

Strategic Intent & Implementation Framework

Strategy #1: Facilities

Date: March 10, 2016

Revision Date:

Strategic Intent (Goal)

What are we trying to accomplish?

The overall intent of the Facilities Strategic Initiative is to evaluate the current building infrastructure and develop a plan for the future aligned with the mission and vision of the Avon Grove School District. The plan shall include best uses for the existing facilities and sites to meet the needs of students, based on the strategic plan, the educational programs and enrollment projections. In addition, the plan shall include renovation and maintenance needs for the current buildings as well as the potential for future expansion of district facilities based upon the educational goals of the district.

Rationale

Why is accomplishing this important to achieving the mission/vision of the district?

How does this strategy influence other strategies?

The mission of the District states, “The purpose of the Avon Grove School District is to foster a learning environment for all students to be exceptionally well-prepared to succeed and lead full and meaningful lives.” In order to accomplish the mission of the district, the district must provide a strong educational program for all students to ensure that they are career and college ready. The development of a comprehensive facilities plan is essential to ensuring that the district has a safe and secure infrastructure that supports the educational goals and programs of the district.

The district facilities must meet the educational, physical, intellectual, social and emotional needs of students. At the same time, the buildings must meet all state and federal requirements to be accessible to individuals with disabilities. All schools must be of adequate size to provide for the safety of students and provide outdoor play areas, bus loading and unloading, parking facilities for students, staff and visitors. The school buildings must be safe and create an environment that will encourage students to learn. In addition, the schools must be organized in such a way as to align with the educational programs of the district and meet staff needs responsible for delivering the educational program.

The Actions Influence Map (see attached) depicts the facilities strategic intent (#93) as a level four action placing it at the top of the map. Although, the facilities strategic intent does not directly influence other actions on the map, this strategy is influenced by the Strategic Action #1 – the development of a comprehensive communications and community engagement plan that is underway in the district.

Success Measures

How will we measure success?

- Comprehensive Facilities Plan that includes:
1. Evaluation of current infrastructure
 2. Evaluation of demographics and enrollment projections
 3. Evaluation of current educational program and defining of educational program for the next 10 years
 4. Renovation plan for existing structures based upon needs of the district
 5. Expansion plan for facilities based upon needs of the district.
 6. Evaluation of finances and options to support recommendations

Verification

What data sources and methods will we use to track and validate measures?

1. District Facilities Study 2014-15
2. Enrollment data & Demographic Study
3. Educational Program and Curriculum Review
4. District Facilities Study 2014-15 and Capital Plan
5. District Facilities Study 2014-15 and Capital Plan
6. District financial information

Assumptions

What other conditions must exist for this intent to be achieved?

1. The district financial standing must be able to support the recommendations of the Comprehensive Facilities Plan.
2. A clearly defined educational plan for the next ten years must be outlined in order to align the Comprehensive Facilities Plan for the district.
3. Enrollment projections completed by a reputable demographer to ensure for the most accurate enrollment projections.
4. Adequate time and resources available to complete the evaluation and analysis of information and develop recommendations for consideration.
5. A communication plan must be developed to ensure that information pertaining to this initiative is made available to all stakeholders in the community.

Research/Evidence

What research or documentation supports that if we accomplish the intent we will achieve the desired outcomes?

A growing body of research provides evidence regarding the correlation between the quality of a learning environment and academic gains. Physical building conditions can affect learning as well as the health and the morale of staff and students. Clean, quiet, safe, comfortable and healthy environments are all important components of successful teaching and learning.

The National Clearinghouse for Educational Facilities publication, *Do School Facilities Affect Academic Outcomes?*, summarizes the research on facility attributes that affect academic outcomes. These attributes fall into six categories: indoor air quality, ventilation and thermal comfort; lighting; acoustics; building age and quality; school size; and class size. The conclusions cited in the report are:

“School facilities affect learning. Spatial configuration, noise, heat, cold, light and air quality obviously bear on students’ and teachers’ ability to perform.”

“Building age is an amorphous concept and should not itself be used as an indicator of a facility’s impact on student performance. Many schools built as civic movements in the 1920s and 1930s still provide, with some modernization, excellent learning environments; many newer schools built in the cost-conscious 1960s and 1970s do not.”

“There is a definite consensus about the positive effects of small school size, and the effects seem to be the strongest with students from lower socio-economic groups.”

“The class size debate is unresolved, although few would argue against smaller classes, where possible. This is an educational issue that has a serious impact on school planning and design, since smaller classes require more classrooms or more schools, a fact that may seem self-evident but often lost in the debate.” (Schneider, 2002).

