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MPS Vision... Schools will be safe, welcoming, well-maintained, and accessible community centers meeting the needs of all.
MPS Core Beliefs...

- Students come first.
- Wherever students are learning is the most important place in the district.
- Increased operational and financial efficiencies are consistently pursued to support learning opportunities for our students.
This is your opportunity

- Reinvest in students
  - Create 21st Century learning spaces
  - Provide equitable access
  - Focus on THEIR future
- Partner and engage with every sector
  - Private
  - Non-profit
  - Neighborhood groups
  - City/County officials
Opportunity now, but there’s trouble coming...

Too many schools...  ...Too few students
Opportunity now, but there’s trouble coming...

Too many schools + too few students = Too high costs
Opportunity now, but there’s trouble coming...

Too many schools + too few students + too high costs
= Too few resources to support quality programs for all
Historical PK12 Enrollment and Projection

Projected 2027-28: 59,969

Current: 66,622
### Regional Comparison – enrollment v capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2017 HS3-12 Enrollment</th>
<th>MPS Capacity</th>
<th>MPS 2017 Efficiency Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>13,957</td>
<td>20,027</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>16,770</td>
<td>18,857</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>14,631</td>
<td>20,533</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>21,264</td>
<td>18,657</td>
<td>114%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISTRICT TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>66,622</strong></td>
<td><strong>78,074</strong></td>
<td><strong>85%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership / Charter Schools</td>
<td>8,899</td>
<td>1,586</td>
<td>includes non-MPS buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>75,521</strong></td>
<td><strong>79,660</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$6,132,500 / year
## Comparisons to other large, urban districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th># Students*</th>
<th># Schools</th>
<th>Square Footage in District</th>
<th># Ss/School</th>
<th>#SF/Ss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore City</td>
<td>83,666</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>17,908,736</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, TX</td>
<td>83,648</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>13,000,000</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford, NC</td>
<td>73,151</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>12,600,000</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Arundel, MD</td>
<td>80,387</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>13,841,871</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>95,641</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>13,704,922</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno, CA</td>
<td>73,460</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>6,999,489</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>134,044</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>25,700,000</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, OH</td>
<td>39,410</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8,567,508</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati, OH</td>
<td>34,227</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6,160,726</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>75,749*</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>15,837,060</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Center for Educational Statistics. 2015-16 facility data.
What are other urban districts doing?

Cincinnati

“Need to house all students but excess space will drain operational funds.”

- CPS plan adjusted enrollment twice from 42,165 to 38,500 and likely to reduce to 31,550.
- Projects based on projections.
- Original plan closed 14 schools, now 26 closed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000 Original Plan</th>
<th>2018 As Revised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>START of PLAN</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New replacement schools</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools renovated</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools Decommissioned</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cleveland

Big changes since 2002:

- 70,000 students with 120 schools
- 39,000 students now with 89 schools
- 50 NEW replacement schools and still replacing 1-6 per year
- Funding – state matching and local bonds with total $1.2B spending
Project Goals

- Gather and report data:
  - Facility functionality and condition
  - Capacity and utilization
  - Facility operating costs
  - Community Input and Feedback
  - Educational trends and impact
- Develop priorities
- Create possible scenarios and budgets
- Develop short- and long-range recommendations for planning
Site Assessments

4 Components

- Building Condition
- Site Condition
- Educational Suitability
- Technology Readiness
# Weighting and Key for Scores

## Combined Score Weights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combined Score Weights</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Building Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>Educational Suitability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Technology Readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Site Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Color-Coded SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color-Coded SCORES</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 90%</td>
<td>Excellent/Like New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 - 90</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 - 79</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 69</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 60</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percent of Schools by Assessment Rating

- Bldg: 3% Excellent, 53% Good, 33% Fair, 6% Poor, 4% Unsatisfactory
- Suit: 4% Excellent, 34% Good, 26% Fair, 6% Poor, 3% Unsatisfactory
- Tech: 11% Excellent, 44% Good, 26% Fair, 3% Poor, 6% Unsatisfactory
- Site: 17% Excellent, 54% Good, 30% Fair, 6% Poor, 1% Unsatisfactory
- Comb: 1% Excellent, 54% Good, 30% Fair, 6% Poor, 1% Unsatisfactory
Percent of Schools by Additional Attributes

![Bar chart showing percent of schools by additional attributes: Equity Priority Index, AC, ADA, Rank 16-17. The chart includes segments for Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, and Unsatisfactory.]
Community Input and Feedback

- **8 large scale meetings** - low turnout despite **major** effort
  - held in each board region
  - 200 participants

- **Online survey** – amazing response
  - 8,000+ respondents
  - Nearly 4,000 students

- **Other groups** – Midnight basketball, volleyball tournament
Community Themes

- Improve building CONDITION
  - Modernization & Air conditioning
  - ADA access
- There is a need for EQUITY
  - Among schools
  - Across all the regions
- Parents and students want QUALITY PROGRAMS in each region
  - Montessori
  - International Baccalaureate
  - Bi-lingual
- Focus on CTE programs that connect to jobs
Putting together the puzzle that is MPS
Findings
Findings

