Buildings and Grounds Committee Presentation November 7, 2023, by Jim Martin

The following presentation was developed to be a starting point for discussion of possible building usage changes. Data for the presentation was gained from the Illinois State School Report Card, the FAQ posted on the 161 website, and presentations previously shared with the entire Summit Hill community.

This presentation will focus on the benefits of a

Grade Center Model of Instruction.

Why Are We Considering Change?

- Decline in enrollment- over 1000 students from peak attendance.
- Increase Equity for Students, Staff and Administration.
- Equitable Use of District Financial Resources.
- Establish a firm foundation for district resources and programing for the foreseeable future.



Equity for Students, Staff and Administration Goal: <u>Curricular/Service Consistency</u>

- Students will continue in their grade cohort through 8th grade.
- More Cross Curricular Options- (i.e.- School Themed Field Trips, Assemblies, Expanding Offerings and more).
- Collaborative options for staff will increase dramatically.
 - PLC's and curriculum work can include all grade-level teachers.
 - Current Principal workloads vary greatly per building.
 - Principals must know 4 grade levels of content; Grade Centers would reduce this.
 - Staff evaluations and Administration to student ratio is inequitable.
- Equitable Student Support Personnel Services Caseloads (Nurses, Social Workers, etc.).
- SCO support will be equal in all buildings.

Equity for Students, Staff and Administration Goal: Provide Low, Equal Class Sizes For All

Summit Hill 161 Current Grade Centers- PreK, K, 5-6, and 7-8.

Current 1-4	<u>Total Students</u>	<u># of Current</u>	# of 1-4 Classerooms
<u>Class Averages</u>	Per Grade	1-4 Classrooms	@ 21 per class for example
• K = 21.6	216		
• 1 st = 17 / 21.5 / 16.75 / 19.75	241	12	12
• 2 nd = 21 / 19 / 20.75 / 18.75	235	13	12
• 3 rd = 26.5 / 16.5 / 17.5 / 20	241	12	12
• 4 th = 22.5 / 18.33 / 22.5 / 19.5	272	13	13
• 5 th =	268		
• 6 th =	258		
• 7 th =	304		
• 8 th =	315		

Equity for Students, Staff and Administration Goal: Equal Access to Supports

Demographic Data	Students	Low Income	IEP	English Learners
District	2476	19%	17%	8%
Arbury Hills	185	24%	17%	13%
Frankfort Square	168	17%	17%	6%
Indian Trail	301	23%	13%	7%
DJR	631/312 1-4	15%	21%	13%

Equity for Students, Staff and Administration Goal: Equal Access to Programs

Gifted, Summit, Clubs, and Possible Band Expansion

- Possible Additions Under a Grade Center Model:
 - Gifted, Summit and Band Programs could be extended to the 4th graders. Under the current model, this is not possible.
 - Clubs and other extra-curricular programs are limited, especially at the smaller buildings.

Use of District Financial Resources. Goal: Equitable Use of Financial Resources

In alignment with District projections, to have an excess of revenue and a balanced budget, capital improvement projects would be put on hold and an average of \$350,000 per year (\$1,750,000 over 5 years) would have to be made.

Equity for Students, Staff and Administration <u>Current Inequity of Per Pupil Spending</u>

School and 2024-25 projected enrollment	Cost Per Pupil Expenditure	
Arbury Hills Elementary School (1-4 Enrollment-185)	PPE= \$19,437	
Dr. Julian Rogus Elementary School (1-4 Enrollment-312) (PreK, K, and 1-4)	PPE= \$16,529	
Frankfort Square Elementary School (1-4 Enrollment- 147)	PPE= \$18,470	
Indian Trail Elementary School (1-4 Enrollment- 294)	PPE= \$14,597	
Hilda Walker Intermediate School (5-6 Enrollment 541)	PPE= \$16,008	
Summit Hill Junior High School (7-8 Enrollment 563)	PPE= \$15,670	

Facility Estimated Repair Costs

Arbury Hills

Built 1960, 19 classrooms

Future Anticipated Costs

Roofing- \$1,237,146.00 Phase 1- \$2,255,662.50 Phase 2- \$881,118.00 Phase 3- \$440,737.50 **Total-** \$4,814,664.00

Frankfort Square

Built 1973, 19 classrooms

Future Anticipated CostsRoofing-\$1,231,122.00Phase1- \$273,031.50Phase2- \$1,090,246.50Phase 3- \$440,737.50Total- \$3,892,620.00

Indian Trail

Built 1974, 32 classrooms

Future Anticipated CostsRoofing-\$1,456,825.00Phase1- \$157,237.50Phase2- \$700,717.50Phase 3- \$2,803,185Total- \$5,116,965.00

Limitations of Multi-Grade Buildings

- The system inherently leads to imbalances in class size, staff/student ratios and support services.
- Redrawing boundaries will be periodically needed, which will fall on the same geographic areas.
- Expansion of programs such as Band and Summit/Gifted are not currently possible.
- Continues the issue of dividing student population (Kindergarten) from a united grade center, negatively affecting student relationships.
- Is not financially feasible to continue indefinitely.
- Schools are not now truly "Neighborhood Schools".



