

The Long Term Facilities Planning Process...

***A Guide to Improving Education
While Improving Communities***

**Education Law Center &
Center for Architecture
and Building Science Research, NJIT**

September 2004

Forward

This document was prepared by Joan Ponessa, Education Law Center (ELC), and Herb Simmens, Center for Architecture and Building Science Research (CABSR) at the New Jersey Institute of Technology. The timeline and framework sections were first introduced at the 4th School Facilities Conference, May 24, 2004 and at the Superintendents Special Session, June 2, 2004 as a draft document. Since then we have actively sought suggestions to supplement our work. As a result, we have refined some of the sections with input from district personnel and other experts.

This document is designed to provide a sample framework or a set of tools that can be reviewed and considered by each Abbott district in preparing for and developing a long range facilities plan during the 2004-05 school year. The framework is designed to take the district from where it is now to where it should be during the next five years. Some of the sections with more involved tasks include supporting questions to assist administrators, Boards of Education and Facilities Advisory Boards in decision-making. These are also the types of questions that stakeholders may ask in reviewing the district's long range plan.

A few districts will be able to skip some sections because the district's school construction program is substantially on the way to completion. However, even those districts will need to plan for the major building management and curricular changes that will occur as facilities work is completed. ELC and CABSR are available to provide additional support to districts and communities as plans are developed.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
Purpose of the Framework.....	3
Relationship of Document to the DOE's Regulations.....	4
Proposed Schedule for LRFP Framework.....	5
Plan to Plan.....	7
Information Gathering.....	9
Development of the Plan.....	17
Articles of Reference.....	23
Appendix.....	25

The Long Term Facilities Planning Process...A Guide to Improving Education While Improving Communities

Introduction

The 2005-2010 Long Range Facility Plans (LRFPs) required by the New Jersey Supreme Court (*Abbott V*) and the Educational Facilities Construction and Financing Act (EFCFA) present a wonderful opportunity for New Jersey's 31 urban school districts to reexamine and strengthen their long term planning for educational adequacy in twenty first century school facilities. (See Appendix #1 for Background information on the Abbott School Construction Program and the first round of long range planning.) It also provides an opportunity for districts to work closely with municipal, community and other groups to ensure that this unprecedented infusion of capital resources can enhance the physical, economic and social fabric of the entire municipality as well as the specific neighborhoods around each school facility.

While the final plans are not required to be submitted to the Department of Education until October 2005, each district should start the planning process now to ensure the creation of a comprehensive plan that meets the district's educational and facility goals and maximizes available support from state government and public and private interests. The first round of planning was done in a very constricted timeframe with little opportunity to consider potential changes in educational programs or engage the community in the process.

Note: While focused on the Abbott districts this framework is also applicable to each of New Jersey's school districts as they prepare their LTFPs.

Purpose of the Framework

ELC and CABSR have carefully reviewed the LRFP process completed in 1999. Because of the opportunity to improve on the first round of planning, we have developed a framework to assist districts in maximizing the potential for successful planning. The framework will provide an approach to reevaluating the first round of planning, review the progress the district has made to date, update all information, review educational programs, improve community participation, and develop new plans for the next five years. Our objectives in creating this framework are as follows:

1. To supplement the first round of planning, not to replace it;
2. To provide a process that recognizes that each district is at different stage in

- implementing the construction program;
3. To build on the NJDOE guidelines from the first round of planning;
 4. To incorporate the requirements of the *Abbott V*, EFCFA, and Executive Order #24;
 5. To provide enhanced guidelines for a comprehensive approach to educational adequacy planning;
 6. To integrate the concept of community centered schools as required under Executive Order #24 including linking schools to community development, providing community spaces where needed, and allowing maximum community participation in the planning process;
 7. To use “high performance” standards in planning schools;
 8. To allow enough time to complete a thorough, comprehensive planning process.
 9. To lead to the creation of a process and document that can provide sufficient guidance and direction to insure that each individual facility is designed in accordance with the educational and facility design policies articulated in the LRFP.

