

From: Hill (Superintendent), Andrew <ahill@wadsworthschools.org>

Date: Wed, Mar 20, 2019 at 8:41 AM

Subject: CIS Committee Update

Good morning. You are receiving this update because you are a member of the CIS Committee or because you have expressed an interest in receiving updates on the CIS/OFCC process. Since my last update to you, there has been additional correspondence with Mr. Prenosil from the OFCC (see below) regarding the questions we asked him (the questions were part of the last update I sent you, the update can be viewed by clicking [here](#)). In addition, the board of education is exploring options as they relate to the contractual issue that is central to our conversations with the OFCC. It is our hope to have a clearer direction on how to move forward at some point in the near future. Thank you for your continued interest in this issue and for your continued support of our school district. If you have any questions, please let me know.

Andy Hill

From: Prenosil, William

Sent: Monday, January 28, 2019 3:38 PM

To: 'Hill (Superintendent), Andrew' <ahill@wadsworthschools.org>

Cc: 'dbeeman@wadsworthschools.org' <dbeeman@wadsworthschools.org>; Drerup, Melanie <melanie.drerup@ofcc.ohio.gov>

Subject: Wadsworth City questions

Andy,

I have been working on answers to your questions.

Rather than waiting until I get all of them I wanted to get you what I have so far.

1. Regarding the Project Agreement referring to new or updated enrollment at the time of a future segment: *Refer to the 7th "Whereas" on the first page. I have attached a copy of the Project Agreement with the sentence highlighted in yellow.*
2. Provide a list of recent Segmented districts with similar excess space issues: *Cleveland Metro Schools (multiple buildings); Athens City Schools; Fairless Local Schools; Kent City Schools; Licking Heights Local Schools; Marietta City Schools; Warrensville Heights City Schools; Bedford City Schools; Crestwood Local Schools; Heath City Schools; Clear Fork Valley Local Schools; LaBrae Local Schools; Shaker Heights City Schools; Noble Local Schools; Tuslaw Local Schools. There are lots more but I assume this will be enough to help show the extent of how often we have this issue.*
3. Special Ed questions pertaining to when we would co-fund beyond the OSDM formulas: *I have attached the section of our OSDM that pertains to our Special Ed recommendations.*

I will continue to work to get you the answer to the last question, about the particular ODE enrollment data source that we use.

William Prenosil, R.A., LEED AP

Sr. Planning Manager

Ohio Facilities Construction Commission

30 West Spring St., 4th Floor

Columbus, OH 43215

Direct: 330-425-2332

Main: 614-466-6290

ofcc.ohio.gov

bill.prenosil@ofcc.ohio.gov

On Wed, Jan 30, 2019 at 3:04 PM Bill.Prenosil@ofcc.ohio.gov <Bill.Prenosil@ofcc.ohio.gov> wrote:
Andy,
Here is the answer to your last question regarding the ODE enrollment data:

The Ohio Department of Education provides three sets of data to OFCC to pre-populate the OFCC questionnaire: K-12 and ungraded enrollment, open enrollment in and out, and community school enrollment. This data is the Official October Enrollment HeadCount for school years 2009-10 through 2013-14. In 2014-15, the "Official October" count was done away with; however, ODE provides OFCC with the data set closest to what would be the count of the first full week in October.

This data set is available in the masked version on the ODE website. ODE provides OFCC with the unmasked version. The difference between them is that for grades with less than 10 students, the unmasked version includes the actual number while the masked version does not. Instead it reads <10.

ODE's explanation of the data is as follows:

"This data represents a headcount of students in attendance during the first full week of classes in October. Note: the October Count Week data collection no longer exists so this does not/is unable to adhere to the same rules as previous years' data. All data that represents less than 10 students is masked to ensure student privacy as subgroup data is presented."

The following is the link to the masked version.

<https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Data/Frequently-Requested-Data/Enrollment-Data>

William Prenosil, R.A., LEED AP

Sr. Planning Manager

From: Hill (Superintendent), Andrew <ahill@wadsworthschools.org>

Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 10:22 AM

To: Prenosil, William <Bill.Prenosil@ofcc.ohio.gov>; Douglas Beeman <dbeeman@wadsworthschools.org>

Cc: Drerup, Melanie <melanie.drerup@ofcc.ohio.gov>

Subject: Re: Wadsworth City questions

Mr. Prenosil,

I apologize for my delay in response, I have been working through what you sent me. I have two (2) additional questions for you.

