

From: **Hill (Superintendent), Andrew** <ahill@wadsworthschools.org>
Date: Tue, Jan 22, 2019 at 11:21 AM
Subject: CIS Committee Update

Good morning. You are receiving this update because you are a member of the CIS Committee or you have expressed an interest in receiving updates on the work of the CIS Committee. The purpose of this update is to keep you current on our ongoing dialogue with the Ohio Facilities Construction Commission (OFCC).

Since my last communication with you, we were invited to a meeting in Columbus on December 18. The stated purpose of the meeting was to come to a resolution on what our current student enrollment number is, as the OFCC officials had questions on the numbers we provided to Tracy Healy for the Future Think Study. Doug Beeman, Linda McCann (our EMIS Coordinator who is responsible for reporting student data) and I attended the meeting. Bill Prenosil, Melanie Drerup and Megan Burke attended on behalf of the OFCC and Tracy Healy attended at the request of Bill Prenosil.

Ms. Healy opened the meeting by sharing with us that in reviewing the 2009 enrollment projection study she previously completed for our district (the DeJong Healy study), she believed we misreported our high school enrollment by 397 students, which is why her ten (10) year projection in 2009 is over 1000 students more than what we actually have in our district today. Bill Prenosil then shared that this misreporting may have led to more buildings being built for us than were needed at the time. He also explained that until a few years ago, the OFCC did not verify enrollment data submitted by school districts, they just used the numbers provided by the district as the basis to fund buildings.

In addition to this, Mr. Prenosil shared a new building space calculation sheet ("Test Plan," see attachment), using the OFCC design manual specifications. According to Mr. Prenosil, the new building space calculations show that we have two (2) schools that we do not need when we simply follow the OFCC square footage calculations for students.

We told them we would immediately look into the allegation we misreported our enrollment numbers in 2009 and that we would review Mr. Prenosil's new space numbers and follow up with questions.

Once we returned to Wadsworth, it did not take long to find out that we did not misreport our enrollment numbers. That led to the following email exchange with all parties:

On Tue, Dec 18, 2018 at 1:26 PM Hill (Superintendent), Andrew
<ahill@wadsworthschools.org> wrote:

Ms. Healy,

Thank you for taking time to meet with us today. After we returned to Wadsworth, we were able to review the following documents:

- (1) 2008-2009 Enrollment Count (internal document);*
- (2) 2009-2010 Enrollment Count (internal document);*
- (3) The 2009 Enrollment Projection Study Completed by DeJong Healy;*

- (4) The 2018 Enrollment Projection Study Completed by Future Think;
- (5) & (6) Official ADM Counts for our School District, as Reported by ODE for FY 09 and FY 10 (these can be accessed at by clicking [here](#));
- (7) The Excel Sheet We Filled out for the 2018 Enrollment Projection Study; and
- (8) The Questionnaire We Filled out for the 2009 Enrollment Projection Study.

To help us gain a better understanding of the 2008-2009 high school enrollment number issue presented to us this morning, we have the following questions:

(1) I wrote this morning at our meeting that we reported 1753 students in high school for the 2008-2009 school year and that 316 of these students were involved in career tech. Is this accurate? If so, we think we have figured out the total calculation of high school students, but we want to verify the calculation method is correct (see below).

The numbers on the questionnaire we submitted under K-12 Enrollment, completed on January 8, 2009, show the following: 9th grade: 400, 10th grade: 358, 11th grade: 453 and 12th grade: 433 for a total of 1644.

The numbers on our internal enrollment count, completed the week of October 10, 2008, show the following: 9th grade: 401, 10th grade: 357, 11th grade: 451 and 12th grade: 432 for a total of 1641.

The ADM reported by ODE for FY09 show the following: 9th grade: 400, 10th grade: 359, 11th grade: 453, 12th grade: 433 for a total of 1645.

The numbers in the 2009 Enrollment Projection Report, as taken from page 27, show the following: 9-12 enrollment totals 1437. When the career tech categories directly below the total on the same chart are added in, the number is 1753.

(2) I wrote this morning at our meeting that our 2009-2010 high school enrollment number was reported as 1356. Our recollection of where this number came from is not clear. Was this number self reported or from ODE? Either way, we are having a hard time coming up with this number, when we use the same logic as presented above for 2008-2009. The logic is as follows:

The numbers on our internal enrollment count, completed the week of October 9, 2009, show the following: 9th grade: 375, 10th grade: 408, 11th grade: 407 and 12th grade: 463 for a total of 1653.