Relationship of Document to the DOE’s Regulations

This document is intended to supplement the DOE regulations and should not in any way conflict with the DOE regulations. The DOE regulations are little changed from the regulations which governed the preparation of the 1998-99 plans and are largely quantitative in nature. Central to a more effective process is defining a vision of the educational philosophy of the district consistent with Abbott and DOE requirements, and basing educational facilities on this philosophy, as well on the needs of the larger community. Experts around the country have shown that educational excellence can best be achieved by a highly inclusive planning process that involves a full range of community stakeholders.

In some cases the actions recommended here are not required by the DOE. They will however lead to a superior LRFP and should provide the framework and justification for seeking additional support for the district’s particularized need facility spaces beyond the basic minimums established by the DOE. In addition research shows that facility designs which reflect the needs of students, teachers, administrators and the community lead to higher achievement by students, greater productivity by staff and greater community satisfaction.

The LRFP should also provide a necessary framework for the individual project plans that follow. Without guidance on basic educational and community development principles articulated in the LRFP, projects will necessarily be designed on an ad hoc and uncoordinated basis, increasing costs and minimizing opportunities to establish district wide standards and practices.

Proposed Schedule for Long Range Facilities Planning Framework for the 2004-05 School Year

Framework Reference Numbers	Activity	Recommended Participants
<i>Plan to Plan</i>		
1	Getting Started, Board Resolution	Superintendent and Board of Education
2	Budgeting	Administration and Board of Education (BOE)
3	Organize Facilities Advisory Board	Administration and BOE
4	Retain Required Consultants	Administration and BOE
5	Development of a Schedule for Planning during the 2004-05 School Year	Administration, BOE, Consultants
6	Announcement of new LRFP Process	Administration and BOE
Information Gathering		
7	Review of District Goals	Administration and BOE
8	Preliminary Screening for Preschool Contracted Providers' Facilities	Administration and Architect
9	Special Education Planning	Administration, Special Education Director, Child Study Teams, and Special Education Parent Representatives
10	Technology System Review	Administration, Facilities Manager, Technology Consultant, and Technology Director
11	Explain Process to Principals and Request Staff Meetings	Superintendent
12	Review of Literature on Educational Facilities Planning	Administration, FAB, and Principals
13	Review Original LRFP and All Amendments to the Original Document	Administration, FAB, Facilities Manager, Consultants, and BOE
14	Examine Municipal and Local Plans, Request Resolution from City	Administration, representative FAB and BOE Members, and Consultants
15	Tour School Environments and Neighborhoods	District Administration, BOE, FAB, Staff, and Community
16	Update Enrollment Projections, Demographics, and District Organization	Certified Demographer, Administration, Board of Education

Framework Reference Numbers	Activity	Recommended Participants
17	Technology Program Review	District Administration, Facilities Manager, Technology Consultant, Technology Director, Curriculum Director
18	Inventory and Analyze Sites	Administration, Consultants
Development of Plan		
19	Development of a Preschool Master Plan including Providers	Administration and Early Childhood Advisory Council
20	Organize District Teams for Educational Review	Administration, Educational Consultant, and School Staff Representatives
21	Examine the NJDOE Software Required for Reporting	Administration and Consultants
22	Organize Community wide Workshops/Charrettes	Administration, Consultants, FAB, Staff, and Community
23	Develop Initial Concept Plans to Reflect District Needs	Administration, Consultants, FAB
24	Complete Initial Draft of DOE Required Reports using DOE Software	Architects, Engineer, Consultants
25	Public Hearings and Meetings to Present Initial Report	Consultants, Administration, FAB, Staff, Community
26	Revise LRFP Based on Public Comments	Consultants, Administration, FAB
27	Prepare Final LRFP for Submission to DOE	Administration, BOE, Consultants
28	Delivery to DOE and Municipal Planning Board	Administration
29	Distribution of LRFP	Administration

Plan to Plan

1. Getting Started – Superintendent and Board of Education

The key to developing a comprehensive facilities planning process that results in district-wide educational improvements as well as building upgrades depends on good district leadership. The superintendent should meet with the administrative staff and assign responsibilities, brief the Board about the process, and request a Board resolution that will recognize the critical importance of the long range facilities planning process for the 2004-05 school year. (A sample resolution is in Appendix #2.)