First, I'm wondering if I am not asking my question on other segmented districts experiencing excess space issues upon attempting to enter phase two (2) of their project in a clear way. The reason I am wondering this is as I make my way through contacting districts on the list you provided (I have not contacted all of them at this point in time), I'm finding that they are telling me they are not segmented but are experiencing excess space issues. Also, I'm finding that some of the districts I have spoken to from the list built their initial structures in the late 1990's or early 2000's, which is prior to the when we believe the law changed to allow districts to segment their master plan into phases (we believe this change in law occurred in 2008). Some I have spoken to reference starting the process over to create a new master plan, not continuing the master plan by entering into the next phase. Can you provide clarification on this issue for me?

Second, I reviewed the Educational Planning Special Education document that you sent. I found the document to be more of a position paper on how special education should be handled. I'm confused on the actual square footage numbers needed for the different disabilities categories, is it the matrix found on page 0114-4? Is there a formula that is used that you could share with me?

Thanks for your assistance.

Andy Hill

On Mon, Mar 18, 2019 at 1:16 PM Bill.Prenosil@ofcc.ohio.gov <Bill.Prenosil@ofcc.ohio.gov> wrote:
Andy,

Here are our answers to your two follow-up questions:

1. Sorry if I was not clear in explaining that these were all not CFAP segment to segment transitions. But transitioning from a CFAP Segment 1 to Segment 2 is treated consistently (for excess space) as districts that transition from ELPP to CFAP, ENP to CFAP, or in urban districts from segment to segment. In all cases there is a time period between the initial project (which required a full Master plan to be developed) to the next project (which requires an updated Master Plan). The updated plan always requires an updated enrollment projection.

I believe I forgot to include Massillon City Schools, which was an ENP to CFAP transition that had a significant issue with excess space.

2. When a district, that is in the active planning phase, believes that they have a student with disabilities population the district believes can't be supported within the OSDM square footage listed on the master facilities plan, the district would provide detailed information on their students with disabilities population to the OFCC. OFCC would review this information and make a determination if this population would be supported within the standard OSDM square feet. If OFCC determines that is not possible OFCC would work with the district to develop a POR specific to the population being served.

I trust this clarifies these two subjects for you.

William Prenosil, R.A., LEED AP
Sr. Planning Manager

From: Hill (Superintendent), Andrew <ahill@wadsworthschools.org>

Date: Mon, Mar 18, 2019 at 4:19 PM

Subject: Re: Wadsworth City questions

To: Bill.Prenosil@ofcc.ohio.gov <Bill.Prenosil@ofcc.ohio.gov>

Cc: Douglas Beeman

<dbeeman@wadsworthschools.org>, melanie.drerup@ofcc.ohio.gov<melanie.drerup@ofcc.ohio.gov>

Thanks for your response, Mr. Prenosil.

As it relates to question #1 below, were the urban districts you reference CFAP for the first phase and CFAP for the next phase, when excess space became an issue? And, if so, did they segment before or after the law changed/was implemented in 2008? As I have shared before, we are still of the belief that our district's fact pattern may be the first of its kind in the state. (CFAP, segmented agreement after the segmented law changed/was created in 2008, is requesting to enter phase 2 via the said agreement and is experiencing an issue with the excess space interpretation and whether the next phase is an amendment to the agreement, as the said agreement states).

As it relates to question #2, I'm sorry that my question continues to cause confusion, I'm clearly not asking it the best way. I'm looking for the square footage formulas used for special education categories, if such square footage formulas exist. The fact that you have previously said special education is taken into account in square footage calculations leads me to believe there must be formulas that exist. In your most recent response, you reference the "the OSDM square footage listed on the master facilities plan." I'm looking for the formulas that drive the numbers found in the master facilities plan. When I stated in my last email to you, "I'm confused on the actual square footage numbers needed for the different disabilities categories, is it the matrix found on page 0114-4? Is there a formula that is used that you could share with

me?", the formula(s) are what I am referring to. I thought the formulas were what you were going to send to me a few correspondences before; what I ended up with from you did not include the formulas, at least not that I could see. If further clarification is possible, especially the ability to review the formulas that drive the calculations, I would appreciate it. If the formulas exist but cannot be shared, I would appreciate being told that.

Thanks for your help.

Andy Hill