

REPORT BY THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
State Allocation Board Meeting, June 27, 2007

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REPORT ON
COMPLETE SCHOOLS

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To provide information requested by the State Allocation Board (SAB) on the components of a complete school consistent with the *California Code of Regulations, Title 5* and a representative sample of such schools.

BACKGROUND

The Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) has been analyzing the ability of districts to build a complete school with the grants provided in the School Facility Program (SFP). In order to determine the adequacy of the grant, it is essential to have a definition of a complete school in which to compare the grant. At the March 2007 SAB meeting, the California Department of Education (CDE) committed to providing OPSC examples of complete schools approved by CDE and the components of a complete school. The CDE has also started the analysis if the complete school supports the world-class academic standards to which students, teachers, administrators, and elected officials are held accountable.

DESCRIPTION

Attached is the CDE report.

This Item was approved by the State Allocation Board on June 27, 2007.

REPORT ON COMPLETE SCHOOLS

Executive Summary

As part of the effort to assess the adequacy of the grants provided in the School Facility Program (SFP), the California Department of Education (CDE) has been asked by the State Allocation Board (SAB) to:

1. Provide examples of complete schools approved by the CDE, and
2. Determine if the complete school supports the world-class academic standards to which students, teachers, administrators, and elected officials are held accountable.

1. Examples of complete schools approved by the CDE

In order to develop a definition of a complete school, an understanding of the 60 year history of state school construction assistance and of *Title 5* standards is necessary.

History

The first state construction assistance program was created in 1949. In creating the program, the Legislature adopted the low end of a range of square footage per student recommendation made by State Superintendent of Public Instruction Roy E. Simpson in 1947. These square footage standards, with minor increases, formed the basis of the 1976 Lease Purchase Program (LPP), and, in turn, the per student grants provided in the SFP that was established in 1998.

The median amount of square footage per student being built nationally and regionally over the past 20 years is compared to the square footage allowances used in developing the SFP grants below:

Table 1

Square Feet per Student

	1987	1997	2006
Elementary Schools			
National Median	90	119	122
California (LPP allowance)	59	73	73
Middle Schools			
National Median	111	146	144
California (LPP allowance)	80	80	80
High Schools			
National Median	153	185	167
California (LPP allowance)	95	95	95

Source: 1987 data, Abramson, 2006
1997 and 2007 data, Abramson, 2007

Two facts stand out:

1. The SFP funding model is based on a per student square footage allowance that is significantly less than the amount of square feet being provided per student in school construction projects nation-wide and regionally.
2. The national median amount of space per student has increased over the past 20 years, while the per-student square footage on which the SFP funding model is based has remained static at the middle and high school levels. The elementary square footage increase is the result of K-3 class size reduction.

Title 5 (A summary of Title 5 is attached as Exhibit 1)

The Title 5 standards by which projects are evaluated by CDE allow variation in program delivery in response to the varied educational needs of the 1,052 districts in the state. For example, a school that serves a student population with extensive needs for intervention and remediation services will have different facility needs than a school without such demands.

Because the design of a school is in response to the educational program provided by a district, it is not possible to define a complete school that will address the needs of students throughout the state. However, in order to allow an assessment of the adequacy of the SFP grants, the CDE has identified 60 school projects that are complete schools.

Complete Schools

The 60 complete schools have a median square foot per student amount that at the middle and high school levels, is significantly less than the square feet per student than provided for in projects built nationally and regionally.

Table 2

	Elementary (median square feet per student)	Middle School (median square feet per student)	High School (median square feet per student)
60 Projects	71	88	108
California SFP Funding Model	73	80	95
Western Region (2006)	88	106	120
National (2006)	122	144	167

The CDE has developed a list of features that exist in many complete schools. This list is an interim step to a more comprehensive definition that is being developed in consultation with stakeholders.

2. Do these complete schools support the world-class academic standards to which students, teachers, administrators, and elected officials are held accountable?

If districts were posed with the opportunity of designing a school without the constraints of the SFP, what features would be included and how large would the spaces be?

The CDE has convened an advisory committee to discuss this critical issue.

REPORT ON COMPLETE SCHOOLS

Background:

As part of the effort to assess the adequacy of the grants provided in the School Facility Program (SFP), the California Department of Education (CDE) has been asked by the State Allocation Board (SAB) to:

1. Provide examples of complete schools approved by the CDE, and
2. Determine if the complete school supports the world-class academic standards to which students, teachers, administrators, and elected officials are held accountable.

These two requests are addressed below.

1. Examples of complete schools approved by the CDE

The Importance of School Facilities

The effects of school facilities on student achievement are well documented in research. CDE can provide SAB members a list of numerous studies that examine and confirm this association. In short, research shows that facilities can increase student achievement from 5-17 percentile points. (Earthman, 2002)

Complete School

In order to understand the term complete school as being used in the grant adequacy discussion, a brief summary of the standards historically used in the programs preceding the SFP, as well as an understanding of school design standards contained in *California Code of Regulations, Title 5 (Title 5)*, is necessary.

Overview of State Standards

In 1949, the legislature responded to the impact the first wave of the baby-boom would have on the need for school facilities by creating the SAB and a process for providing assistance to districts experiencing enrollment growth. A survey of districts (there were 2,554 in 1946 as compared to 1,052 today) conducted by the Senate Investigating Committee on Education noted “that 213 schools and districts were holding double and triple sessions in 1,748 classrooms during the 1946-47 school year” (Senate of the State of California, 1948). Because double and triple sessions reduce available instructional time, about 61,000 K-8 students (of the 1,078,670 K-8 students statewide in 1946) had shortened learning opportunities because their schools were overcrowded. Additionally, class sizes of 35 were not uncommon with some classes being as large as 55 students. (Senate of the State of California, 1948)

It is interesting to note that recently another strategy to compensate for overcrowded classrooms resulted in a multitrack year-round education plan called

Concept 6, which also compromises instructional time. The use of the Concept 6 calendar is being phased out as a requirement of the *Williams* settlement.

In addition to the large number of “unhoused” (the term presently used) students, the Senate Investigating Committee noted that many of the 38,897 classrooms in the state “do not conform to the state code, are obsolescent, and are neither properly lighted nor ventilated. Many of them are not up to standards against earthquakes” (ibid.)

The combined demands of having to replace thousands of inadequate classrooms while also building thousands of new classrooms, created an estimated need of \$142,440,000. In order to provide assistance to districts, the Legislature needed to develop standards in order to prioritize and define state assistance.

To assist in this effort, then State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Roy E. Simpson, in 1947 convened a group of school district superintendents as the *Committee on Defining School Plant Adequacy*. This group realized that a square footage standard was more effective in meeting the need for school facilities than a per student dollar amount for two reasons:

1. Square footage standards, unlike a per-student dollar amount, are not subject to inflation. A square foot in 1947 remains a square foot in 2007;
2. An adequate square foot allowance tied to a cost factor would allow districts to respond to local needs more effectively. That is, one district may need, for program reasons, more specialized or more expensive spaces than another district. A per student dollar amount cannot adjust to these differences.

The Committee’s recommended ranges of space per student are summarized below (Bursch, 1955):

- Elementary - 55-70 square feet per student
- Middle - 75-100 square feet per student
- High - 86-110 square feet per student

The low end of these ranges was adopted by the Legislature in creating the State School Building Aid Law of 1949 (*Education Code* Section 15700, et seq.).

From the start, the CDE had concerns over the adequacy of these square footage standards. A 1955 CDE analysis of projects built under these standards indicated that “...it has been difficult—in fact well nigh impossible—under these limitations to provide adequate building space...”. (ibid.) Of specific concern was the decreased size of classrooms as compared to projects built without state aid—1,200 square feet in non-state aid projects to under 1,000 square feet in

state aided projects. The report also noted that the limited square footage allocation led to districts building high schools for higher enrollments than desired in order to be eligible for sufficient square footage to build a complete school. (ibid.)

These 1949 square footage standards, with minor changes, were incorporated into the Lease Purchase Program (LPP) of 1976. An across the board seven percent increase in square footage was provided in 1987. Other minor increases were provided during the course of the LPP in acknowledgement of educational programs such as special education and the need for speech and resource specialist spaces. At the conclusion of the LPP in 1998, the square feet allocation was:

- Elementary - 59 square feet per student
- Middle - 80 square feet per student
- High – 94.6 square feet per student (for 2,000 student school)

These amounts were not significantly higher than the low end of the square footage range initially proposed by the CDE in 1947.

In response to the limited space allocation, the CDE emphasized the importance of the classroom by recommending that 31 of the 55 square feet allocated in 1949 for elementary students be used for classrooms.

Classrooms, where students spend most of their day and where most instruction occurs, have had additional uses and demands placed upon them since the 1949 standard was established:

- Computers (15-20 square feet per station),
- Access compliance,
- Inclusion students and aides,
- Pull-out and small group spaces,
- Flexibility for changing educational approaches.

Other areas of a school have also been subject to expansion since 1949, including:

- Space for academic intervention and remediation,
- Space for support of at-risk students (counselors, etc.),
- Toilet rooms, elevator shafts, ramps and lifts for access compliance as required by the Division of the State Architect,
- Mechanical space for increased electrical service and computer servers,
- Storage space for an increased amount of instructional materials,
- Pre-kindergarten classrooms and outdoor space.

Additionally, schools are often called to serve as centers of community and provide a variety of supplemental services such as School Based Coordinated Health Centers and after school programs. These demands have implications for school design and the definition of a complete school.

For additional perspective, the chart below compares the square footages of the LPP that formed the basis of the SFP grant to the national median per student square footage for constructed projects.

Table 1

Square Feet per Student

	1987	1997	2006
Elementary Schools			
National Median	90	119	122
California (LPP Allowance)	59	73	73
Middle Schools			
National Median	111	146	144
California (LPP Allowance)	80	80	80
High Schools			
National Median	153	185	167
California (LPP Allowance)	95	95	95

Source: 1987 data, Abramson, 2006
1997 and 2007 data, Abramson, 2007

Two facts stand out:

1. The SFP funding model is based on a per student square footage allowance that is significantly less than the amount of square feet being provided per student in school construction projects nation-wide.
2. The national median amount of space per student has increased over the past 20 years, while the per student square footage on which the SFP funding model is based has remained static at the middle and high school levels. The elementary square footage increase is the result of K-3 class size reduction.

States such as California have a climate that allows exterior circulation, and therefore require less interior space, than states with more severe climates. In 2006, schools constructed in four western states—California, Nevada, Arizona, and Hawaii—had median per student square foot amounts of:

- Elementary Schools – 88 square feet per student
- Middle Schools – 106 square feet per student
- High Schools-- 120 square feet per student
(Abramson, 2007)

Even compared to the median square footage of schools constructed in neighboring states, California's schools are built with a funding model based on significantly less square footage per student. The national and regional median figures include data from California. If the California data were able to be disaggregated from the national and regional data, an even greater disparity would result.

Title 5 Standards

California *Education Code (EC)* Section 17251 charges the CDE with the development of standards for school sites and plans. Plan standards are contained in *California Code of Regulations, Title 5* Section 14030. These standards focus on student safety and educational appropriateness. All projects approved by the SAB are required, pursuant to *EC* Section 17070.50, to be approved by the CDE. Projects not requesting state funds must also use the *Title 5* standards but are not required to seek CDE review and approval.

Title 5 standards were developed after the establishment of the state's per student square footage allowance standards in 1949, so educational appropriateness is viewed in light of the *Title 5* standards being developed to exist within the confines of a funding system.

In summary, California has required the educational program model to meet the funding standards instead of the educational program driving the funding standard.

Key to the *Title 5* review is the district's board-adopted educational specifications. The educational specification provides the architect information on the educational program needs that drive the design of a school.

Title 5 is structured to allow flexibility in the review of plans based on the individual needs of a district, as presented in the educational specification, and a district may request a variance to a specific standard if it is documented that student safety and educational appropriateness are not compromised (*Title 5* Section 14030(r)).

For example:

Title 5 Section 14030(g) requires general education classrooms to be a minimum of 960 square feet. A district's educational program may call for project-based learning. The architectural response to this program need is a cluster of 800 square foot classrooms around a shared 300 square foot project area.

Title 5 Section 14030(k)(2) requires a school's administrative space to "...have sufficient square footage to accommodate the number of staff for the maximum enrollment of the school." Each school's needs are different, so what is sufficient in one school may not be sufficient in another. For instance, one district's policy

and program requires additional vice principals, counselors, and a parent room as a strategy to improve student achievement as necessary due to state and federal accountability requirements. The administration building at such a school would be larger than a school without such program requirements. In short, one size does not fit all.

Such decisions are repeated throughout the design process and affect the types and size of spaces, and thus the cost, of a school.

Financial hardship districts

Financial hardship districts, particularly, have limited funding available to respond to program needs. The CDE has seen projects in which the design, while meeting *Title 5* standards, has not provided all of the facilities commonly thought to be necessary for a complete school. For example, a multipurpose room is deleted due to cost pressures and outdoor lunch shelters constructed instead. While unenclosed shelters provide space for food service, the lack of an interior space for eating significantly affects program delivery in inclement weather.

With regard to financial hardship projects, CDE brings to the SAB's attention two trends being employed by many hardship districts in an effort to build complete schools.

1. Larger schools

Districts, in an attempt to obtain sufficient funds, build schools larger than they would prefer.

A district, for educational reasons, would like to build elementary schools of no more than 600 students. However, in order to receive sufficient funds from the SFP to build a complete school, a school for 900 students must be built.

A similar concern was expressed by the CDE in 1955 (Bursch, 1955).

Research shows the benefits of smaller schools, yet many districts, because of the facility funding model, must build larger schools.

2. Increased use of portables

Another common response to budget constraints is using portable classrooms instead of permanent construction. Often, financial hardship districts must use both strategies—larger schools and portables—to complete a school.

