worthington HS will be at 100% utilization and at 1,425 students Worthington Kilbourn will be utilized at 77%. Both utilization numbers are significantly off of what is considered an ideal utilization at 85%.
2. Balance of resources and programs. Worthington Schools strives to provide equal programmatic opportunities for every school in the District. If Thomas Worthington is projected to be 500-600 students larger, this presents program offering balance challenges to the District.

Therefore the recommendation will be to move an elementary school from the current Thomas Worthington HS feeder to the Worthington Kilbourne feeder pattern. This recommendation does not single out an individual school, as it is recommended that a separate boundary and feeder process that engages local school communities be engaged to make this final decision. It is recommended that this process of balancing high school enrollment begin immediately as to identify the 2018/19 6th grade class as the first class to be required to enter into the Kilbourne HS feeder pattern. Concurrently, there could be an option for older siblings of those 6th graders that may choose to attend Kilbourne HS previous to the phasing in process. This maybe reflected in a policy recommendation regarding sibling attendance due to boundary or feeder pattern changes. It should be clear however that changing the high school feeder does not necessarily mean that the elementary school identified needs to change its boundary, but the community process should explore all opportunities for balancing enrollment at all grade levels.

Recommendations



C. Capacity for all students

Since 2012 Worthington Schools enrollment has increased over 1,000 students, with over a 400 student increase in elementary schools alone. Coupled with elementary program offerings of partial full day kindergarten, fine arts programs, special education programs, and gifted programs, elementary spaces have left the District with limited or no space for future enrollment growth.

There are two approaches to increasing capacity at the elementary grade level: new construction to add additional space in the District or change grade configuration that converts the district to a K-5 configuration, thus moving 6th grade to the middle school level. The latter of the two pathways was chosen as the recommendation for this facilities plan, that shifts the focus then to the middle school facilities and how to best accommodate the 6th grade rising enrollment.

By moving 6th grade students from the elementary grade level it reduces the projected enrollment in elementary schools (2022/23) from nearly 5,700 students to approximately 4,900 students, creating nearly 800 elementary school seats, or approximately one and a half elementary schools. This, however, then shifts the utilization pressure to the middle grades level.

The recommendation for increase capacity at the middle school level is to use the existing middle schools in the District including the Perry Middle School campus, implement renovation and construction strategies to increase capacity and to create a middle to high school feeder pattern that does not permanently split student cohorts.

The result of the recommendations are as follows:

Total MS Capacity: 2,700 2022/23 Projected Enrollment: 2,440 Utilization: 90%

Total ES Capacity: 5,801 2022/23 Projected Enrollment: 4,888 Utilization: 84%

The committee recognizes that the use of portables as short-term capacity issues may be a part of the solution until full implementation can occur. The committee also recognizes that there will be adjustments to elementary boundaries that may occur as a result, in order to balance utilization, assuring capacity for all students at all schools.

Recommendations



Phase I- Summary

Convert District to a K –5 Grade Configuration

Phase I approximate cost \$78 million (includes 5-year renewal of capital/maintenance projects)

Renovate Kilbourne and McCord Middle Schools

Renovate/New Construction and Demolition Worthingway MS

New Construction at Perry Middle School

Total MS Capacity: 2,700 2022/23 Projected Enrollment: 2,440 Utilization: 90%

Total ES Capacity: 5,801 2022/23 Projected Enrollment: 4,888 Utilization: 84%

Planning & Design funding for Thomas Worthington High School

Start process of balancing high school enrollment by moving an elementary school currently in the Thomas Worthington HS to the Worthington Kilbourne HS boundary

Optional Renovations OR New Construction with Reserve Funds (additional \$20.0 M)

Elementary Common Space and/or Air Conditioning (\$1.5 - \$10.0 M)

Replacement Elementary School (\$20.0 M)

Recommendations

The following tables illustrates Phase I of the facilities master plan.