2. Budgeting - Administration and Board of Education (BOE)

The 2004-05 budget should plan for necessary consulting services and additional staff time in order to have the necessary expertise to develop the LRFP. The amount to be budgeted will vary by size of district, in house capabilities, available data, and progress in achieving the goals in the 1999 plan. The overall cost to each district should not vary greatly from the cost of preparing the 1998-99 plan. Individual components of the plan may require greater or lesser resources however. For example, the inventory process for identifying deficiencies in each building may require less consultant or staff time, but additional resources may be necessary to support greater community and staff involvement.

3. Organize Facilities Advisory Board –Administration and BOE

Abbott school districts should establish a permanent district-wide Facilities Advisory Board (FAB) as required during development of the first round of LRFPs for the purpose of ongoing discussions during school planning, design and construction. **The FAB will help ensure that a broad range of views are considered in the planning process, that the process itself is viewed with legitimacy and support and that the final plan will be understood and championed by the community.**

Recommended FAB guidelines:

1. Include parents (non-district employees and, if possible one or more parents that represent a constituency such as the PTA or other parent organizations); representatives of district employee unions; district administrators; a city council member and/or the mayor; a member of the city's planning board and staff; representatives from student government, community groups, agencies, and businesses. A licensed architect, licensed engineer and other consultants hired by the district, as well as an SCC and DOE representative should participate in the meetings.
2. Meet at least 6 times per year;
3. Keep and distribute minutes for review and post on district website;

4. Elect a chairperson;
5. Open all meetings to the public;
6. Allow public input through written comments and a public comment period during the meetings;
7. Designate a contact person within the district to communicate with the public; and
8. Review and provide comment and recommendations on each phase of the LRFP prior to consideration by the board of education.

The FAB should insure that community input :

- Occurs early in the process;
- Occurs at convenient locations and times;
- Is based on best available data, best practices and field visits;
- Is continuous before, during and after the development of the LTFFP.

4. Retain Required Consultants - Administration and BOE

The LRFP process requires the expertise of many different types of individuals. No one person has all the skills needed to develop a comprehensive plan. The district's facilities manager is a key person for tallying the physical condition of the buildings, but should not be expected to tie the educational programming into the design process. In many districts this may require the services of an educational consultant to work with the district when all pertinent information has been collected (See Section #19). The LRFP process also requires the assistance of an architect/planner, engineer, a technology consultant, technical support for data collection, and a certified demographer for enrollment projections. If the district does not have a staff member with the appropriate expertise, consultants should be retained and contracts signed in preparation for the year-long process.

Careful consideration should be given to the reporting arrangements for the consultant team. It is important that lines of authority are clear and that the process is supervised by an individual in the district with sufficient standing to insure that both educational adequacy and facility issues are given full consideration.

5. Development of a Schedule for Planning during the 2004-05 School Year - Administration, BOE, Consultants

Essentially a plan-to-plan should be developed. A schedule for FAB meetings and other tasks must be developed. This should include an outline of the components of the LRFP process individualized to reflect the amount of work required at each stage, deadlines for staff input into the educational program review from each school, meetings with city officials around site problems, and sufficient time for community meetings to discuss concerns.

6. Announcement of new LRFP Process - Administration and BOE

All principals and staff; including maintenance, secretarial, and bus drivers; should be alerted that the 2004-05 school year will be a year devoted to school facilities planning.

Staff members should be encouraged to participate as much as possible, especially in the educational program review. **Even if the local school is in construction or under renovation**, the staff should be encouraged to participate in the district-wide planning. Operational changes that will result from district-wide planning and changes that will occur when the new building comes online will impact everyone in the district. Students should be encouraged to provide input to the discussions through structured class projects, after school activities, design competitions and participation in committees at all grade levels.

In addition, announcements of the pending LRFP process should be made to the public via newsletters, district website, local news media, PTA, local businesses, and through FAB contacts. Local school leadership councils (SLCs) can also be supportive in spreading the word and providing input.

Information Gathering

7. Review of District Goals – Administration and BOE

Every district has a set of goals and objectives that should be periodically reviewed by the administration and the Board of Education to gauge progress in achieving them. These goals and objectives should be readily available for public scrutiny. If the goals and objectives are not being met, an analysis of some of the impediments should be reviewed. For example, issues such as low test scores; dropouts; overcrowding; mobility; vandalism; violence; student health problems (smoking, drugs, obesity, lack of preventive health care, pregnancy, etc.) might need to be addressed.