The educational program and life cycle costs are compromised by an over reliance on portable classrooms.

Conclusion

The examination of the complete school must be made with the understanding that the LPP square footage standards that form the basis for the SFP per pupil grant were the product of an austere program developed 60 years ago.

Because of the unique needs of each district and school, a definition of complete that is relevant to over 1,000 districts is difficult to achieve. Should an administrative space be a certain size in order for the school to be complete? As seen above, if such a standard is used, a school with extensive needs for academic support and intervention could be seen as “over-building” an administrative building when in fact the building is properly sized for the support of the students.

The CDE, in support of the SAB’s efforts to assess the adequacy of the SFP grant, has identified 60 recent CDE approved projects (Exhibit 3) from throughout the state that represent complete schools based on each district’s educational specification.

The median square footage per student of the 60 projects is compared to the previously noted national and regional median square footages below:

Table 2

	Elementary (median square feet per student)	Middle School (median square feet per student)	High School (median square feet per student)
60 Projects	71	88	108
Western Region (2006)	88	106	120
National (2006)	122	144	167

The 60 projects determined to be complete schools by the CDE are on average built with significantly less square feet than projects built nationwide and in neighboring states. Recall also, that if California data were to be disaggregated from the national and regional date, the differences would be even greater.

Comparing the 60 projects to the allowances that were used in creating the SFP shows that middle schools and high schools require significantly more square footage to build a complete school than currently provided for in the SFP funding model.

Table 3

	Elementary (median square feet per student)	Middle (median square feet per student)	High School (median square feet per student)
60 Projects	71	88	108
LPP-SFP	73	80	95
Percent increase required in per student square footage to allow complete school	0%	10%	14%

2. Do these complete schools support the world-class academic standards to which students, teachers, administrators, and elected officials are held accountable?

The second question, do these complete schools support California’s world-class academic standards, again requires perspective and a review of the constraints of the school building funding model.

Districts have built schools with basically the same funding model for the past 60 years, and it is the changing educational program that has had to adapt to the static funding model. During the nine years in which the SFP has been in place, numerous educational programs have been adopted by the Legislature, but the SFP funding model has not been changed to reflect any needed facilities. Recent initiatives have been enacted to increase the number of counselors and create School Based Coordinated Health Centers. Both of these efforts have space needs which are not reflected in the SFP funding model.

If districts were posed with the opportunity of designing a school without the constraints of the SFP, what features would be included and how large would the spaces be?

The CDE has convened an advisory committee to discuss these critical issues.

Until these questions are answered, CDE offers an interim operational definition of a complete school. This definition consists of a list of features that should be present in a complete school and is attached as Exhibit 2. If a feature is not listed, it should not be viewed that the feature is an enhancement, but rather a response to a local need. Beyond the discussion of the types and size of spaces are the issues of quality and furniture and equipment. The CDE recommends that school facility projects be built to high performance standards and should be constructed of quality materials that will stand the test of time.

Exhibit 1

Summary of Standards for the Design/Construction of School Facilities California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Division 14

§ 14030.

- a. **Educational Specifications.** Plans are based on school board-approved educational specifications.
- b. **Site Layout.** Parent drop off, bus loading areas, and parking are separated to allow students to enter and exit the school grounds safely.
 1. Buses do not pass through parking areas, unless a barrier is provided that prevents vehicles from backing directly into the bus loading area.
 2. Parent drop off area is adjacent to school entrance and separate from bus area and parking.
 3. Vehicle traffic pattern does not interfere with foot traffic patterns. Foot traffic does not have to pass through entrance driveways to enter school.
 4. Parking stalls are not located so vehicles must back into bus or loading areas. Island fencing or curbs are used to separate parking areas from loading areas.
 5. Bus drop off for handicapped students is in the same location as for regular education students.
- c. **Playground and Field Areas.** Adequate physical education teaching stations are available to fulfill the course requirements for the planned enrollment. Supervision of playfields is not obstructed.
- d. **Delivery and Utility Areas.** Delivery and service areas are located to provide vehicular access that does not jeopardize the safety of students and staff.
- e. **Future Expansion.** If temporary or permanent expansion is anticipated, the site layout can accommodate additions without substantial alterations to existing structures or playgrounds.
- f. **Placement of Buildings.**
 1. Building placement is compatible with other functions on campus; e.g., band room is not next to library.
 2. Physical relationship of classrooms and support areas allows unobstructed movement of staff and students around the campus.
 3. Building placement has favorable orientation to natural light.
 4. Restrooms are conveniently located, require minimum supervision, and are easily accessible from playground and classrooms.
 5. Parking spaces are sufficient for staff, visitors, and eligible students.
 6. The campus is secured by fencing.

Exhibit 1

- g. **Classrooms.** General classrooms are at least 960 square feet (s.f.). Total classroom space meets or exceeds the capacity planned for the school using the district's loading standards.
- h. **Specialized Classrooms and Areas.**
 - 1. Small-Group Areas: are not counted as classrooms; are located near classrooms
 - 2. Kindergarten Classrooms.
 - i. 1350 s.f. for permanent structures
 - ii. Classrooms are designed to allow supervision of play yards and all areas of the classroom.
 - iii. Play yard design provides a variety of activities for developing large motor skills.
 - iv. Classrooms are located close to parent drop-off and bus loading areas.
 - v. Storage, casework, and learning stations are designed for use in free play and structured activities; e.g., shelves are deep and open for frequent use.
 - vi. Windows, marking boards, sinks, drinking fountains, and furniture are at appropriate heights for kindergarteners.
 - vii. Restrooms are self-contained within the classroom or within the kindergarten complex.
 - 3. Special Education Classrooms and Areas.
 - i. A new school designates at least 240 s.f. for Resource Specialist Program.
 - ii. A new school designates at least 200 s.f. for the speech and language program.
 - iii. A new school designates office area for the psychologist and counseling program.
 - iv. Special day classrooms are at least the same size as regular education classrooms.
 - v. The area allowances in *Education Code* Section 17047(a) for special day class programs are used for the design of classroom and support space.
 - vi. Special day classrooms are distributed throughout the campus.
 - vii. No more than two special day classrooms are together.
 - viii. A conference area is available.

Exhibit 1

- ix. Medical therapy units are close to visitor parking and accessible after school hours.
- i. **Laboratories shall be designed in accordance with the planned curriculum.**
 1. Science Laboratories are at least 1300 s.f., including storage and teacher prep area, and designed for the safe handling of hazardous materials. Storage and safety equipment, including exhaust fume hoods, eyewashes, deluge showers, are provided.
 2. Consumer Home Economics Laboratories are at least 1300 s.f., including lecture area and student storage.
 3. Industrial and Technology Education Laboratories have lab workstations and a lecture area in or near the lab, are designed for the safe handling and ventilation of hazardous materials.
 4. Computer Instructional Support Area labs are at least 960 s.f., provide for student movement around learning stations, sufficient outlets, power sources and network links, proper ventilation, security and lighting provided.
 5. Art Studios have adequate ventilation for dust and fumes; kiln is in a safe, ventilated area.
 6. Music Rooms are acoustically isolated from the rest of the school and have convenient access to the auditorium.
 7. Dance Studios have mirrors, ballet bars, electrical outlets, and a minimum of 2000 s.f. (or 3,500 square feet if performance space is needed).
 8. Theater or Auditorium has ramped seating, space for orchestra pit; location provides convenient public access and parking while preserving security of the school campus
- j. **Gymnasium, Shower/Locker Area shall be designed to accommodate multiple use activities in accordance with the planned enrollment:**
 1. The gymnasium is secured from other parts of the campus for events.
 2. The shower/locker area is of sufficient size to allow students enrolled in the physical education program to shower and dress each period.
 3. Toilets are available for the public in facilities intended for community use, and not in shower/locker areas.
 4. Office space is provided for physical education teachers.
 5. Space is available for weight lifting, exercise equipment usage, aerobics, and the like.

Exhibit 1

k. **Auxiliary Areas.**

1. Multipurpose room meets minimum essential size standards and accommodates physical education activities, assemblies, and extracurricular activities. Stage may have a dividing wall but is not intended to be a classroom. Ceiling height allows for clearance of light fixtures for physical education activities.
2. Administrative Office.
 - i. Students have direct confidential access to pupil personnel area.
 - ii. Counter tops are accessible to the student population, both at a standing and wheelchair level.
 - iii. Clerical staff has a clear view of nurse's office.
 - iv. The nurse's office has a bathroom separate from staff bathroom(s) in the administration area.
 - v. Space is available for private conference and waiting areas.
 - vi. A faculty workroom is available for a staff proportionate to the student population.
3. Library/Media Center and Technology. Library space meets minimum essential facilities standards. Visual supervision from circulation desk is available to study areas, stack space, and student work centers.

l. **Lighting.** Windows allow daylight but do not cause excess glare or heat gain.

m. **Acoustical.** Sound attenuation is a design element in noisy environments.

n. **Plumbing.**

1. Restrooms allow for supervision.
2. Fixtures are in accord with the *California Plumbing Code*.
3. Restrooms having direct outside access are visible from playground and easily supervised.

o. **Year-Round Education.** For multitrack schools, storage and planning space is provided for off-track teachers, and storage is provided for student projects and student records.

p. **American Disabilities Act.** (DSA)

q. **Child Care Program:** complies with the requirements in *Education Code* Section 17264 for new schools where space for childcare programs is provided.

r. **Exemptions.** If an exemption to a standard is needed, the school district must demonstrate that the educational appropriateness and safety of a school design will not be compromised by an alternative to that standard.

Exhibit 1

§ 14036. Integrated Facilities.

Special education classrooms are integrated with classrooms for non-special education students when:

- a. Special education classrooms are located near regular education classrooms.
- b. If relocatables, their ratio to permanent special education classrooms, is the same as for regular education students.
- c. Special education classrooms are not located on a special education campus adjacent to another school.

Exhibit 2

Components included in a complete elementary school:

Classroom

- Standard classrooms supporting both small group and large group instruction
- Kindergarten classrooms
- Specialized classrooms for science, art and music
- Classrooms and support spaces for special education

Physical Education Spaces

- Hardcourts with a variety of fixed equipment to accommodate basketball and other activities
- Turf and field areas
- Apparatus area

Support Facilities

- Computer room
- Small group areas
- Resource Specialist Program (RSP) area
- Speech specialist office
- Psychologist office
- Academic support such as Title 1

Common Essential Facilities

- Media/center library
- Administration
 - Principal's office
 - Vice Principal's office
 - Office space for itinerant staff
 - Healthy professional office
 - Conference areas
 - Teacher workroom
 - Staff room
 - Parent room
 - Student record storage
 - General Storage
- Multipurpose Room
 - Dining area
 - Food service (preparation or serving)
 - Stage
 - Outdoor dining area
 - Storage for chairs and tables

Exhibit 2

Components included in a complete elementary school (continued)

Infrastructure

- Staff restrooms
- Student restrooms
- Storage rooms
- Custodian room(s)
- Mechanical, data and electrical space
- Staff parking area
- Covered circulation
- Space for preschool buildings

Exhibit 2

Components included in a complete middle school are:

Classroom

- Standard classrooms supporting both small group and large group instruction
- Specialized classrooms for science (both lab and non-lab), art, language, career technical instruction, and music
- Classrooms for special education and special education support spaces
- Facilities for performing arts (can be in multipurpose room)

Physical Education Spaces

- Gymnasium
- Shower/locker room
- Office for physical education teachers
- Physical education classroom
- Storage for equipment
- Hardcourts with a variety of fixed equipment to accommodate basketball and other activities
- Field areas including track, soccer, and softball.

Support Facilities

- Computer room
- Small group areas
- Resource Specialist Program (RSP) area
- Speech specialist office
- Psychologist office
- Academic support such as Title 1

Common Essential Facilities

- Media/center library
- Administration
 - o Principal's office
 - o Vice Principal(s)' office
 - o Counselor(s)' office
 - o Health professional office
 - o Office space for itinerant staff
 - o Conference areas
 - o Teacher workroom
 - o Staff room
 - o Parent room
 - o Clerical support
 - o Student record storage
 - o General Storage

Exhibit 2

Components included in a complete middle school (continued)

Common Essential Facilities (continued)

- Multipurpose Room
 - Dining area
 - Food service (preparation or serving)
 - Adjunct serving areas
 - Stage
 - Outdoor dining area
 - Storage for chairs and tables

Infrastructure

- Staff restrooms
- Student restrooms
- Storage rooms
- Custodian room(s)
- Mechanical, data, and electrical space
- Staff parking area
- Covered circulation

Exhibit 2

Components included in a complete high school are:

Classroom

- Standard classrooms supporting both small group and large group instruction
- Specialized classrooms for science (both lab and non-lab), art, language, career technical instruction, and music
- Facilities for performing arts
- Classrooms for special education
- Student store

Physical Education Spaces

- Gymnasium(s)
- Space for wrestling
- Space for dance
- Space for weightlifting
- Shower/locker room
- Physical education classroom
- Office for physical education teachers
- Hardcourts with a variety of fixed equipment to accommodate basketball and other activities
- Field areas including football, track, soccer, softball, baseball and physical education space.
- Pool

Support Facilities

- Computer room
- Small group areas
- Resource Specialist Program (RSP) area
- Speech specialist office
- Psychologist office
- Academic support such as Title 1

Common Essential Facilities

- Media/center library
- Administration
 - Principal's office
 - Vice Principal(s)' office
 - Counselor(s)' office
 - Health professional office
 - Office space for itinerant staff
 - Security office
 - Conference areas
 - Teacher workroom
 - Staff room
 - Parent room

Exhibit 2

Components included in a complete high school (continued)

Common Essential Facilities (continued)

- Clerical support
- Student record storage
- General storage
- Career center

- Multipurpose Room
 - Dining Area
 - Food service (preparation or serving)
 - Adjunct serving areas
 - Stage
 - Outdoor dining area

Infrastructure

- Staff restrooms
- Student restrooms
- Storage rooms
- Custodian room(s)
- Mechanical, data and electrical space
- Staff parking area
- Student parking
- Covered circulation

Works Cited

Abramson, Paul. "Giving Students Some Space." *School Planning and Management*, May 2006.