RECOMMENDATION- PHASE I		Funding Target Phase I - \$80M				Total
		Anticipated Year				
		2019/20	2020/2021	2021/2022	2022/23	
Capital Projects	Proposed Action					\$46 M
Kilbourne Middle School	Renovation (600)	\$2.5 M				
Worthingway Middle School	Selective Replacement (750)	\$20 M				
McCord Middle School	Renovation (600)	\$2.5 M				
Perry Middle School	Renovation/New Construction (750)	\$20 M				
Thomas Worthington High School	Planning/Design/Minor Renovations*	\$1.0 M				
(Optional) Elementary Common Space Improvements and/or Air Conditioning OR New Elementary	From General Fund*	\$1.5 to \$10.0 M				
Elementary into Kilbourne High School Boundary	Feeder Change	\$20.0 M				
		No Capital Cost				
Projected Maintenance/Capital Improvements						\$32.0 M
Buses		\$2.5 M				
Technology		\$5.0 M				
Maintenance		\$17 M				
Equipment Replacement		\$3.0 M				
Contingency		\$4.5 M				
*TWHS- Approximately \$2.7M identified in School Maintenance Budget for Improvements before Replacement		Total Phase I Cost				\$78.0 M

PHASE I School Maintenance	Approximate Cost	
Bluffsvew ES	\$622,000	\$17 M
Brookside ES	\$1,341,000	
Colonial Hills ES	\$165,000	
Evening Street ES	\$1,365,000	
Granby ES	\$1,246,000	
Liberty ES	\$806,500	
Slate Hill ES	\$754,600	
Wilson Hill ES	\$1,360,800	
Worthington Estates ES	\$1,778,000	
Worthington Hills ES	\$1,148,200	
Worthington Park ES	\$1,244,800	
Sutter Park	\$1,160,400	
Thomas Worthington HS	\$2,700,000	
Worthington Kilbourne HS	\$1,056,900	
Linworth Alternative	\$119,000	

*Does not include maintenance for other district facilities

Recommendations



Phase II- Summary

Phase II approximate cost \$97.5 - \$102.5 million (includes 5 year renewal of capital/maintenance projects)

Replacement of Majority of Thomas Worthington High School

Select Renovation at Worthington Kilbourne High School

Replace two (2) Elementary Schools TBD

RECOMMENDATION- PHASE II		Funding Target Phase II - \$90 M - \$100 M				
		Anticipated Year				Total
		2023/24	2024/2025	2025/2026	2026/27	
Capital Projects	Proposed Action					\$82.5 M
Elementary School TBD	New Construction (600)	\$20.5 M				
Elementary School TBD	New Construction (500)	\$17.0 M				
Thomas Worthington High School	Replacement (1,600)	\$40.0 M				
Worthington Kilbourne High School	Renovation	\$5.0 M				
Projected Maintenance/Capital Improvements						
Buses		TBD				Target \$15.0 - \$20.0 M
Technology		TBD				
Maintenance		TBD				
Equipment Replacement		TBD				
Contingency		TBD				
		Total Phase II Cost				\$97.5 - \$102.5 M

Recommendations



Phase III- Summary

Phase III approximate Cost \$47.5 million (includes 5 year renewal of capital/maintenance projects)

Replace Elementary School TBD

RECOMMENDATION- PHASE III		Funding Target Phase II - \$50.0 - \$60.0 M				
		Anticipated Year				Total
		2028/29	2029/2030	2030/2031	2031/32	
Capital Projects	Proposed Action					
Elementary School TBD	New Construction (600)	\$22.5 M				
						\$22.5 M
Projected Maintenance/Capital Improvements						Target \$25.0 M
Buses		TBD				
Technology		TBD				
Maintenance*		TBD				
Equipment Replacement		TBD				
Contingency		TBD				
		Total Phase III Cost				\$47.5 M



End of Document

Cooperative Strategies
www.Coopstrategies.com

614.798.8828
3325 Hilliard Rome Rd.
Hilliard OH 43026