- Significant support for successful educational programs – IB, Montessori, bilingual, CTE-focus.
- Programs are not provided equitably across the district.
- More capacity than needed, with regional differences.
- Some persistently “hard to staff” schools.
- Schools are not equally able to provide 21st Century learning environments:
  - Technology readiness average score is “Excellent.”
  - Building Condition score average is “Fair.”
  - Site Condition score average is “Fair.”
  - Educational suitability average score is “Poor.”
- **Estimated cost** - improve all facilities to Combined Score of 85 $969,508,700.
Cost of upgrading all schools to 85

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Condition</td>
<td>$543,664,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Suitability</td>
<td>$304,909,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Readiness</td>
<td>$1,570,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Condition</td>
<td>$119,352,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$969,508,700</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations

1. **Provide equitable access to identified educational programs in all 4 regions.** Considerations for equitable program distribution include the following:
   - Locate to support cross-regional access to choice opportunities.
   - Create feeder patterns for specialty programs.
   - Ensure each region has at least one of each identified program – K-8 and middle school, Montessori, bilingual, and IB, including the MYP.

   - **As examples:**
     - Northwest: Vincent HS, Madison HS and Morse MS
     - Central: North HS and maybe a second Montessori program site
     - East: Bayview HS with Parkside as their arts-focus feeder
     - Southwest: Greenfield
Recommendations

2. Build new facilities / major renovation/reinvention in each region, as needed, to address condition and educational suitability of schools.

   o As examples:
     o Central: Douglas School
     o East: Riverside HS and Gaenslen School
     o Northwest: 95th Street School or Parkview School
     o Southwest: new bi-lingual middle school
3. **Renovate facilities in all regions to improve instruction and to raise combined scores to a minimum of 85.**

   - **Priority 1:** Schools with a Combined Score <70 and/or Utilization >120%
     - Some have no AC
     - Some have Poor or Unsatisfactory ADA access
     - Timeframe: 3-5 years

   - **As examples:**
     - **Priority 1**
       - Central: 14 schools, $123,102,500
       - East: 16 schools, $119,788,300
       - Northwest: 11 schools, $58,934,400
       - Southwest: 20 schools, $122,314,900
3. Renovate facilities in all regions to improve instruction and to raise combined scores to a minimum of 85.
   - **Priority 2**: Schools with a Combined Score <75 and/or Utilization >100%
     - Timeframe: 5-15 years
   - As examples:
     - Central: 11 schools, $82,895,000
     - East: 9 schools, $55,315,900
     - Northwest: 14 schools, $82,909,100
     - Southwest: 4 schools, $37,207,200
Recommendations

4. Repurpose schools to reduce capacity across the district and allow for reallocation of funds to support instruction.

   o Criteria for school selections:
     - Low Combined Score and/or Educational Suitability Score,
     - High operational and/or energy costs,
     - Distribution of schools aligned with distribution of students
     - Equity Index and neighborhood considerations/dynamics
     - Strategic land use planning
     - Lack of ADA access, air conditioning

   o As examples:
     - East region – Repurpose 4 schools
     - Central region – Repurpose 8 schools
     - Northwest region – Repurpose 8 schools
     - Southwest region – Add 4 schools

Work with Offices of Academics and Innovation to find district uses for space and enhance the educational opportunities for all children.
Supporting Recommendations

1. Continue to review Regional Development strategies to support success.
2. Review and revise Administrative policies 5.01 and 7.05.
3. Review and adopt Facility Standards, including capacity guidelines.
4. Monitor and adjust Priority 1 and 2 schools based on annual enrollment review.
5. Identify and install partners in buildings:
   - Partners in support of students – medical, dental, mental health
   - Partners in support of community – social services, housing, child care, commerce
   - Partners in support of both students and the community/neighborhood – job training, alternative schedules day/night use
6. Monitor and adjust Repurpose/Close list based on annual enrollment review.
7. Review continued use of administrative and support spaces based on costs and need.
8. Continue to connect and communicate with your community.
Financing Options

• Do Nothing

• Explore funding options
  • Cost savings – reducing empty seats, repurposing / reusing space
    • Milwaukee – Garfield School apartments, Centro del Nino, Wisconsin Ave.
    • Kansas City, MO – Office of Repurposing: Sale of district office building
    • St. Louis – condominiums, office buildings, programs moved
  • New funding sources
    • Local bonds
    • Public/Private/Partnerships (P3) and QZAB (expired) - but P3 funding viable option
    • SPLOST funding - Atlanta/DeKalb
    • State matching support - Ohio (Cincinnati/Cleveland)
This is your opportunity

- Expand successful programs across all regions
- Operate EFFECTIVELY and EFFICIENTLY with realigned resources
- Connect with the city to rebuild neighborhoods

Leverage to connect with business partners:
- Rockwell Automation with Bradley Tech
- Johnson Controls with Obama SCTE
- Aurora Health with North HS
- Kohl’s with Bayview HS
- Quad Graphics with MKE School of the Arts
So, WHAT’S Next?

• Define your programs – K-8/MS, H3/K3, K-12, etc.
• Ensure great regional opportunities – Put programs into regions
• Create great NEW/REVITALIZED spaces
• Ensure SAFE/VITAL spaces for ALL
• Take a stand for quality, not just location
• CELEBRATE successes
MPS Vision... Schools will be safe, welcoming, well-maintained, and accessible community centers meeting the needs of all.
Thank You!
For questions, 
Susan Zoller
szoller@mgtconsulting.com