In addition, *“researchers have found that students in deteriorating school buildings score between 5 to 11 percentile points lower on standardized achievement tests than students in modern buildings, after controlling for income level”.* (Miami Dade Public Schools, 2012). There is also consensus around the concept that deteriorating schools affect student morale. *“Studies indicate that student attitudes become more positive after they move into new or renovated school buildings”.* (Miami Dade Public Schools, 2012). By the same token, studies indicate that teacher satisfaction and retention are both influenced by the condition of the school building.

The American Federation of Teacher’s (AFT) publication, *Building Minds, Minding Buildings: Turning Crumbling Schools into Environments for Learning* was commissioned in response to Section 5414 of the No Child Left Behind Act on the “health and learning impacts of environmentally unhealthy public school buildings on students and teachers.” (AFT, 2006). The commissioned report found “poor environments in schools adversely influence the health, performance, and attendance of students.” (AFT, 2006). Factors such as poor lighting, inadequate ventilation, crumbling walls, damaged ceiling tiles, and inoperative heating and air conditioning systems were reported in AFT’s 2006 research results. The results also included the factors of noise, overcrowding, and air quality, recognizing their link to student learning. (AFT, 2006).

Schneider, M. (2002). *Do School Facilities Affect Academic Outcomes?* National Clearinghouse for Educational Facilities, Washington, D.C. Retrieved from <http://www.ncef.org/pubs/outcomes.pdf> .

Miami Dade Public Schools. (2012). *The Impact of School Buildings on Learning*. Research Services, Miami, Florida.
 American Federation of Teachers. (2006). *Building Minds, Minding Buildings: Turning Crumbling Schools into Environments for Learning*. Retrieved from <http://www.aft.org/pdfs/psrp/bmmbcrubming1106.pdf>.

The Facilities Action Team will review and further develop the Implementation Plan at their first meeting.

Implementation Plan
Key actions to occur along with the product and milestone date. Specific actions with more detail will be managed in a tracking tool and be used as part of the Strategy Action Team Meetings.

Key Actions	Outcomes	Milestone Dates
School Visitations <i>(Upper Dublin, Phoenixville, Downingtown, Seaford)</i>	Information pertaining to facility layout and program development	November 2014 February 2015
Conduct a District-wide Facilities Study	District-wide Facilities Study Report	March 2015
Form a Facilities Input Group	Report recommendations to Board of School Directors	Monthly Meetings beginning Spring 2016
Conduct a demographic study	Demographic Study with Enrollment Projections	Fall of 2016
Evaluation of current curriculum and educational program	Educational Plan (10 year)	Spring of 2016
Comprehensive review of financials (i.e. debt service, fund balance, etc.)	Financial Plan to support recommendations including funding options	Spring of 2016
Recommendation of FIG to Board	Comprehensive Facilities Plan	December 2017

The Facilities Action Team will map out the Monitoring & Success Plan at their first meeting.

Monitoring & Success Plan
How will we monitor progress and identify success?

Outcome	Method/Metric	Frequency	Criteria

Financial Impact
How much will the project cost if completed according to the strategic intent? How will estimated costs impact the implementation timeline?

Financial costs will include funds to support the following:

- Consultant from Gilbert Architects
- Demographer to conduct study
- Supplies/Resources to support the Action Team/FIG

Strategic Action Team Members

Name	Position
Daniel Carsley	Project Manager, Business Manager
Matthew Crockett	Supervisor of Building & Grounds
John Cramp	CCIU Director Facilities Management
Jeffrey Detweiler	Principal at AGI

Michael Berardi	Principal FSEMS
Edward Farina	Board Liaison
Danielle Hoffer	Consultant, Gilbert Architect Inc.
Facilities Input Committee	
Name	Position
Daniel Carsley	Co-chair, Business Manager
Margaret V. Sharp, Ed. D.	Co-chair, Assistant Superintendent
	PLE Parent
	PLE Parent
	AGI Parent
	AGI Parent
	FSEMS Parent
	FSEMS Parent
	AGHS Parent
	AGHS Parent
	Community Member
	Community Member
	Community Member
	Community Member
	Community Member
	Community Member
	Community Member
Edward Farina	AGSD Board Facilities Committee Chair
Jeffrey Billig	AGSD Board Facilities Committee Member
Herman Engle	AGSD Board Facilities Committee Member
M. Christopher Marchese, Ed. D.	Superintendent, Ad Hoc Participant
Bonnie Wolff	Board President, Ad Hoc Participant
Brian Gaerity	Board Vice President, Ad Hoc Participant

Endorsement Date by Strategic Intent Steering Committee: _____

Signature of Board President

Date

Signature of Superintendent

Date