The ADM reported by ODE for FY10 show the following: 9th grade: 376, 10th grade: 407, 11th grade: 404 and 12th grade: 446 for a total of 1643.

The numbers in the 2018 Enrollment Projection Report, as found on page 13, show the following: 9th grade: 377, 10th grade: 407, 11th grade: 329 and 12th grade: 350 for a total of 1463. When the career tech categories are added in from the chart, as described above to reach your 2008-2009 number of 1753, the total count for 2009-2010 is 1733.

The numbers on the spreadsheet we provided you for the 2018 Enrollment Projection Study show the following: 9th grade: 377, 10th grade: 407, 11th grade: 404 and 12th grade: 446 for a total of 1634.

If the number you shared is 1356, can you describe where the number came from and what is included/excluded in it?

We are trying to wrap our heads around the 397 (1753-1356) student discrepancy shared with us this morning and all of the numbers we can find do not add up. It would appear that the difference may actually be 20 (1753-1733) students from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010 based upon the 2009 and 2018 Enrollment Projection Reports, but, there must be something we are missing? Thank you for your assistance and we look forward to your response.

Andy Hill

On Tue, Dec 18, 2018 at 3:35 PM Tracy Healy <thealy@futurethinkinc.com> wrote:

Hi All,

It was a pleasure meeting this morning. Here comes a big apology from me. There was an error in the 1,356 number I referenced this morning. See response to question 2.

1. Yes, that is accurate. There is a total of 1,753 students in grades 9-12 submitted by the District in January 2009.

2. The numbers for 2009-10 came from the ODE HeadCount. I just realized there was an error in the formula for the second table on page 13 of the October 10, 2018 Report for grades 9-12. I am so sorry for the confusion! And for you spinning your wheels trying to reconcile the numbers.

Years 2009-10 through 2013-14 do not include 9th grade, a big problem when I used that table to compare against the 2008-09 submitted by the District in January 2009. I've attached a comparison table which looks at grades 9-12 and CT students. The difference is only 20 students, which shoots down the theory that the high school numbers were reported incorrectly in 2009. And much more in line with the ADM and your internal enrollment counts.

I've put together a table which illustrates the numbers. Everything you came up with is correct. See attached.

3. Now, what does this all mean moving forward?

The projections still hold true as we've determined the numbers you provided in the spreadsheet are correct. The reason for the difference between the 2009 projection and 2018 projection is that the District enrollment declined over the last 10 years when it was projected to increase. As I mentioned this morning, the District had increased by 857 students from 1999-00 to 2008-09. Based on this increase and the housing development underway, the March 2009 Report showed a projected increase of 851 students.

Since 2009, however, the District has experienced a decline of 252 students.

I will dig a little deeper to provide a more detailed answer, but I wanted to get back as quickly as possible re: the error in my formula.

Thanks and again, my apologies,

Tracy

From: Hill (Superintendent), Andrew <ahill@wadsworthschools.org>
Sent: Wednesday, December 19, 2018 10:42 AM
To: Tracy Healy <thealy@futurethinkinc.com>
Cc: Prenosil, William <Bill.Prenosil@ofcc.ohio.gov>; Drerup, Melanie <melanie.drerup@ofcc.ohio.gov>; Burke, Megan <Megan.Burke@ofcc.ohio.gov>; Douglas Beeman <dbeeman@wadsworthschools.org>; Linda McCann <lmccann@wadsworthschools.org>

Subject: Re: Follow Up Questions

Thank you for the response, Ms. Healy.

Mr. Prenosil and/or Ms. Drerup, can you direct me to where I can find the square footage methodology, etc. used by the OFCC? I've found some documents through a Google search but I want to ensure that I'm reviewing the appropriate documents. In particular, I'm interested in the documents that discuss the number of students per square footage of a building (e.g. 43,750 square feet = no more than 350 students, which was shared with us yesterday), how the ratios for different grade spans are determined, etc. In addition, can you clarify for me what you include in square footage for a building? Is it the square footage as found on the blue prints? Do local funded initiatives count toward the square footage used for your calculations (e.g performing arts center at our high school)?

I believe we will have some additional questions pertaining to the number calculations that were presented on the "Test Plan" document shared with us yesterday. Before we ask our questions, we would like to review the supporting documentation that drives the formulas and numbers shared with us.

I anticipate that once we receive the requested documentation, we will send an official written response to you that details our thoughts and questions pertaining to what was shared with us yesterday.