Abramson, Paul "12th Annual School Construction Report" *School Planning and Management*, February 2007.

Bursch, Charles. "Maximum Building Area Allowance per Pupil under the State Aid Program." *California Department of Education*, May 11, 1955.

Earthman, Glen I. "School Facility Conditions and Student Academic Achievement." *UCLA's Institute for Democracy, Education, and Access*, October 2002.

"Second Report, Senate Investigating Committee on Education." *Senate of the State of California*, March 1948.

Additional Reading

Bursch, Charles. "Forty Years of School Planning" *California Department of Education*, 1966.

Exhibit 3

Elementary, Middle, High	School District	School Name (see notes)	Grade Level	Square Feet	Master Plan Capacity	Project Capacity (SFP Loading)	Percent Site is of CDE Recommended for Master Plan Enrollment	Kindergarten Teaching Stations	1350 sq ft k ts?	Special Day Class Teaching Stations	Grades 1-6 Teaching Stations	Grades 7-8 Teaching Stations	Grades 9-12 TS	960 sq ft standard ts?	Multipurpose Room Sq. Ft.	Library Sq. Ft.	Food Service Sq. Ft.	Gymnasium Sq. Ft.	Platform /Stage Sq. Ft.	Square feet per student-- Capacity	
H	Corona- Norco	Eleanor Roosevelt High	9-12	367,500	3,985	3,985	0.71	0	N/A	6	0	0	145	Y	5,650	12,400	3,977	19,051	3,102	92	
H	Desert Sands	High School #4	9-12	245,967	2,610	2,286	0.75	0	N/A	2	0	0	84	Y	4,437	6,236	3,564	21,767	1,156	108	
H	Antelope Valley High	Knight High (1)	9-12	211,366	3,429	2,934	0.64	0	N/A	2	0	0	108	N	0	6,304	2,506	21,379	2,240	72	
H	Antelope Valley High	Eastside High (2)	9-12	343,000	3,175	3,175	0.86	0	N/A	6	0	0	115	Y	0	9,497	5,841	22,483	3,326	108	
H	Capistrano Unified	San Juan Hills High (3)	9-12	236,709	2,694	2,664	0.74	0	N/A	2	0	0	98	Y	0	3,309	3,555	25,710	43,130	89	
H	Tulare Joint Union HSD	Third Tulare HS (6)	9-12	157,031	2,070	1,458	1.18	0	N/A	0	0	0	54	N	4,898	7,251	2,371	18,971	812	108	
H	Porterville Unified	Arts/Technology Small High School (7)	9-12	51,695	500	499	0.73	0	N/A	1	0	0	18	Y	8,277	1,516	1,403	0	1,978	104	
H	Dixon Unified	Dixon High (8)	9-12	161,109	2,236	2,236	0.91	0	N/A	2	0	0	82	Y	5,045	9,032	2,836	29,580	1,767	72	
H	San Ramon Valley U	Dougherty Valley (10, 11)	9-12	306,478	2,720	2,504	0.71	0	N/A	6	0	0	93	N	9,406	8,362	5,846	43,726	2,473	122	
H	Mojave Unified	California City High	9-12	84,638	1,100	728	0.90	0	N/A	2	0	0	26		3,840	2,500	2,160	10,201	0	116	
H	Kern Union High	Frontier High	9-12	200,029	2,106	2,105	1.03	0	N/A	5	0	0	76	Y	9,741	5,358	1,488	14,280	0	95	
H	Los Angeles USD	Central High #2	9-12	345,388	2,403	2,403	0.23	0	N/A	0	0	0	89	Y	3,796	6,130	2,892	27,446	2,513	144	
H	Los Angeles USD	East Los Angeles HS #1	9-12	139,318	1,026	1,026	0.16	0	N/A	0	0	0	38	Y	3,943	3,125	2,266	12,800	986	136	
H	Folsom-Cordova USD	Vista del Lago HS (24)	9-12	233,127	1,808	1,538	0.82	0	N/A	2	0	0	56	Y	6,135	15,267	2,358	31,940	0	152	
H	Roseville Jt Union HS	High School #5-Antelope (22)	9-12	201,639	2,269	1,665	0.72	0	N/A	2	0	0	61	Y	6,036	6,137	2,505	32,706	1,952	121	
H	Elk Grove USD	Cosumnes Oaks (18)	9-12	230,554	2,867	2,785	0.80	0	N/A	3	0	0	102	N	7,575	14,614	3,271	30,796	0	83	
H	Sweetwater UHSD	High School #13	9-12	216,767	2,500	2,195	0.65	0	0	6	0	0	79	Y	7,742	5,544	4,480	13,298	1,500	99	
H	Washington Unified	New High	9-12	324,126	3,112	2,572	0.90	0	N/A	5	0	0	98	Y	6,784	9,428	8,762	74,062	0	126	
TOTAL				4,056,441	42,610	38,758									93,305	132,010	62,081	450,196			
Number of Projects				18																	
					Master Plan Capacity	Project Capacity															
					Mean Square Feet Per Student	95	105														
					Median Square Feet Per Student	93	108														
					Mean School Size	2,367	2,153														
					Median School Size	2,452	2,261														
					Median Percent Site Size	0.75															

Exhibit 3

Elementary, Middle, High	School District	School Name (see notes)	Grade Level	Square Feet	Master Plan Capacity	Project Capacity (SFP Loading)	Percent Site is of CDE Recommended for Master Plan Enrollment	Kindergarten Teaching Stations	1350 sq ft k ts?	Special Day Class Teaching Stations	Grades 1-6 Teaching Stations	Grades 7-8 Teaching Stations	Grades 9-12 TS	960 sq ft standard ts?	Multipurpose Room Sq. Ft.	Library Sq. Ft.	Food Service Sq. Ft.	Gymnasium Sq. Ft.	Platform /Stage Sq. Ft.	Square feet per student-- Capacity
E	Plum Valley Elem	Plum Valley	K-8	10,103	235	102	1.00	0	0	0	3	1	0	Y	2,911	960	431	0	0	99
E	Richfield Elem	Richfield Elem	K-8	28,743	500	329	0.99	1	Y	0	10	2	0	Y	1,777	960	845	6,764	0	87
E	Irvine Unified	Turtle Ridge	K-8	69,658	643	639	0.88	2	N	4	15	6	0	N	3,432	8,000	1,100	0	625	109
E	Chino Valley Unif	Site#1 at Preserve	K-8	85,823	973	973	0.63	3	N	2	23	11	0	N	0	6,700	3,000	7,720	1,000	88
E	San Marcos Unified	San Elijo Elementary	K-5	54,442	938	838	0.64	3	N	1	30	0	0	Y	3,000	2,700	1,000	0	900	65
E	Chula Vista	Otay Ranch (ES #43)	K-6	63,283	800	776	0.74	4	N	2	26	0	0	Y	4,694	1,913	945	4,218	476	82
E	Cottonwood Elem	Cottonwood Elem	K-6	43,800	1,040	688	1.00	0	N/A	1	27	0	0	N	3,774	1,380	646	0	525	64
E	Irvine Unified	El Camino Real	K-6	67,141	1,000	652	0.58	2	N	4	22	0	0	N	3,490	6,253	2,482	0	1,466	103
E	Carlsbad Unif	Southeast Elem	K-5	49,500	743	584	0.86	3	Y	1	20	0	0	Y	3,883	2,123	1,303	0	622	85
E	Clovis Unified	Harlan Ranch ES (4)	K-6	53,720	825	684	0.93	2	Y	1	25	0	0	N	4,067	2,154	2,010	0	716	79
E	Central Unified	New Elementary @ Ed Center (5)	K-6	56,000	860	851	1.21	3	N	2	30	0	0	Y	3,445	1,211	1,253	0	792	66
E	Visalia Unified	Leila Elementary	K-6	48,627	850	785	0.93	4	Y	3	26	0	0	Y	3,695	1,000	708	0	814	62
E	Visalia Unified	Southeast Elementary	K-6	48,627	750	785	0.78	4	Y	3	26	0	0	Y	3,695	1,000	708	0	814	62
E	Alameda City Unified	Woodstock ES (12)	K-5	49,290	704	704	0.48	4	Y	1	29	0	0	Y	4,067	1,000	2,324	0	1,152	70
E	Gilroy Unified	Greenfield ES	K-5	53,403	750	640	0.64	4	Y	0	30	0	0	Y	4,000	1,974	644	0	435	83
E	Arvin Union	El Camino ES	K-6	54,344	1,100	864	0.68	6	Y	3	27	0	0	Y	4,239	1,780	1,593	0	1,035	63
E	Wasco Union Elem	Theresa Burke (13)	K-6	50,167	1,099	900	0.97	4	N	0	32	0	0	Y	3,425	1,280	325	0	905	56
E	Los Angeles USD	Canoga Park New Elementary	K-5	75,224	600	600	0.18	3	Y	0	21	0	0	Y	7,521	0	1,301	0	903	125
E	Dry Creek Joint Elementary	Barrett Ranch Elementary	K-5	49,962	763	763	93.73	3	N	1	27	0	0	N	4,570	1,893	491	0	978	65
E	Oakley Union Elementary	Carpenter Elementary	K-5	40,720	575	575	101.0	3	Y	0	20	0	0	Y	5,007	0	1,388	0	1,025	71
E	San Diego Unified	Herbert Ibarra ES (16)	K-5	68,754	940	768	0.49	6	N	2	24	0	0	Y	4,980	2,533	784	0	984	90
E	San Diego Unified	Jonas Salk ES (17)	K-5	63,174	768	768	0.81	6	N	2	24	0	0	Y	4,879	2,715	1,242	0	1,000	82
E	Folsom-Cordova USD	Russell Ranch Elem.	K-5	42,468	763	529	0.78	2	Y	6	17	0	0	y	4,940	1,579	385	0	1,006	80
E	Roseville City Elementary SD	W-75 Junction Elementary	K-6	42,025	775	600	0.71	2	N	0	22	0	0	y	3,331	1,644	377	0	867	70
E	Perris ESD	Skyview ES (19)	K-6	44,000	850	825	0.61	2	Y	0	31	0	0	Y	4,073	3,370	1,068	0	725	53
E	Perris ESD	Railway ES (19)	K-6	47,840	900	900	0.96	3	Y / N	0	30	0	0	Y	4,073	3,370	1,068	0	725	53
E	Etiwanda ESD	Miller ES (20)	K-5	51,217	884	884	0.86	2	Y	1	33	0	0	Y	4,073	3,370	1,068	0	725	58

TOTAL
Number of Projects 27

	Master Plan Capacity	Project Capacity
Mean Square Feet Per Student	65	74
Median Square Feet Per Student	65	71
Mean School Size	801	704
Median School Size	800	763
Median Percent Site Size	0.81	

Exhibit 3

Elementary, Middle, High	School District	School Name (see notes)	Grade Level	Square Feet	Master Plan Capacity	Project Capacity (SFP Loading)	Percent Site is of CDE Recommended for Master Plan Enrollment	Kindergarten Teaching Stations	1350 sq ft k ts?	Special Day Class Teaching Stations	Grades 1-6 Teaching Stations	Grades 7-8 Teaching Stations	Grades 9-12 TS	960 sq ft standard ts?	Multipurpose Room Sq. Ft.	Library Sq. Ft.	Food Service Sq. Ft.	Gymnasium Sq. Ft.	Platform /Stage Sq. Ft.	Square feet per student-- Capacity
--------------------------	-----------------	-------------------------	-------------	-------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	---	--------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------	------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------	----------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------

NOTES

- (1) small gym 8,432 large gym 12,947
- (2) small gym 8,397 large gym 14,086
- (3) small gym 8,590 large gym 17,120
- (4) general TS are 940 sq ft
- (5) kindergarten rooms average 1,048 sq. ft.
- (6) TS vary in size between 899 sq ft - 991 for general classrooms, most are under 960 sq ft.
- (7) Arts/Tech High School, part of the small high school project, cafeteria serves as a gym during inclement weather. Uses gym at adjacent Swarthmore HS
- (8) 7 TS undersized, joint use gym
- (9) 4 TS undersized due to HVAC
- (10) 949 sq. ft.
- (11) gymnasium and auxiliary gym
- (12) TS plus workroom = 960
- (13) Theresa Burke ES "wanted 500-550 but built for 850", K rooms 1280, smaller library and M, financial hardship projects are typically twice as large as 50/50
- (14) 957 sq. ft.
- (15) 1235 sq. ft.
- (16) 1134 sq. ft.
- (17) 1135 sq. ft.
- (18) library shared with adjacent high school, Libray square footage reflced in HS
- (19) Skyview ES and Railway ES essentially the same set of plans with the position of buildings changed
- (20) Miller ES utilizes same core facilities as Skyview and Railway with different TS layout
- (21) final plan approval letter issued on 12/18/2000
- (22) Joint use gym
- (23) Joint Use MP
- (24) Joint use gym

REPORT BY THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
State Allocation Board Meeting, May 23, 2007

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REPORT ON
COMPLETE SCHOOLS

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To provide information requested by the State Allocation Board (SAB) on the components of a complete school consistent with the *California Code of Regulations, Title 5* and a representative sample of such schools.

BACKGROUND

The Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) has been analyzing the ability of districts to build a complete school with the grants provided in the School Facility Program (SFP). In order to determine the adequacy of the grant, it is essential to have a definition of a complete school in which to compare the grant. At the March 2007 SAB meeting, the California Department of Education (CDE) committed to providing OPSC examples of complete schools approved by CDE and the components of a complete school. The CDE has also started the analysis if the complete school supports the world-class academic standards to which students, teachers, administrators, and elected officials are held accountable.