Possible Reconfiguration Plans

- Maintain the Current Building Configuration.
- Close One Building.
- Return Kindergarten to Grade Buildings.
- Closure of Frankfort Square and Arbury Hills Schools.
- Closure of Indian Trail, Arbury Hills and Frankfort Square Schools.

Maintain the Current Building Configuration

Issues:

- Our current configuration cannot be financially maintained without cuts.
- Resources are not equitably distributed throughout the learning community.
- Student population will continue to decline for the foreseeable future.
- In alignment with District projections, in order to have an excess of revenue and a balanced budget, capital improvement projects would be put on hold and an average of \$350,000 per year (\$1,750,000 over 5 years) would have to be made. The only way to do so would be cuts to cut programs and staff.



Close One Building (example, Arbury Elementary School)

1. Example One:

- 1. EC, Preschool, K @ Frankfort Square School (50 + 100 + 214 = 364 students approx.)
- 2. 1-2 @ DJR (230 + 230 = 460 students approx.)
- 3. 3-4 @ Trail (227 + 268 = 495 students approx.)
- 4. 5-6 @ Walker (269 + 260 = 529 students approx.)
- 5. 7-8 @ SHJH (294 + 314 = 608 students approx.)
- 6. Mary Drew remains closed (0 students)
- 2. Example Two
 - 1. EC, Preschool @ Mary Drew (50 + 100 = 150 students approx.)
 - 2. K-3 in multiple buildings
 - 1. Indian Trail (75 + 65 + 76 + 70 = 286 students approx.)
 - 2. Frankfort Square (33 + 42 + 37 + 31 = 143 students approx.) Arbury added (39 + 46 + 42 + 48 = 175 students approx.) Total for Frankfort Square School if all Arbury students were moved there (318 students approx.)
 - 3. DJR (67+ 77 + 77 + 78 = 299 students approx.)
 - 3. 4-5 @ Walker (268 + 269 = 537 students approx.)
 - 4. 6-8 @ SHJH (260 + 294 + 314 = 868 students approx.)

Return Kindergarten to Grade Buildings

• Change in Building Attendance:

- <u>Arbury Hills-</u> 179 + 39K = 218.
 <u>Frankfort Square-</u> 166 + 33K = 199.
 Indian Trail 300 + 75K = 375.
 - $\frac{1101a11}{11a11} \frac{1101}{11a11} \frac{300 \pm 731}{210 \pm 6714} = 373.$
 - <u>DJR-</u> <u>310 + 67K = 377</u> (a reduction of 147 K students).
 - Hilda Walker- 529 no change.
 - <u>Summit Hill JH-</u> 608 no change.
 - Does not address issues of Equity, Operation and Maintenance costs, Average Class Size Consistency, or long-rang funding capability.

Close Frankfort Square and Arbury Hills, Establish Grade Center Centers

- SHJH: Grades 7th and 8th
- <u>HW</u>: Grades 5th and 6th
- <u>IT</u>: Grades 3 and 4
- <u>DJR</u>: Grades PreK, K, 1 and 2
 - Can save \$8,707,284 in future building repair costs.
 - Will allow more control of class sizes.

<u>Close Indian Trail, Arbury Hills and Frankfort</u> <u>Square Schools, Establish Grade Centers</u>

Grade Configuration:

- <u>SHJH</u>: Grades 6, 7 and 8th
- <u>HW</u>: Grades 3, 4 and 5
- <u>DJR</u>: Grades PreK, K, 1 and 2
 - This model does not allow enough flexibility for future enrollment increases.
 - Will not be able to maintain current low-class sizes due to space limitations
 - Can save \$13,824,249 in future building repair costs

Goal: Establish a firm foundation for district resources and programing for the foreseeable future.

Advantages of Grade Centers Summary

Grade Centers provide a more consistent and equitable educational experience for students, access to consistent supports, more consistent average class sizes, enhanced educational programing, more focused professional development, the ability to absorb changes in student enrollment, avoid costly repairs to aging buildings, and a reinvestment/reallocation of dollars to students and maintenance/improvements to our remaining buildings.