As an aside, it is rather unfortunate that the information shared yesterday could not have been shared prior to the meeting so we could have spent time prior to the meeting reviewing the information and preparing questions, which then could have been the focus of the meeting. I look forward to your response. Thank you for your assistance.

Andy Hill

Bill.Prenosil@ofcc.ohio.gov

Dec 19, 2018, 1:53 PM

to me, melanie.drerup@ofcc.ohio.gov, Megan.Burke@ofcc.ohio.gov, Douglas, Linda, Tracy

Andy,

Most of the information you are asking about is in our Ohio School Design Manual (OSDM) and it is available online here: <https://ofcc.ohio.gov/Resources/Design-Manual-OSDM/2018-OSDM>

I recommend however, that I come to your offices and answer your questions in person. That way I can show you our Master Planning web tool and do some “live” modeling which will help you understand how it works. If you are agreeable let me know and we can come up with a date/time in early January.

Locally Funded Initiatives and non-OSDM spaces do not count towards the square footage used for area calculations. We can review how all that works as well when we meet.

We agree that it would have been best if we could have shared the information that Tracy shared before the meeting, however, both Melanie and I learned about it for the first time also at the meeting. Tracy had not yet shared what she had discovered until then because it was so recent.

Sincerely,

William Prenosil, R.A., LEED AP

Sr. Planning Manager”

Doug and I then met with Bill Prenosil on January 16. At our meeting, we asked Mr. Prenosil the following questions:

Why do the student capacity limit numbers for many of our buildings change each time you run your numbers yet the buildings are the same size today they were when you ran the first set of numbers in August?

Mr. Prenosil explained the reason is the grade levels he puts into the buildings, as the square footage requirements change depending on the grade of the student. In the last numbers he presented to us on December 18 (“Test Plan” referenced above), he has 7th-12th grade in the high school, 4th-7th in the middle school and pre-k-4th grade in the elementary schools (see right corner of the first page of the attachment).

Where does the square footage the OFCC uses for each building come from, as the square footage on the building blueprints differ from the square footage used on the OFCC projections?

The OFCC design manual specifies this. There are certain areas they do not count, oversize calculations that go into this, etc. He shared the square footage numbers being used do not include the local funded initiatives in our new buildings (e.g. performing arts center at the high school that our community paid 100% of with no state assistance). He shared the square footage numbers he is using match those found in our initial OFCC master plan from 2009.

How does the special education square footage calculation work?

Mr. Prenosil responded that he would send us the section of the design manual that addresses the special education square footage calculation.

Can you answer the two (2) questions asked in my October 25 letter to Ms. Drerup that we never received a response to?

Mr. Prenosil reviewed the questions (Is there documentation that you can provide that demonstrates that the language included in our 2009 segmentation agreement was presented in the context of total district enrollment, with the possibility of losing access to future funding for a full building if enrollment did not increase or declined, rather than the understanding of those in our school district, as presented above? and As there are many ways to calculate student enrollment; can you direct me to the source from ODE that you reviewed?) and assured us that he would discuss them with Ms. Drerup and then respond to us.

Can you produce a list of segmented districts that have faced the same excess space issue we are experiencing? (We explained that we had previously asked him this question and upon following up with leadership in the school district he told us, we found out the school district faced the excess space issue but they were not segmented. Until proven otherwise, we speculate that we may be the first segmented district to face the excess space issue upon expressing our intention to move into the second phase of our segmented project.)

Mr. Prenosil said he would get us the list. He said there are many segmented districts that have faced the same issue as us, we are not the first.

Mr. Prenosil asked what our next steps may be. We shared that we did not know. We told him there is some legislative interest in our issue and that we will need to examine the contract issue that is at the heart of our disagreement with the OFCC.

We expect to receive answers to the items listed above soon. We adamantly dispute the OFCC's claim that we could absorb students from two (2) buildings into our other six (6) buildings. While the OFCC formula may suggest this can occur, we challenged Mr. Prenosil to find room in our current schools. In the meantime, we will have discussion with our board of education on the next steps for our school district. I think we have reached the end of the phase where we question numbers and try to explain to the OFCC the basis for our contractual issue. It appears to me that we are not going to get anywhere, the process the OFCC follows is what they intend to follow, regardless of our contractual agreement. Once our board of education has discussion, I will follow up with you on our next steps.

In the meantime, if you have any questions, please contact me. I appreciate your continued interest in this process.

Andy

Andrew J. Hill, Ed.D.
Superintendent
Wadsworth City School District
330-335-1301 (phone)
524 Broad St.
Wadsworth, OH 44281