DESCRIPTION

Attached is the CDE report.

REPORT ON COMPLETE SCHOOLS

Executive Summary

As part of the effort to assess the adequacy of the grants provided in the School Facility Program (SFP), the California Department of Education (CDE) has been asked by the State Allocation Board (SAB) to:

1. Provide examples of complete schools approved by the CDE, and
2. Determine if the complete school supports the world-class academic standards to which students, teachers, administrators, and elected officials are held accountable.

1. Examples of complete schools approved by the CDE

In order to develop a definition of a complete school, an understanding of the 60 year history of state school construction assistance and of *Title 5* standards is necessary.

History

The first state construction assistance program was created in 1949. In creating the program, the Legislature adopted the low end of a range of square footage per student recommendation made by State Superintendent of Public Instruction Roy E. Simpson in 1947. These square footage standards, with minor increases, formed the basis of the 1976 Lease Purchase Program (LPP), and, in turn, the per student grants provided in the SFP that was established in 1998.

The median amount of square footage per student being built nationally and regionally over the past 20 years is compared to the square footage allowances used in developing the SFP grants below:

Table 1

Square Feet per Student

	1987	1997	2006
Elementary Schools			
National Median	90	119	122
California (LPP allowance)	59	73	73
Middle Schools			
National Median	111	146	144
California (LPP allowance)	80	80	80
High Schools			
National Median	153	185	167
California (LPP allowance)	95	95	95

Source: 1987 data, Abramson, 2006
1997 and 2007 data, Abramson, 2007

Two facts stand out:

1. The SFP funding model is based on a per student square footage allowance that is significantly less than the amount of square feet being provided per student in school construction projects nation-wide and regionally.
2. The national median amount of space per student has increased over the past 20 years, while the per-student square footage on which the SFP funding model is based has remained static at the middle and high school levels. The elementary square footage increase is the result of K-3 class size reduction.

Title 5 (A summary of Title 5 is attached as Exhibit 1)

The Title 5 standards by which projects are evaluated by CDE allow variation in program delivery in response to the varied educational needs of the 1,052 districts in the state. For example, a school that serves a student population with extensive needs for intervention and remediation services will have different facility needs than a school without such demands.

Because the design of a school is in response to the educational program provided by a district, it is not possible to define a complete school that will address the needs of students throughout the state. However, in order to allow an assessment of the adequacy of the SFP grants, the CDE has identified 60 school projects that are complete schools.

Complete Schools

The 60 complete schools have a median square foot per student amount that at the middle and high school levels, is significantly less than the square feet per student than provided for in projects built nationally and regionally.

Table 2

	Elementary (median square feet per student)	Middle School (median square feet per student)	High School (median square feet per student)
60 Projects	71	88	108
California SFP Funding Model	73	80	95
Western Region (2006)	88	106	120
National (2006)	122	144	167

The CDE has developed a list of features that exist in many complete schools. This list is an interim step to a more comprehensive definition that is being developed in consultation with stakeholders.

2. Do these complete schools support the world-class academic standards to which students, teachers, administrators, and elected officials are held accountable?

If districts were posed with the opportunity of designing a school without the constraints of the SFP, what features would be included and how large would the spaces be?

The CDE has convened an advisory committee to discuss this critical issue.

REPORT ON COMPLETE SCHOOLS

Background:

As part of the effort to assess the adequacy of the grants provided in the School Facility Program (SFP), the California Department of Education (CDE) has been asked by the State Allocation Board (SAB) to:

1. Provide examples of complete schools approved by the CDE, and
2. Determine if the complete school supports the world-class academic standards to which students, teachers, administrators, and elected officials are held accountable.

These two requests are addressed below.

1. Examples of complete schools approved by the CDE

The Importance of School Facilities

The effects of school facilities on student achievement are well documented in research. CDE can provide SAB members a list of numerous studies that examine and confirm this association. In short, research shows that facilities can increase student achievement from 5-17 percentile points. (Earthman, 2002)

Complete School

In order to understand the term complete school as being used in the grant adequacy discussion, a brief summary of the standards historically used in the programs preceding the SFP, as well as an understanding of school design standards contained in *California Code of Regulations, Title 5 (Title 5)*, is necessary.

Overview of State Standards

In 1949, the legislature responded to the impact the first wave of the baby-boom would have on the need for school facilities by creating the SAB and a process for providing assistance to districts experiencing enrollment growth. A survey of districts (there were 2,554 in 1946 as compared to 1,052 today) conducted by the Senate Investigating Committee on Education noted “that 213 schools and districts were holding double and triple sessions in 1,748 classrooms during the 1946-47 school year” (Senate of the State of California, 1948). Because double and triple sessions reduce available instructional time, about 61,000 K-8 students (of the 1,078,670 K-8 students statewide in 1946) had shortened learning opportunities because their schools were overcrowded. Additionally, class sizes of 35 were not uncommon with some classes being as large as 55 students. (Senate of the State of California, 1948)

It is interesting to note that recently another strategy to compensate for overcrowded classrooms resulted in a multitrack year-round education plan called

Concept 6, which also compromises instructional time. The use of the Concept 6 calendar is being phased out as a requirement of the *Williams* settlement.

In addition to the large number of “unhoused” (the term presently used) students, the Senate Investigating Committee noted that many of the 38,897 classrooms in the state “do not conform to the state code, are obsolescent, and are neither properly lighted nor ventilated. Many of them are not up to standards against earthquakes” (ibid.)

The combined demands of having to replace thousands of inadequate classrooms while also building thousands of new classrooms, created an estimated need of \$142,440,000. In order to provide assistance to districts, the Legislature needed to develop standards in order to prioritize and define state assistance.

To assist in this effort, then State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Roy E. Simpson, in 1947 convened a group of school district superintendents as the *Committee on Defining School Plant Adequacy*. This group realized that a square footage standard was more effective in meeting the need for school facilities than a per student dollar amount for two reasons:

1. Square footage standards, unlike a per-student dollar amount, are not subject to inflation. A square foot in 1947 remains a square foot in 2007;
2. An adequate square foot allowance tied to a cost factor would allow districts to respond to local needs more effectively. That is, one district may need, for program reasons, more specialized or more expensive spaces than another district. A per student dollar amount cannot adjust to these differences.

The Committee’s recommended ranges of space per student are summarized below (Bursch, 1955):

- Elementary - 55-70 square feet per student
- Middle - 75-100 square feet per student
- High - 86-110 square feet per student

The low end of these ranges was adopted by the Legislature in creating the State School Building Aid Law of 1949 (*Education Code* Section 15700, et seq.).

From the start, the CDE had concerns over the adequacy of these square footage standards. A 1955 CDE analysis of projects built under these standards indicated that “...it has been difficult—in fact well nigh impossible—under these limitations to provide adequate building space...”. (ibid.) Of specific concern was the decreased size of classrooms as compared to projects built without state aid—1,200 square feet in non-state aid projects to under 1,000 square feet in

state aided projects. The report also noted that the limited square footage allocation led to districts building high schools for higher enrollments than desired in order to be eligible for sufficient square footage to build a complete school. (ibid.)

These 1949 square footage standards, with minor changes, were incorporated into the Lease Purchase Program (LPP) of 1976. An across the board seven percent increase in square footage was provided in 1987. Other minor increases were provided during the course of the LPP in acknowledgement of educational programs such as special education and the need for speech and resource specialist spaces. At the conclusion of the LPP in 1998, the square feet allocation was:

- Elementary - 59 square feet per student
- Middle - 80 square feet per student
- High – 94.6 square feet per student (for 2,000 student school)

These amounts were not significantly higher than the low end of the square footage range initially proposed by the CDE in 1947.

In response to the limited space allocation, the CDE emphasized the importance of the classroom by recommending that 31 of the 55 square feet allocated in 1949 for elementary students be used for classrooms.

Classrooms, where students spend most of their day and where most instruction occurs, have had additional uses and demands placed upon them since the 1949 standard was established:

- Computers (15-20 square feet per station),
- Access compliance,
- Inclusion students and aides,
- Pull-out and small group spaces,
- Flexibility for changing educational approaches.

Other areas of a school have also been subject to expansion since 1949, including:

- Space for academic intervention and remediation,
- Space for support of at-risk students (counselors, etc.),
- Toilet rooms, elevator shafts, ramps and lifts for access compliance as required by the Division of the State Architect,
- Mechanical space for increased electrical service and computer servers,
- Storage space for an increased amount of instructional materials,
- Pre-kindergarten classrooms and outdoor space.

Additionally, schools are often called to serve as centers of community and provide a variety of supplemental services such as School Based Coordinated Health Centers and after school programs. These demands have implications for school design and the definition of a complete school.

For additional perspective, the chart below compares the square footages of the LPP that formed the basis of the SFP grant to the national median per student square footage for constructed projects.

Table 1

Square Feet per Student

	1987	1997	2006
Elementary Schools			
National Median	90	119	122
California (LPP Allowance)	59	73	73
Middle Schools			
National Median	111	146	144
California (LPP Allowance)	80	80	80
High Schools			
National Median	153	185	167
California (LPP Allowance)	95	95	95

Source: 1987 data, Abramson, 2006
1997 and 2007 data, Abramson, 2007

Two facts stand out:

1. The SFP funding model is based on a per student square footage allowance that is significantly less than the amount of square feet being provided per student in school construction projects nation-wide.
2. The national median amount of space per student has increased over the past 20 years, while the per student square footage on which the SFP funding model is based has remained static at the middle and high school levels. The elementary square footage increase is the result of K-3 class size reduction.

States such as California have a climate that allows exterior circulation, and therefore require less interior space, than states with more severe climates. In 2006, schools constructed in four western states—California, Nevada, Arizona, and Hawaii—had median per student square foot amounts of:

- Elementary Schools – 88 square feet per student
- Middle Schools – 106 square feet per student
- High Schools-- 120 square feet per student
(Abramson, 2007)

Even compared to the median square footage of schools constructed in neighboring states, California's schools are built with a funding model based on significantly less square footage per student. The national and regional median figures include data from California. If the California data were able to be disaggregated from the national and regional data, an even greater disparity would result.

Title 5 Standards

California *Education Code (EC)* Section 17251 charges the CDE with the development of standards for school sites and plans. Plan standards are contained in *California Code of Regulations, Title 5* Section 14030. These standards focus on student safety and educational appropriateness. All projects approved by the SAB are required, pursuant to *EC* Section 17070.50, to be approved by the CDE. Projects not requesting state funds must also use the *Title 5* standards but are not required to seek CDE review and approval.

Title 5 standards were developed after the establishment of the state's per student square footage allowance standards in 1949, so educational appropriateness is viewed in light of the *Title 5* standards being developed to exist within the confines of a funding system.

In summary, California has required the educational program model to meet the funding standards instead of the educational program driving the funding standard.

Key to the *Title 5* review is the district's board-adopted educational specifications. The educational specification provides the architect information on the educational program needs that drive the design of a school.

Title 5 is structured to allow flexibility in the review of plans based on the individual needs of a district, as presented in the educational specification, and a district may request a variance to a specific standard if it is documented that student safety and educational appropriateness are not compromised (*Title 5* Section 14030(r)).

For example:

Title 5 Section 14030(g) requires general education classrooms to be a minimum of 960 square feet. A district's educational program may call for project-based learning. The architectural response to this program need is a cluster of 800 square foot classrooms around a shared 300 square foot project area.

Title 5 Section 14030(k)(2) requires a school's administrative space to "...have sufficient square footage to accommodate the number of staff for the maximum enrollment of the school." Each school's needs are different, so what is sufficient in one school may not be sufficient in another. For instance, one district's policy

and program requires additional vice principals, counselors, and a parent room as a strategy to improve student achievement as necessary due to state and federal accountability requirements. The administration building at such a school would be larger than a school without such program requirements. In short, one size does not fit all.

Such decisions are repeated throughout the design process and affect the types and size of spaces, and thus the cost, of a school.

Financial hardship districts

Financial hardship districts, particularly, have limited funding available to respond to program needs. The CDE has seen projects in which the design, while meeting *Title 5* standards, has not provided all of the facilities commonly thought to be necessary for a complete school. For example, a multipurpose room is deleted due to cost pressures and outdoor lunch shelters constructed instead. While unenclosed shelters provide space for food service, the lack of an interior space for eating significantly affects program delivery in inclement weather.

With regard to financial hardship projects, CDE brings to the SAB's attention two trends being employed by many hardship districts in an effort to build complete schools.

1. Larger schools

Districts, in an attempt to obtain sufficient funds, build schools larger than they would prefer.

A district, for educational reasons, would like to build elementary schools of no more than 600 students. However, in order to receive sufficient funds from the SFP to build a complete school, a school for 900 students must be built.

A similar concern was expressed by the CDE in 1955 (Bursch, 1955).

Research shows the benefits of smaller schools, yet many districts, because of the facility funding model, must build larger schools.

2. Increased use of portables

Another common response to budget constraints is using portable classrooms instead of permanent construction. Often, financial hardship districts must use both strategies—larger schools and portables—to complete a school.

The educational program and life cycle costs are compromised by an over reliance on portable classrooms.

Conclusion

The examination of the complete school must be made with the understanding that the LPP square footage standards that form the basis for the SFP per pupil grant were the product of an austere program developed 60 years ago.

Because of the unique needs of each district and school, a definition of complete that is relevant to over 1,000 districts is difficult to achieve. Should an administrative space be a certain size in order for the school to be complete? As seen above, if such a standard is used, a school with extensive needs for academic support and intervention could be seen as “over-building” an administrative building when in fact the building is properly sized for the support of the students.

