**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**
**DISTRICT-WIDE BUILDING CAPACITY STUDY**

**GENERAL**

The purpose of the study is to assess the ability of current school facilities to accommodate current and projected enrollments. This study is to be evaluated by D97 in conjunction with the 2013 Enrollment Projection, Update from 2011 prepare by Ehlers & Associates dated June 11, 2013.

STR has visited and met with the principals at each of the 10 school facilities to gain an understanding of the current space uses and curricula. We also gathered information from the District regarding the acceptable ranges of students per classroom, including the option to add a teacher's aide, as per agreements with the teachers. This information goes directly to determining the capacity per classroom.

**ASSUMPTIONS – ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS**

The calculation for elementary schools assumes the current curriculum and programs are to remain. Only the core classrooms are counted in this capacity, as breakout spaces/classes do not directly increase capacity. Therefore, the capacity of non-classroom facilities (i.e. Special Education, Art, Music, etc) is not included in the calculation.

**ASSUMPTIONS – MIDDLE SCHOOLS**

The calculation for the middle schools assumes that the International Baccalaureate has been implemented at all grades (not just the current 6$^{th}$ grade level). Therefore, we have assumed 5 core classes per team. Additionally, the number of Science Laboratories limits the quantity of teams, as this is a core team class. With 8 science rooms, there are assumed to be a maximum of 8 teams. This, ultimately, sets the capacity of the building with the inclusion of the Self-Contained Special Education classrooms and their enrollment.

**OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS**

Below we have provided a table showing the capacity ranges for each school with a column indicating the projected enrollment for the year 2017/2018. Please refer to the Building Capacity Worksheets for each building for a details breakdown of spaces.

It is important to note that dissimilar enrollments by grade level could have a significant effect on actual overall capacity. For example, it is possible to be under building capacity and yet, due to a particular class size, not have enough available classrooms. This study does not propose options to accommodate an anomaly in class size, nor over capacity enrollment.

| School Facility Name | Building Capacity Range | | | Ehler's Projected Enrollment 2017/2018 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | High | w/ Aide | |
| Beye Elementary | 360 | 442 | 506 | 449 |
| Hatch Elementary | 345 | 417 | 477 | 314 |
| Holmes Elementary | 475 | 586 | 666 | 550 |
| Irving Elementary | 475 | 586 | 666 | 550 |
| Lincoln Elementary | 575 | 701 | 797 | 603 |
| Longfellow Elementary | 560 | 689 | 773 | 709 |
| Mann Elementary | 460 | 556 | 636 | 464 |
| Whittier Elementary | 365 | 457 | 517 | 382 |
| Brooks Middle School | 988 | 1160 | – – | 1000 |
| Julian Middle School | 988 | 1160 | – – | 1047 |

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

We understand that Longfellow may currently be at or over building capacity, and will remain so as compared to the projected enrollment. We also understand that Beye will be over capacity as compared to the projected enrollment.

For the identified problem facilities, we recommend assembling a team with an understanding of the space uses, programs, and scheduling from a facility level as well as District level. Through discussions with this team, STR can assist in proposing options to accommodate the population. Some of these options may include relocation of existing uses and/or programs within the building, creative scheduling, interior renovations, even possibly relocation of some functions to other schools with more available space.

**END OF EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**