The CDE, in support of the SAB’s efforts to assess the adequacy of the SFP grant, has identified 60 recent CDE approved projects (Exhibit 3) from throughout the state that represent complete schools based on each district’s educational specification.

The median square footage per student of the 60 projects is compared to the previously noted national and regional median square footages below:

Table 2

	Elementary (median square feet per student)	Middle School (median square feet per student)	High School (median square feet per student)
60 Projects	71	88	108
Western Region (2006)	88	106	120
National (2006)	122	144	167

The 60 projects determined to be complete schools by the CDE are on average built with significantly less square feet than projects built nationwide and in neighboring states. Recall also, that if California data were to be disaggregated from the national and regional date, the differences would be even greater.

Comparing the 60 projects to the allowances that were used in creating the SFP shows that middle schools and high schools require significantly more square footage to build a complete school than currently provided for in the SFP funding model.

Table 3

	Elementary (median square feet per student)	Middle (median square feet per student)	High School (median square feet per student)
60 Projects	71	88	108
LPP-SFP	73	80	95
Percent increase required in per student square footage to allow complete school	0%	10%	14%

2. Do these complete schools support the world-class academic standards to which students, teachers, administrators, and elected officials are held accountable?

The second question, do these complete schools support California’s world-class academic standards, again requires perspective and a review of the constraints of the school building funding model.

Districts have built schools with basically the same funding model for the past 60 years, and it is the changing educational program that has had to adapt to the static funding model. During the nine years in which the SFP has been in place, numerous educational programs have been adopted by the Legislature, but the SFP funding model has not been changed to reflect any needed facilities. Recent initiatives have been enacted to increase the number of counselors and create School Based Coordinated Health Centers. Both of these efforts have space needs which are not reflected in the SFP funding model.

If districts were posed with the opportunity of designing a school without the constraints of the SFP, what features would be included and how large would the spaces be?

The CDE has convened an advisory committee to discuss these critical issues.

Until these questions are answered, CDE offers an interim operational definition of a complete school. This definition consists of a list of features that should be present in a complete school and is attached as Exhibit 2. If a feature is not listed, it should not be viewed that the feature is an enhancement, but rather a response to a local need. Beyond the discussion of the types and size of spaces are the issues of quality and furniture and equipment. The CDE recommends that school facility projects be built to high performance standards and should be constructed of quality materials that will stand the test of time.

Exhibit 1

Summary of Standards for the Design/Construction of School Facilities California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Division 14

§ 14030.

- a. **Educational Specifications.** Plans are based on school board-approved educational specifications.
- b. **Site Layout.** Parent drop off, bus loading areas, and parking are separated to allow students to enter and exit the school grounds safely.
 1. Buses do not pass through parking areas, unless a barrier is provided that prevents vehicles from backing directly into the bus loading area.
 2. Parent drop off area is adjacent to school entrance and separate from bus area and parking.
 3. Vehicle traffic pattern does not interfere with foot traffic patterns. Foot traffic does not have to pass through entrance driveways to enter school.
 4. Parking stalls are not located so vehicles must back into bus or loading areas. Island fencing or curbs are used to separate parking areas from loading areas.
 5. Bus drop off for handicapped students is in the same location as for regular education students.
- c. **Playground and Field Areas.** Adequate physical education teaching stations are available to fulfill the course requirements for the planned enrollment. Supervision of playfields is not obstructed.
- d. **Delivery and Utility Areas.** Delivery and service areas are located to provide vehicular access that does not jeopardize the safety of students and staff.
- e. **Future Expansion.** If temporary or permanent expansion is anticipated, the site layout can accommodate additions without substantial alterations to existing structures or playgrounds.
- f. **Placement of Buildings.**
 1. Building placement is compatible with other functions on campus; e.g., band room is not next to library.
 2. Physical relationship of classrooms and support areas allows unobstructed movement of staff and students around the campus.
 3. Building placement has favorable orientation to natural light.
 4. Restrooms are conveniently located, require minimum supervision, and are easily accessible from playground and classrooms.
 5. Parking spaces are sufficient for staff, visitors, and eligible students.
 6. The campus is secured by fencing.

Exhibit 1

- g. **Classrooms.** General classrooms are at least 960 square feet (s.f.). Total classroom space meets or exceeds the capacity planned for the school using the district's loading standards.
- h. **Specialized Classrooms and Areas.**
 - 1. Small-Group Areas: are not counted as classrooms; are located near classrooms
 - 2. Kindergarten Classrooms.
 - i. 1350 s.f. for permanent structures
 - ii. Classrooms are designed to allow supervision of play yards and all areas of the classroom.
 - iii. Play yard design provides a variety of activities for developing large motor skills.
 - iv. Classrooms are located close to parent drop-off and bus loading areas.
 - v. Storage, casework, and learning stations are designed for use in free play and structured activities; e.g., shelves are deep and open for frequent use.
 - vi. Windows, marking boards, sinks, drinking fountains, and furniture are at appropriate heights for kindergarteners.
 - vii. Restrooms are self-contained within the classroom or within the kindergarten complex.
 - 3. Special Education Classrooms and Areas.
 - i. A new school designates at least 240 s.f. for Resource Specialist Program.
 - ii. A new school designates at least 200 s.f. for the speech and language program.
 - iii. A new school designates office area for the psychologist and counseling program.
 - iv. Special day classrooms are at least the same size as regular education classrooms.
 - v. The area allowances in *Education Code* Section 17047(a) for special day class programs are used for the design of classroom and support space.
 - vi. Special day classrooms are distributed throughout the campus.
 - vii. No more than two special day classrooms are together.
 - viii. A conference area is available.

Exhibit 1

- ix. Medical therapy units are close to visitor parking and accessible after school hours.
- i. **Laboratories shall be designed in accordance with the planned curriculum.**
 1. Science Laboratories are at least 1300 s.f., including storage and teacher prep area, and designed for the safe handling of hazardous materials. Storage and safety equipment, including exhaust fume hoods, eyewashes, deluge showers, are provided.
 2. Consumer Home Economics Laboratories are at least 1300 s.f., including lecture area and student storage.
 3. Industrial and Technology Education Laboratories have lab workstations and a lecture area in or near the lab, are designed for the safe handling and ventilation of hazardous materials.
 4. Computer Instructional Support Area labs are at least 960 s.f., provide for student movement around learning stations, sufficient outlets, power sources and network links, proper ventilation, security and lighting provided.
 5. Art Studios have adequate ventilation for dust and fumes; kiln is in a safe, ventilated area.
 6. Music Rooms are acoustically isolated from the rest of the school and have convenient access to the auditorium.
 7. Dance Studios have mirrors, ballet bars, electrical outlets, and a minimum of 2000 s.f. (or 3,500 square feet if performance space is needed).
 8. Theater or Auditorium has ramped seating, space for orchestra pit; location provides convenient public access and parking while preserving security of the school campus
- j. **Gymnasium, Shower/Locker Area shall be designed to accommodate multiple use activities in accordance with the planned enrollment:**
 1. The gymnasium is secured from other parts of the campus for events.
 2. The shower/locker area is of sufficient size to allow students enrolled in the physical education program to shower and dress each period.
 3. Toilets are available for the public in facilities intended for community use, and not in shower/locker areas.
 4. Office space is provided for physical education teachers.
 5. Space is available for weight lifting, exercise equipment usage, aerobics, and the like.

Exhibit 1

k. **Auxiliary Areas.**

1. Multipurpose room meets minimum essential size standards and accommodates physical education activities, assemblies, and extracurricular activities. Stage may have a dividing wall but is not intended to be a classroom. Ceiling height allows for clearance of light fixtures for physical education activities.
2. Administrative Office.
 - i. Students have direct confidential access to pupil personnel area.
 - ii. Counter tops are accessible to the student population, both at a standing and wheelchair level.
 - iii. Clerical staff has a clear view of nurse's office.
 - iv. The nurse's office has a bathroom separate from staff bathroom(s) in the administration area.
 - v. Space is available for private conference and waiting areas.
 - vi. A faculty workroom is available for a staff proportionate to the student population.
3. Library/Media Center and Technology. Library space meets minimum essential facilities standards. Visual supervision from circulation desk is available to study areas, stack space, and student work centers.

l. **Lighting.** Windows allow daylight but do not cause excess glare or heat gain.

m. **Acoustical.** Sound attenuation is a design element in noisy environments.

n. **Plumbing.**

1. Restrooms allow for supervision.
2. Fixtures are in accord with the California *Plumbing Code*.
3. Restrooms having direct outside access are visible from playground and easily supervised.

o. **Year-Round Education.** For multitrack schools, storage and planning space is provided for off-track teachers, and storage is provided for student projects and student records.

p. **American Disabilities Act.** (DSA)

q. **Child Care Program:** complies with the requirements in *Education Code* Section 17264 for new schools where space for childcare programs is provided.

r. **Exemptions.** If an exemption to a standard is needed, the school district must demonstrate that the educational appropriateness and safety of a school design will not be compromised by an alternative to that standard.

Exhibit 1

§ 14036. Integrated Facilities.

Special education classrooms are integrated with classrooms for non-special education students when:

- a. Special education classrooms are located near regular education classrooms.
- b. If relocatables, their ratio to permanent special education classrooms, is the same as for regular education students.
- c. Special education classrooms are not located on a special education campus adjacent to another school.

Exhibit 2

Components included in a complete elementary school:

Classroom

- Standard classrooms supporting both small group and large group instruction
- Kindergarten classrooms
- Specialized classrooms for science, art and music
- Classrooms and support spaces for special education

Physical Education Spaces

- Hardcourts with a variety of fixed equipment to accommodate basketball and other activities
- Turf and field areas
- Apparatus area

Support Facilities

- Computer room
- Small group areas
- Resource Specialist Program (RSP) area
- Speech specialist office
- Psychologist office
- Academic support such as Title 1

Common Essential Facilities

- Media/center library
- Administration
 - Principal's office
 - Vice Principal's office
 - Office space for itinerant staff
 - Healthy professional office
 - Conference areas
 - Teacher workroom
 - Staff room
 - Parent room
 - Student record storage
 - General Storage
- Multipurpose Room
 - Dining area
 - Food service (preparation or serving)
 - Stage
 - Outdoor dining area
 - Storage for chairs and tables

Exhibit 2

Components included in a complete elementary school (continued)

Infrastructure

- Staff restrooms
- Student restrooms
- Storage rooms
- Custodian room(s)
- Mechanical, data and electrical space
- Staff parking area
- Covered circulation
- Space for preschool buildings

Exhibit 2

Components included in a complete middle school are:

Classroom

- Standard classrooms supporting both small group and large group instruction
- Specialized classrooms for science (both lab and non-lab), art, language, career technical instruction, and music
- Classrooms for special education and special education support spaces
- Facilities for performing arts (can be in multipurpose room)

Physical Education Spaces

- Gymnasium
- Shower/locker room
- Office for physical education teachers
- Physical education classroom
- Storage for equipment
- Hardcourts with a variety of fixed equipment to accommodate basketball and other activities
- Field areas including track, soccer, and softball.

Support Facilities

- Computer room
- Small group areas
- Resource Specialist Program (RSP) area
- Speech specialist office
- Psychologist office
- Academic support such as Title 1

Common Essential Facilities

- Media/center library
- Administration
 - o Principal's office
 - o Vice Principal(s)' office
 - o Counselor(s)' office
 - o Health professional office
 - o Office space for itinerant staff
 - o Conference areas
 - o Teacher workroom
 - o Staff room
 - o Parent room
 - o Clerical support
 - o Student record storage
 - o General Storage

Exhibit 2

Components included in a complete middle school (continued)

Common Essential Facilities (continued)

- Multipurpose Room
 - Dining area
 - Food service (preparation or serving)
 - Adjunct serving areas
 - Stage
 - Outdoor dining area
 - Storage for chairs and tables

Infrastructure

- Staff restrooms
- Student restrooms
- Storage rooms
- Custodian room(s)
- Mechanical, data, and electrical space
- Staff parking area
- Covered circulation

Exhibit 2

Components included in a complete high school are:

Classroom

- Standard classrooms supporting both small group and large group instruction
- Specialized classrooms for science (both lab and non-lab), art, language, career technical instruction, and music
- Facilities for performing arts
- Classrooms for special education
- Student store

Physical Education Spaces

- Gymnasium(s)
- Space for wrestling
- Space for dance
- Space for weightlifting
- Shower/locker room
- Physical education classroom
- Office for physical education teachers
- Hardcourts with a variety of fixed equipment to accommodate basketball and other activities
- Field areas including football, track, soccer, softball, baseball and physical education space.
- Pool

Support Facilities

- Computer room
- Small group areas
- Resource Specialist Program (RSP) area
- Speech specialist office
- Psychologist office
- Academic support such as Title 1

Common Essential Facilities

- Media/center library
- Administration
 - Principal's office
 - Vice Principal(s)' office
 - Counselor(s)' office
 - Health professional office
 - Office space for itinerant staff
 - Security office
 - Conference areas
 - Teacher workroom
 - Staff room
 - Parent room

Exhibit 2

Components included in a complete high school (continued)

Common Essential Facilities (continued)

- Clerical support
- Student record storage
- General storage
- Career center

- Multipurpose Room
 - Dining Area
 - Food service (preparation or serving)
 - Adjunct serving areas
 - Stage
 - Outdoor dining area

Infrastructure

- Staff restrooms
- Student restrooms
- Storage rooms
- Custodian room(s)
- Mechanical, data and electrical space
- Staff parking area
- Student parking
- Covered circulation

Works Cited

Abramson, Paul. "Giving Students Some Space." *School Planning and Management*, May 2006.

Abramson, Paul "12th Annual School Construction Report" *School Planning and Management*, February 2007.

Bursch, Charles. "Maximum Building Area Allowance per Pupil under the State Aid Program." *California Department of Education*, May 11, 1955.

Earthman, Glen I. "School Facility Conditions and Student Academic Achievement." *UCLA's Institute for Democracy, Education, and Access*, October 2002.

"Second Report, Senate Investigating Committee on Education." *Senate of the State of California*, March 1948.

Additional Reading

Bursch, Charles. "Forty Years of School Planning" *California Department of Education*, 1966.

Exhibit 3

Elementary, Middle, High	School District	School Name (see notes)	Grade Level	Square Feet	Master Plan Capacity	Project Capacity (SFP Loading)	Percent Site is of CDE Recommended for Master Plan Enrollment	Kindergarten Teaching Stations	1350 sq ft k ts?	Special Day Class Teaching Stations	Grades 1-6 Teaching Stations	Grades 7-8 Teaching Stations	Grades 9-12 TS	960 sq ft standard ts?	Multipurpose Room Sq. Ft.	Library Sq. Ft.	Food Service Sq. Ft.	Gymnasium Sq. Ft.	Platform /Stage Sq. Ft.	Square feet per student-- Capacity	
H	Corona- Norco	Eleanor Roosevelt High	9-12	367,500	3,985	3,985	0.71	0	N/A	6	0	0	145	Y	5,650	12,400	3,977	19,051	3,102	92	
H	Desert Sands	High School #4	9-12	245,967	2,610	2,286	0.75	0	N/A	2	0	0	84	Y	4,437	6,236	3,564	21,767	1,156	108	
H	Antelope Valley High	Knight High (1)	9-12	211,366	3,429	2,934	0.64	0	N/A	2	0	0	108	N	0	6,304	2,506	21,379	2,240	72	
H	Antelope Valley High	Eastside High (2)	9-12	343,000	3,175	3,175	0.86	0	N/A	6	0	0	115	Y	0	9,497	5,841	22,483	3,326	108	
H	Capistrano Unified	San Juan Hills High (3)	9-12	236,709	2,694	2,664	0.74	0	N/A	2	0	0	98	Y	0	3,309	3,555	25,710	43,130	89	
H	Tulare Joint Union HSD	Third Tulare HS (6)	9-12	157,031	2,070	1,458	1.18	0	N/A	0	0	0	54	N	4,898	7,251	2,371	18,971	812	108	
H	Porterville Unified	Arts/Technology Small High School (7)	9-12	51,695	500	499	0.73	0	N/A	1	0	0	18	Y	8,277	1,516	1,403	0	1,978	104	
H	Dixon Unified	Dixon High (8)	9-12	161,109	2,236	2,236	0.91	0	N/A	2	0	0	82	Y	5,045	9,032	2,836	29,580	1,767	72	
H	San Ramon Valley U	Dougherty Valley (10, 11)	9-12	306,478	2,720	2,504	0.71	0	N/A	6	0	0	93	N	9,406	8,362	5,846	43,726	2,473	122	
H	Mojave Unified	California City High	9-12	84,638	1,100	728	0.90	0	N/A	2	0	0	26		3,840	2,500	2,160	10,201	0	116	
H	Kern Union High	Frontier High	9-12	200,029	2,106	2,105	1.03	0	N/A	5	0	0	76	Y	9,741	5,358	1,488	14,280	0	95	
H	Los Angeles USD	Central High #2	9-12	345,388	2,403	2,403	0.23	0	N/A	0	0	0	89	Y	3,796	6,130	2,892	27,446	2,513	144	
H	Los Angeles USD	East Los Angeles HS #1	9-12	139,318	1,026	1,026	0.16	0	N/A	0	0	0	38	Y	3,943	3,125	2,266	12,800	986	136	
H	Folsom-Cordova USD	Vista del Lago HS (24)	9-12	233,127	1,808	1,538	0.82	0	N/A	2	0	0	56	Y	6,135	15,267	2,358	31,940	0	152	
H	Roseville Jt Union HS	High School #5-Antelope (22)	9-12	201,639	2,269	1,665	0.72	0	N/A	2	0	0	61	Y	6,036	6,137	2,505	32,706	1,952	121	
H	Elk Grove USD	Cosumnes Oaks (18)	9-12	230,554	2,867	2,785	0.80	0	N/A	3	0	0	102	N	7,575	14,614	3,271	30,796	0	83	
H	Sweetwater UHSD	High School #13	9-12	216,767	2,500	2,195	0.65	0	0	6	0	0	79	Y	7,742	5,544	4,480	13,298	1,500	99	
H	Washington Unified	New High	9-12	324,126	3,112	2,572	0.90	0	N/A	5	0	0	98	Y	6,784	9,428	8,762	74,062	0	126	
TOTAL				4,056,441	42,610	38,758									93,305	132,010	62,081	450,196			
Number of Projects				18																	
					Master Plan Capacity	Project Capacity															
					Mean Square Feet Per Student	95	105														
					Median Square Feet Per Student	93	108														
					Mean School Size	2,367	2,153														
					Median School Size	2,452	2,261														
					Median Percent Site Size	0.75															

Exhibit 3

Elementary, Middle, High	School District	School Name (see notes)	Grade Level	Square Feet	Master Plan Capacity	Project Capacity (SFP Loading)	Percent Site is of CDE Recommended for Master Plan Enrollment	Kindergarten Teaching Stations	1350 sq ft k ts?	Special Day Class Teaching Stations	Grades 1-6 Teaching Stations	Grades 7-8 Teaching Stations	Grades 9-12 TS	960 sq ft standard ts?	Multipurpose Room Sq. Ft.	Library Sq. Ft.	Food Service Sq. Ft.	Gymnasium Sq. Ft.	Platform /Stage Sq. Ft.	Square feet per student-- Capacity
E	Plum Valley Elem	Plum Valley	K-8	10,103	235	102	1.00	0	0	0	3	1	0	Y	2,911	960	431	0	0	99
E	Richfield Elem	Richfield Elem	K-8	28,743	500	329	0.99	1	Y	0	10	2	0	Y	1,777	960	845	6,764	0	87
E	Irvine Unified	Turtle Ridge	K-8	69,658	643	639	0.88	2	N	4	15	6	0	N	3,432	8,000	1,100	0	625	109
E	Chino Valley Unif	Site#1 at Preserve	K-8	85,823	973	973	0.63	3	N	2	23	11	0	N	0	6,700	3,000	7,720	1,000	88
E	San Marcos Unified	San Elijo Elementary	K-5	54,442	938	838	0.64	3	N	1	30	0	0	Y	3,000	2,700	1,000	0	900	65
E	Chula Vista	Otay Ranch (ES #43)	K-6	63,283	800	776	0.74	4	N	2	26	0	0	Y	4,694	1,913	945	4,218	476	82
E	Cottonwood Elem	Cottonwood Elem	K-6	43,800	1,040	688	1.00	0	N/A	1	27	0	0	N	3,774	1,380	646	0	525	64
E	Irvine Unified	El Camino Real	K-6	67,141	1,000	652	0.58	2	N	4	22	0	0	N	3,490	6,253	2,482	0	1,466	103
E	Carlsbad Unif	Southeast Elem	K-5	49,500	743	584	0.86	3	Y	1	20	0	0	Y	3,883	2,123	1,303	0	622	85
E	Clovis Unified	Harlan Ranch ES (4)	K-6	53,720	825	684	0.93	2	Y	1	25	0	0	N	4,067	2,154	2,010	0	716	79
E	Central Unified	New Elementary @ Ed Center (5)	K-6	56,000	860	851	1.21	3	N	2	30	0	0	Y	3,445	1,211	1,253	0	792	66
E	Visalia Unified	Leila Elementary	K-6	48,627	850	785	0.93	4	Y	3	26	0	0	Y	3,695	1,000	708	0	814	62
E	Visalia Unified	Southeast Elementary	K-6	48,627	750	785	0.78	4	Y	3	26	0	0	Y	3,695	1,000	708	0	814	62
E	Alameda City Unified	Woodstock ES (12)	K-5	49,290	704	704	0.48	4	Y	1	29	0	0	Y	4,067	1,000	2,324	0	1,152	70
E	Gilroy Unified	Greenfield ES	K-5	53,403	750	640	0.64	4	Y	0	30	0	0	Y	4,000	1,974	644	0	435	83
E	Arvin Union	El Camino ES	K-6	54,344	1,100	864	0.68	6	Y	3	27	0	0	Y	4,239	1,780	1,593	0	1,035	63
E	Wasco Union Elem	Theresa Burke (13)	K-6	50,167	1,099	900	0.97	4	N	0	32	0	0	Y	3,425	1,280	325	0	905	56
E	Los Angeles USD	Canoga Park New Elementary	K-5	75,224	600	600	0.18	3	Y	0	21	0	0	Y	7,521	0	1,301	0	903	125
E	Dry Creek Joint Elementary	Barrett Ranch Elementary	K-5	49,962	763	763	93.73	3	N	1	27	0	0	N	4,570	1,893	491	0	978	65
E	Oakley Union Elementary	Carpenter Elementary	K-5	40,720	575	575	101.0	3	Y	0	20	0	0	Y	5,007	0	1,388	0	1,025	71
E	San Diego Unified	Herbert Ibarra ES (16)	K-5	68,754	940	768	0.49	6	N	2	24	0	0	Y	4,980	2,533	784	0	984	90
E	San Diego Unified	Jonas Salk ES (17)	K-5	63,174	768	768	0.81	6	N	2	24	0	0	Y	4,879	2,715	1,242	0	1,000	82
E	Folsom-Cordova USD	Russell Ranch Elem.	K-5	42,468	763	529	0.78	2	Y	6	17	0	0	y	4,940	1,579	385	0	1,006	80
E	Roseville City Elementary SD	W-75 Junction Elementary	K-6	42,025	775	600	0.71	2	N	0	22	0	0	y	3,331	1,644	377	0	867	70
E	Perris ESD	Skyview ES (19)	K-6	44,000	850	825	0.61	2	Y	0	31	0	0	Y	4,073	3,370	1,068	0	725	53
E	Perris ESD	Railway ES (19)	K-6	47,840	900	900	0.96	3	Y / N	0	30	0	0	Y	4,073	3,370	1,068	0	725	53
E	Etiwanda ESD	Miller ES (20)	K-5	51,217	884	884	0.86	2	Y	1	33	0	0	Y	4,073	3,370	1,068	0	725	58

TOTAL
Number of Projects 27

	Master Plan Capacity	Project Capacity
Mean Square Feet Per Student	65	74
Median Square Feet Per Student	65	71
Mean School Size	801	704
Median School Size	800	763
Median Percent Site Size	0.81	

Exhibit 3

Elementary, Middle, High	School District	School Name (see notes)	Grade Level	Square Feet	Master Plan Capacity	Project Capacity (SFP Loading)	Percent Site is of CDE Recommended for Master Plan Enrollment	Kindergarten Teaching Stations	1350 sq ft k ts?	Special Day Class Teaching Stations	Grades 1-6 Teaching Stations	Grades 7-8 Teaching Stations	Grades 9-12 TS	960 sq ft standard ts?	Multipurpose Room Sq. Ft.	Library Sq. Ft.	Food Service Sq. Ft.	Gymnasium Sq. Ft.	Platform /Stage Sq. Ft.	Square feet per student-- Capacity
--------------------------	-----------------	-------------------------	-------------	-------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	---	--------------------------------	------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------	------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------	----------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------

NOTES

- (1) small gym 8,432 large gym 12,947
- (2) small gym 8,397 large gym 14,086
- (3) small gym 8,590 large gym 17,120
- (4) general TS are 940 sq ft
- (5) kindergarten rooms average 1,048 sq. ft.
- (6) TS vary in size between 899 sq ft - 991 for general classrooms, most are under 960 sq ft.
- (7) Arts/Tech High School, part of the small high school project, cafeteria serves as a gym during inclement weather. Uses gym at adjacent Swarthmore HS
- (8) 7 TS undersized, joint use gym
- (9) 4 TS undersized due to HVAC
- (10) 949 sq. ft.
- (11) gymnasium and auxiliary gym
- (12) TS plus workroom = 960
- (13) Theresa Burke ES "wanted 500-550 but built for 850", K rooms 1280, smaller library and M, financial hardship projects are typically twice as large as 50/50
- (14) 957 sq. ft.
- (15) 1235 sq. ft.
- (16) 1134 sq. ft.
- (17) 1135 sq. ft.
- (18) library shared with adjacent high school, Libray square footage reflced in HS
- (19) Skyview ES and Railway ES essentially the same set of plans with the position of buildings changed
- (20) Miller ES utilizes same core facilities as Skyview and Railway with different TS layout
- (21) final plan approval letter issued on 12/18/2000
- (22) Joint use gym
- (23) Joint Use MP
- (24) Joint use gym

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE
State Allocation Board Meeting June 27, 2007

DEFERRED MAINTENANCE PROGRAM DEPOSITS

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

To present those school districts which have submitted a revised certification of deposit for the 2005/2006 Basic Deferred Maintenance (DM) Grant Apportionment.

DESCRIPTION

As a condition of receiving the 2005/2006 Basic Apportionment approved at the December 2006 State Allocation Board meeting, districts are required to match these funds with a deposit into their Deferred Maintenance Fund and have their County Office of Education (COE) certify the deposit. Current law requires the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) to adjust any unmatched apportionments to the actual amount of funds deposited. An item was presented at the March 2007 State Allocation Board meeting reducing those district apportionments.

Subsequently, the OPSC has received revised certifications of deposit matching the Basic Grant apportionments. The Attachment represents the districts whose apportionment should be restored based on the revised certification of deposit.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Accept the revised certifications of deposit from the COE.
2. Restore the Basic Grant Apportionments (961-400) as indicated on the Attachment.

This Item was approved by the State Allocation Board on June 27, 2007.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER
State Allocation Board Meeting, June 27, 2007

DEFERRED MAINTENANCE PROGRAM
MAXIMUM DEPOSIT

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To report those school districts which have now deposited the maximum funds into their Deferred Maintenance Fund.

DESCRIPTION

As a condition of receiving the 2005/2006 basic apportionment approved at the December 2006 State Allocation Board meeting, districts are required to match these funds with a deposit into their Deferred Maintenance Fund and have their County Office of Education certify the deposit. Current law requires those districts to report to the legislature whenever they do not make their maximum deposit.

The districts listed on the Attachment have submitted revised certifications of deposit and now meet the requirements of Education Code Section 17584.1(b).

RECOMMENDATION

Accept this report.

This Item was approved by the State Allocation Board on June 27, 2007.

ATTACHMENT

DEFERRED MAINTENANCE PROGRAM 2005/2006 FISCAL YEAR
 Maximum Amount Deposited Pursuant to Education Code Section 1859.1(b)
 State Allocation Board Meeting, June 27, 2007

40/CDS #	County	School District	Maximum	Original Deposit	Revised Deposit
10082	Del Norte	Del Norte County Office of Education	\$ 52,290	\$ 51,181	\$ 52,290
61820	Del Norte	*Del Norte County Unified	152,622	149,387	152,623
62554	Glenn	Capay Joint Union Elementary	5,217	4,900	5,217
10116	Glenn	Glenn County Office of Education	88,585	78,622	88,585
62570	Glenn	Hamilton Union Elementary	18,292	18,032	18,292
62596	Glenn	Lake Elementary	5,528	4,978	5,528
75481	Glenn	Orland Joint Unified	90,847	87,431	90,847
62638	Glenn	Plaza Elementary	5,777	5,331	5,777
62646	Glenn	Princeton Joint Unified	10,579	10,404	10,579
62653	Glenn	Stony Creek Joint Unified	7,722	7,405	7,722
64659	Los Angeles	La Canada	174,113	154,315	174,113
66951	Placer	Western Placer Unified	171,696	94,438	171,696
69112	Santa Barbara	Blochman Union Elementary	8,928	8,922	8,928
69146	Santa Barbara	Carpinteria Unified	114,677	112,537	114,677
69153	Santa Barbara	Casmalia Elementary	3,249	3,180	3,249
75010	Santa Barbara	*Cuyama Joint Unified	17,979	17,597	17,979
69203	Santa Barbara	*Guadalupe Union Elementary	48,020	47,001	48,020
69211	Santa Barbara	Hope Elementary	57,299	56,084	57,299
69229	Santa Barbara	*Lompoc Unified	453,237	443,628	453,237
69260	Santa Barbara	Orcutt Union Elementary	199,143	194,921	199,143
10421	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara County Office of Education	324,488	317,608	324,488
69328	Santa Barbara	Santa Ynez Valley Union High	45,016	44,061	45,016
69344	Santa Barbara	Vista Del Mar Union Elementary	9,279	9,082	9,279
70565	Solano	Travis Unified	211,609	207,122	211,609
10504	Stanislaus	Stanislaus County Office of Education	475,760	426,285	475,760
75028	Trinity	Mountain Valley Unified	24,831	24,501	24,831
			<u>\$ 2,776,783</u>	<u>\$ 2,578,953</u>	<u>\$ 2,776,784</u>

Grand Total

* District is now eligible to receive Emergency Repair Program funding, pursuant to Regulation Section 1859.328.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER
State Allocation Board Meeting, June 27, 2007

FACILITY INSPECTION TOOL

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To request adoption of the Facility Inspection Tool (FIT) to serve as the permanent evaluation instrument to ensure school facilities are in good repair.

BACKGROUND

Senate Bill 550 (Chapter 900, Statutes of 2004 - Vasconcellos) established the good repair standard in response to the settlement agreement in the case of *Williams vs. California*. A school facility in good repair was defined as "maintained in a manner that assures that it is clean, safe, and functional as determined pursuant to an interim evaluation instrument developed by the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC)." The Interim Evaluation Instrument (IEI) was adopted by the State Allocation Board (SAB) in January 2005, and has been used by school districts and county offices of education (COEs) in assessing school facilities with respect to cleanliness, safety and functionality.

Subsequently, pursuant to Education Code (EC) Section 17002 and with assistance of a stakeholder workgroup, the OPSC drafted the Good Repair Report which made recommendations to the Governor and Legislature regarding options for a permanent State standard to replace the IEI. These recommendations became the foundation for the statutory definition of good repair identified in Assembly Bill (AB) 607 (Chapter 704, Statutes of 2006 – Goldberg). AB 607 provided the statutory definition of good repair and required the OPSC to develop a permanent evaluation instrument for school facilities to incorporate a component ranking and facility scoring. The new instrument will replace the IEI to be used by school districts and county offices of education in ensuring that all California school children have access to clean, safe and functional school facilities.

AUTHORITY

EC Section 17002(d), amended as a result of AB 607, directs the OPSC on or before July 1, 2007 to develop a permanent school facility inspection and evaluation instrument that evaluates facility components on a scale of "good," "fair," or "poor," and provides an overall summary of the conditions at each school on a scale of "exemplary," "good," "fair," or "poor."

STAFF COMMENTS

To assist in the development of the FIT and maximize the opportunity for user input on the rating and scoring system, the OPSC formed a workgroup of experts and practitioners from COEs and school districts across the State as well as public school health advocates.

First, the workgroup developed a list of the characteristics necessary for a user-friendly and functional facility inspection tool. Among these desired characteristics are the following: a tool that is easily understood and easy to use at on-site inspections; a rating system that is simple to calculate and easy to understand and interpret; and a format that allows for maximum flexibility, comments and feedback.

Next, the workgroup evaluated the good repair criteria outlined in law and contained in the IEI. The group noted that, although all of the criteria define clean, safe and functional school facilities, some of the facility conditions are more critical to the health and safety of pupils and staff. If left unmitigated, they could cause severe and immediate injury, illness, or death of the occupants. The group identified such facility conditions based on the items specifically identified in EC Section 17592.72(c) for purposes of Emergency Repair Program funding. When incorporated into the FIT, these items constitute "extreme deficiencies" and indicate that the particular category (system/component) fails in meeting the standard of good repair at the school site being evaluated.

STAFF COMMENTS (cont.)

To evaluate the relevancy of the ranking and scoring system, the draft evaluation tool was tested in the field. Field testing produced understandable and reasonable results at various school sites, providing a meaningful measure of good repair for individual school sites. Testers affirmed many of the workgroups objectives, including the importance for ease of use and the option to give specific details and comments. In response to testing and testers' comments, the tool was further modified and adapted to users' needs. Upon completion of the workgroup's discussions, the OPSC presented the draft FIT to the Implementation Committee, where it was thoroughly discussed and overwhelmingly supported.

The result of the workgroup's efforts is a balanced facilities inspection tool that appropriately assesses the conditions of schools while being mindful of users' needs and skill levels. The tool provides a means to identify needed repairs by specific area on the site and system type, and allows for school districts to easily transfer the information to the School Accountability Report Card. Although the rating and scoring is limited to the grading specified in law, percentage ranking allows for additional grading within the definitions of exemplary, good, fair, and poor, and the overall facility score can serve as a meaningful measure for improvement of facility conditions. If considered necessary, supplementing the FIT with additional good repair criteria could be undertaken at the local school district or COE level.

RECOMMENDATION

Adopt the attached FIT as a replacement for the IEI.

This Item was approved by the State Allocation Board on June 27, 2007.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Office of Public School Construction would like to acknowledge and extend appreciation to the following members of the workgroup for their assistance in the development of a permanent standard of good repair:

Mr. Brooks Allen

Attorney
American Civil Liberties Union

Mr. Chris Cox

Program Manager
Maintenance, Operations, and Transportation
San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools

Mr. Bryan Ehm

Facilities Planning Coordinator
San Diego County Office of Education

Ms. Vinceena Kelly, AIA

Regionalized Business Services Coordinator
Division of Business Advisory Services
Los Angeles County Office of Education

Ms. Deborah Moore

Executive Director
Green Schools Initiative

Mr. Carlos Rivera

Education Research and Evaluation Consultant
Policy & Evaluation Division
California Department of Education

Mr. Bill Savidge

Vice-Chair
Coalition for Adequate School Housing
Engineering Officer
West Contra Costa Unified School District

Ms. Mamie Starr

Director, Operations/Support Services
San Joaquin County Office of Education

Ms. Toni Stein, Ph.D.

Air Pollution Research Specialist
State of California Department of Health Services

Mr. Fred Yeager

Assistant Director
School Facilities Planning Division
California Department of Education

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER
State Allocation Board Meeting, June 27, 2007

LABOR COMPLIANCE PROGRAM GRANTS

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To present for the Board's consideration regulations to allow Labor Compliance Program (LCP) grant funding for districts that voluntarily initiate and enforce a LCP and to adjust the LCP grant.

BACKGROUND

Labor Code Section 1771.7 requires school districts that choose to use funds derived from either the Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2002 or 2004 (Propositions 47 and 55, respectively) to initiate and enforce a LCP. However, school districts with projects apportioned from the Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2006 (Proposition 1D) are not required to comply with this law. As a result, at the February 2007 State Allocation Board (SAB) meeting, the Board requested Staff to research if a district voluntarily implements a LCP on a project for which such a program is no longer mandated by statute, if it is permissible for the SAB to continue to provide the grant for the purpose of reimbursing the district for the costs of voluntarily initiating and enforcing a LCP.

At the March 2007 SAB meeting, Staff reported that SAB Legal Counsel opined that while the Labor Code Section 1771.7(a) requires school districts to initiate and enforce a LCP on those projects funded under Propositions 47 and 55 and not Proposition 1D, subsection (e) of the aforementioned statute was sufficiently broad enough that it can be read to authorize the SAB to continue to provide the LCP grant for those districts that voluntarily initiate and enforce a LCP. SAB Legal Counsel cited the legislative intent of Labor Code 1771.7 was to ensure that every school district in the State pay the prevailing rate of per diem wages to workers employed on public works projects undertaken by districts. As a result, the Legislature provided the Board with the ability to increase the State's share of increased costs to accommodate labor compliance programs. Since labor compliance programs may continue to be voluntarily implemented by school districts, the Board is simply furthering the legislative intent of Labor Code 1771.7 by providing the grant augmentation to help ensure the prevailing wage rates are paid on public works projects.

In addition, Staff provided the Board an update to the March 2006 report regarding the adequacy of LCP apportionments based on 245 project audits. The report contained the following information:

- Through January 2007, the SAB has provided LCP grants for 3,342 projects.
- The 245 project audits represent 7.3 percent of all projects that have received LCP grants and 100 percent of those projects closed out to date.
- New Construction LCP apportionments have been under spent by an average of 40.9 percent.
- Modernization LCP apportionments have been under spent by 63.7 percent.

As a result of the discussion on these two issues, the Board requested Staff to return at a future meeting with regulations to provide the LCP grant augmentation for those districts that voluntarily initiate and enforce a LCP for projects apportioned from Proposition 1D and to adjust the LCP grant. However, due to recently raised legal concerns regarding the SAB's authority to provide LCP grants on a voluntary basis, Staff have provided alternatives that could bifurcate this issue and allow the SAB to move forward with both issues or just the grant adjustment portion of this item.

(Continued on Page Two)

AUTHORITY

Labor Code 1771.7 states in part that the SAB shall increase per-pupil grant amounts to accommodate the State's share of the costs of initiating and enforcing a LCP. The law provides that a School Facility Program (SFP) project is eligible for an increase in the per-pupil grant amount if both of the following conditions are met:

- The project was or will be funded from the proceeds of Propositions 47 or 55.
- The Notice to Proceed for the initial contract for construction of the project was issued on or after April 1, 2003.

Labor Code 1771.7 also provides an exception to the full and final apportionment provisions in the law to accommodate LCP costs on projects that have already received their full apportionment amount without the LCP funding but were eligible for the funding. Additionally, this statute gives the SAB the authority to provide grant augmentations to ensure prevailing wage rates are paid on public works projects.

STAFF COMMENTS

Providing the LCP Grant on a Voluntary Basis

At the May 4, 2007 Implementation Committee meeting, based on the Board's request, Staff proposed allowing those projects apportioned with funds from other than Propositions 47 and 55 to be eligible for LCP funds provided the district voluntarily initiates and enforces a LCP. A member of the audience involved in the Proposition 1D bond discussions questioned the recommendation and the SAB Legal Counsel's February 2007 opinion stating that the SAB Legal Counsel's basis for opining that the SAB can provide the LCP grant on a voluntary basis is hinged on the legislative intent of Assembly Bill 1506 which added Labor Code 1771.7. However, it was this audience member's belief that the legislative intent of Proposition 1D was more recent and therefore more germane to the issue as the Legislature chose not to require the initiation and enforcement of a LCP for projects apportioned with these bond funds. The same member of the audience also called attention to the fact that existing law provides a SFP project is eligible for an increase in the per-pupil grant if "both" of the conditions noted above are met. Projects funded out of Proposition 1D do not meet the first condition and, thus, are not eligible.

Staff consulted with the SAB's Legal Counsel regarding the audience member's concerns. The SAB Legal Counsel opined that Labor Code 1771.7 is not absolute and that while Labor Code 1771.7 requires that districts with projects apportioned from Propositions 47 and 55 initiate and enforce a LCP for which the Board will provide a grant augmentation, the intent of the legislation was to ensure prevailing wage rates are enforced on public work projects constructed by school districts. While it is true the Legislature did not require the initiation and enforcement of a LCP in Proposition 1D, it did not prohibit it. If a district's project is funded exclusively with Proposition 1D bond funds, the Board does have the discretion to make a policy decision to allow the continual funding of a LCP on a voluntary basis; however, the SAB Legal Counsel did caution that such a decision may be vulnerable to a legal challenge. The SAB Legal Counsel further opined that those districts that have projects funded in part with Proposition 47 and/or 55 bond funds will be required to initiate and enforce a LCP.

Should the Board request Staff to provide LCP funding on a voluntary basis, Staff recommends that provisions be made for impacted districts to access this additional funding effective upon the approval of the regulations by the Office of Administrative Law. Since Labor Code 1771.7(e) provides an exemption to the full and final provisions of Education Code 17070.63, Staff intends, if this provision is approved by the SAB, to automatically include the appropriate LCP funding for projects that indicated LCP compliance for those applications previously funded with Proposition 1D funds. Staff would also notify all other districts individually of the opportunity to include a request for LCP grants where a request was not made on the funding application, but where that district voluntarily initiated and enforced an LCP.

(Continued on Page Three)

STAFF COMMENTS (cont.)

LCP Grant Amounts

At the same Implementation Committee meeting, Staff introduced a proposed reduction to the new construction and modernization LCP grant. For new construction projects, the proposed reduction is limited to those districts with projects with a total project cost, less site acquisition costs, of one million dollars or less as Staff believes there is sufficient data to justify the reduction. Under current regulations, a district receives a LCP apportionment of \$16,000 for any project where the cost is one million dollars or less, less site acquisition costs. So a district with a project that will cost one million dollars and a district with a project that will cost \$50,000 will both receive a \$16,000 LCP grant. Under the proposed regulations, districts with projects in this cost range will receive a LCP apportionment of 0.65 percent of the total project cost, less site acquisition costs. Staff recommends this change based on data which indicates districts are expending only 16.10 percent of the LCP funds for projects totaling one million dollars or less. If a project exceeds one million dollars, no changes are being recommended as there is insufficient data to provide a defensible adjustment to the existing LCP grant.

For modernization projects, Staff is proposing a 25 percent reduction in the LCP grant for all projects regardless of the total project costs. While the data supports an even further reduction in the LCP apportionment for most of the projects audited, Staff believes a 25 percent reduction is conservative and reasonable at this time until more data can be gathered over the forthcoming year.

Members of the Committee and audience expressed concern with Staff's recommendations. Many cited that the data pool was too small to justify any adjustment to the LCP grant. While the data used for this analysis represented 7.3 percent of all projects apportioned with LCP funds, the 245 projects represented 100 percent of all projects audited. Some audience members also cited that it is common for districts to not report or under-report LCP expenditures explaining that with larger projects it was difficult for the district to identify LCP costs, especially if force account labor was used. Others cited that multiple projects are often bid together as a means of economies of scale, therefore making it difficult to extract accurate LCP costs as the common practice was to take the LCP costs and divide them equally amongst the contracted projects. While this method may be convenient for reporting purposes, it does not represent the actual LCP costs for each of the projects reported. Some members of the Committee and audience contended that since 73 (12 new construction and 61 modernization) of the 245 projects had no LCP costs reported by the districts, the adjustments to the LCP grants could not be justified. While Staff does not concur with that rationale, Staff eliminated those 73 projects when developing their conservative grant reduction recommendations to the Board. The results of the review of the remaining 172 projects (39 new construction and 133 modernization) are as follows:

- New Construction LCP apportionments have been under spent by an average of 30.3 percent.
- Modernization LCP apportionments have been under spent by 46.8 percent.

The average under spent amounts compared to the LCP grants provided is visually displayed on the attached Exhibits 1 and 2. These exhibits also illustrate that the proposed grant reduction will still provide grants in excess of the average LCP expenditures.

There was limited LCP cost data available during the initial implementation of the program in July 2003. Staff, with the assistance of the Implementation Committee, therefore provided a grant augmentation that was based on the best available cost data at the time. In turn, it was agreed that the amount of the per pupil grant for LCP would be revisited based on actual costs incurred by districts. The districts were subsequently asked to account for all LCP funds expended for each project apportioned. If a district combined several projects for the purposes of economies of scale or used force account labor, the district was responsible for tracking and reporting complete LCP expenditures appropriately for audit purposes. In fact, pursuant to SFP Regulation Section 1859.106, Program Accountability Expenditure Audit, districts are required to maintain a record of the complete LCP costs incurred:

(Continued on Page Four)

STAFF COMMENTS (cont.)

LCP Grant Amounts (cont.)

"Districts shall be required to maintain all appropriate records that support all district certifications and expenditures for all costs associated with SFP, Charter School, and Joint-Use projects for a period of not less than four years from the date the notice of completion is filed for the project in order to allow other agencies, including, without limitation, the Bureau of State Audits and the State Controller to perform their audit responsibilities."

Furthermore, in the SFP Expenditure Audit Guidebook, districts are instructed to:

"...provide a detailed listing of project expenditures that reflect all expenditures for the project by warrant numbers, warrant dates, warrant payees, warrant amounts, and specific descriptions of the expenditures, as required on the Form SAB 50-06. The description of expenditures must provide sufficient detail for the audit staff to verify all project expenditures are applicable to the project and that the expenditures have been recorded in the proper cost categories. In addition, the district must report the eligible expenditures for the project that encompass the State and district matching share. Also, if the district augmented the project beyond the State and district share, please include these costs on the same report, but identify them as being solely district funded."

Thus, even if the LCP grants are not adjusted today based on the assertions of the stakeholders and more data is collected over the course of the next year, it is likely Staff will continue to receive incorrect LCP cost expenditure data from the districts resulting in the same conundrum. Consequently based on the expenditure data reported in the 245 projects audited thus far, it appears the SFP is over funding the LCP grant; therefore, Staff recommends a reduction in the State's share of the LCP grant for new construction and modernization projects. In an effort to ensure the LCP grant augmentation remains sufficient to cover the costs of initiating and enforcing a LCP, Staff will conduct another analysis in one year to ensure the adequacy of the LCP grant.

Additional non-substantive SFP Regulation changes included in this item:

The *Application for Funding* (Form SAB 50-04) includes the addition of a certification that the district will comply with all laws pertaining to the construction of its facilities. This certification was inadvertently omitted in a prior regulatory revision.

The *Fund Release Authorization* (Form SAB 50-05) is being revised to require districts to provide:

- a copy of voter approved bond language when a district's joint-use partners' financial contribution is provided through local bond proceeds.
- a certification that the district's joint-use partner's financial contribution has been provided by a local bond specifically for the joint-use purpose, if applicable.
- the earliest issue date of the Notice to Proceed and well as the date the contract was signed for New Construction, Modernization and Joint-Use projects.

The *Application for Joint Use Funding* (Form SAB 50-07) corrects the Department of Labor Relations to Department of Industrial Relations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Direct Staff to proceed with either Alternative 1 or Alternative 2, as described below.

Alternative 1 (Voluntary LCP and LCP Grant Adjustment):

1. Adopt the proposed amendments to the regulations as shown on Attachment A and request Staff to begin the regulatory process to reduce the LCP grant for both new construction and modernization projects and to provide the LCP grant to districts that voluntarily initiate and enforce a LCP.
2. Request Staff return in one year to provide an update on the adequacy of the LCP grants.

Alternative 2 (LCP Grant Adjustment):

1. Adopt the proposed amendments to the regulations as shown on Attachment B and request Staff to begin the regulatory process to reduce the LCP grant for both new construction and modernization projects.
2. Request Staff return in one year to provide an update on the adequacy of the LCP grants.

BOARD ACTION

In view of the two opposing legal opinions concerning the Board's ability to provide grants for districts that voluntarily participate in a labor compliance program (LCP), the Board requested the SAB Legal Counsel obtain an informal legal opinion from the Attorney General's office. Alternative Two of this item, the proposed regulatory amendments to reduce the LCP grants, was held over to the July SAB meeting.

ATTACHMENT A

Article 8. New Construction and Modernization Grant Determinations

Section 1859.71.4. New Construction Pupil Grant Increase for Labor Compliance Program.

- (a) After determining all other funding authorized by these Regulations, the Board shall increase the per-unhoused-pupil grant amount by 50 percent of the following calculation for any project for which the district is required under Labor Code Section 1771.7(a) and (b) to initiate and enforce a LCP and for any project for which the district voluntarily initiates and enforces a LCP:
 - (1) Using the chart in (b) of this Section, determine the total amount of funding to be provided for the increased costs of a new construction project due to the initiation and enforcement of a LCP.
 - (2) Divide the amount determined in subsection (a)(1) by the total number of pupils, or by one if no pupils are assigned, in the approved application.
- (b) The funding provided for a new construction project to initiate and enforce a LCP shall be calculated on the total project cost, exclusive of site acquisition costs, as follows:

<u>\$16,000</u>	<u>0.65 percent of</u>	<u>For the first costs for projects less than \$1 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
	<u>or</u>	<u>\$16,000 for the first \$1 million for projects equal to or more than \$1 million, plus</u>
<u>1.6 percent</u>		<u>Of the next \$1 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.25 percent</u>		<u>Of the next \$1 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.15 percent</u>		<u>Of the next \$1 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.32 percent</u>		<u>Of the next \$2 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.31 percent</u>		<u>Of the next \$2 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.46 percent</u>		<u>Of the next \$5 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.44 percent</u>		<u>Of the next \$5 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.42 percent</u>		<u>Of the next \$30 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.4 percent</u>		<u>Of any remaining portion</u>

Note: Authority cited: Section 17070.35, Education Code.

Reference: Section 17072.10, Education Code.

...

Section 1859.78.1. Modernization Pupil Grant Increase for Labor Compliance Program.

- (a) After determining all other funding authorized by these Regulations, the Board shall increase the per-pupil grant amount by the following calculation, less the district matching share required in Section 1859.79, for any project for which the district is required under Labor Code Section 1771.7(a) and (b) to initiate and enforce a LCP and for any project for which the district voluntarily initiates and enforces a LCP:
 - (1) Using the chart in (b) of this Section 1859.71.4(b), determine the total amount of funding to be provided for the increased costs of a modernization project due to the initiation and enforcement of a LCP.
 - (2) Divide the amount determined in subsection (a)(1) by the total number of pupils, or by one if no pupils are assigned, in the approved application.
- (b) The funding provided for a modernization project to initiate and enforce a LCP shall be calculated on the total project cost as follows:

<u>\$12,000</u>	<u>For the first \$1 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>1.2 percent</u>	<u>Of the next \$1 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.18 percent</u>	<u>Of the next \$1 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.11 percent</u>	<u>Of the next \$1 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.24 percent</u>	<u>Of the next \$2 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.23 percent</u>	<u>Of the next \$2 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.35 percent</u>	<u>Of the next \$5 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.33 percent</u>	<u>Of the next \$5 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.32 percent</u>	<u>Of the next \$30 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.3 percent</u>	<u>Of any remaining portion</u>

Note: Authority cited: Section 17070.35, Education Code.

Reference: Section 17074.10, Education Code

ATTACHMENT B

Article 8. New Construction and Modernization Grant Determinations

Section 1859.71.4. New Construction Pupil Grant Increase for Labor Compliance Program.

- (a) After determining all other funding authorized by these Regulations, the Board shall increase the per-unhoused-pupil grant amount by 50 percent of the following calculation for any project for which the district is required under Labor Code Section 1771.7(a) and (b) to initiate and enforce a LCP:
 - (1) Using the chart in (b) of this Section, determine the total amount of funding to be provided for the increased costs of a new construction project due to the initiation and enforcement of a LCP.
 - (2) Divide the amount determined in subsection (a)(1) by the total number of pupils, or by one if no pupils are assigned, in the approved application.
- (b) The funding provided for a new construction project to initiate and enforce a LCP shall be calculated on the total project cost, exclusive of site acquisition costs, as follows:

\$16,000 <u>0.65 percent of For the first costs for projects less than \$1 million or any part thereof, plus</u>	<u>or</u>
\$16,000 for the first \$1 million for projects equal to or more than \$1 million, plus	
<u>1.6 percent</u>	<u>Of the next \$1 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.25 percent</u>	<u>Of the next \$1 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.15 percent</u>	<u>Of the next \$1 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.32 percent</u>	<u>Of the next \$2 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.31 percent</u>	<u>Of the next \$2 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.46 percent</u>	<u>Of the next \$5 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.44 percent</u>	<u>Of the next \$5 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.42 percent</u>	<u>Of the next \$30 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.4 percent</u>	<u>Of any remaining portion</u>

Note: Authority cited: Section 17070.35, Education Code.

Reference: Section 17072.10, Education Code.

...

Section 1859.78.1. Modernization Pupil Grant Increase for Labor Compliance Program.

- (a) After determining all other funding authorized by these Regulations, the Board shall increase the per-pupil grant amount by the following calculation, less the district matching share required in Section 1859.79, for any project for which the district is required under Labor Code Section 1771.7(a) and (b) to initiate and enforce a LCP:
 - (1) Using the chart in (b) of this Section 1859.71.4(b), determine the total amount of funding to be provided for the increased costs of a modernization project due to the initiation and enforcement of a LCP.
 - (2) Divide the amount determined in subsection (a)(1) by the total number of pupils, or by one if no pupils are assigned, in the approved application.
- (b) The funding provided for a modernization project to initiate and enforce a LCP shall be calculated on the total project cost as follows:

<u>\$12,000</u>	<u>For the first \$1 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>1.2 percent</u>	<u>Of the next \$1 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.18 percent</u>	<u>Of the next \$1 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.11 percent</u>	<u>Of the next \$1 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.24 percent</u>	<u>Of the next \$2 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.23 percent</u>	<u>Of the next \$2 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.35 percent</u>	<u>Of the next \$5 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.33 percent</u>	<u>Of the next \$5 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.32 percent</u>	<u>Of the next \$30 million or any part thereof, plus</u>
<u>0.3 percent</u>	<u>Of any remaining portion</u>

Note: Authority cited: Section 17070.35, Education Code.

Reference: Section 17074.10, Education Code