As the district prepares to update the long range plan, a review of the district's goals and objectives is essential because enhanced facilities could provide opportunities to improve programs to better support achieving the goals. Lack of space is often a major detriment to effectively resolving the district's programming problems.

Supporting questions...

What are the key educational goals and objectives for the district?

Are the district's goals and objectives different than the goals and standards outlined by the Department of Education and required to be reported on annually in the "School District Effectiveness" checklist?

What progress has been made in achieving the district's goals and objectives?

What kind of review process is in place to periodically review and or revise the district's goals and objectives?

What are some of the impediments to meeting the district's goals and objectives

What changes to the goals or objectives have been recommended as a result of the LRFP or other district strategic planning processes?

How have the goals and objectives been communicated to the various school constituencies - staff, students, parents and community? In schools? On the district's website? What kinds of conclusions has the Facilities Advisory Committee reached concerning the relationship of the district's goals to facility planning?

8. Preliminary Screening for Preschool Contracted Providers' Facilities - Administration, Architect, and Providers

Each Abbott district's preschool planning process must be inclusive and comprehensive to ensure that all 3 and 4 year olds, regardless of where they are housed, are in "educationally adequate facilities." At present, there has been no assessment of preschool providers' buildings. In order to ensure "educational adequacy," the same preschool facilities planning standards (recent amendment to 6A:26) must apply to all buildings housing preschool classrooms.

As a first step toward a comprehensive planning process for the district's LRFP, some basic information obtained through an initial screening will be helpful:

- The condition of providers' buildings based on the preschool facilities standards, including classroom space configurations and size, natural lighting/outdoor connection, outdoor play space, toilet arrangements and safety issues.
- The status of ownership of the provider building. (Owned or leased?)
- The providers that are operating or will be able to operate at least 6 (90 students) preschool classrooms.
- Provider's willingness to upgrade building if funding is available.

This initial assessment will provide districts with information for the planning process to ensure that all preschool facilities are educationally adequate. (See # 19 below)

Please note: The above recommendation for initial screening is made with the supposition that regardless of where construction/renovation of preschool facilities take place, districts will not supplant existing quality preschool programs. Further, a majority of Abbott districts will continue to subcontract with high quality community programs. The purpose of a new district planning process should be to attempt to incorporate all programs of high quality and address the facilities issues that arise after assessment.

9. Special Education Planning - Administration, Special Education Director, Child Study Teams, and Special Education Parent Representatives

New buildings and/or renovated buildings will mean new spaces for special education needs. It most likely will also mean that the location of some programs will change, the types of programs in certain schools will change, and some children may be able to be brought back to the local school or to the district. It hopefully will also mean that adequate spaces for speech, physical therapy, and other “related services” will be provided in appropriate spaces in the near future. In order to assure an adequate district-wide program, space planning will be essential. This long-range planning opportunity provides the perfect opportunity to re-examine the district’s goals for special education students.

Each student’s annual review should be reviewed by the Child Study Team(s) to determine the approximate number of students that might have been placed within the district or in their local school if space was available. These numbers should serve as a planning guide for a larger group discussion with all concerned staff and parent reps. These current students will not be the same students involved when the new or renovated facilities come online, but the district needs some gauge for assessing space needs for special education students. Some discussion should also be centered around additional spaces needed to provide better accommodations for related services.

10. Technology System Review - Administration, Facilities Manager, Technology Consultant, Technology Director

District technology has two components: district-wide systems and educational programs (see # 16). A district may need an information/computer technology consultant to deal with the first component to guarantee that the district works toward a centrally planned, designed, implemented, and managed infrastructure with clearly defined interfaces for users. The continued technological advances, and the problems and potential they represent, increases the importance of the LRFP efforts.

11. Explain Process to Principals and Request Staff Meetings - Superintendent

All schools have regular staff meetings. At least two of these meetings at the beginning of the 2004 school year should be devoted to discussing school facilities issues, in particular as they affect teaching and learning. The principal should be encouraged to create a short questionnaire for all staff; including classroom aides, maintenance, secretarial, and bus drivers; to allow staff to identify physical deficiencies in the present building to preclude the meetings from becoming gripe sessions about broken window locks, peeling paint, etc. The objective of the staff meetings should be to discuss potential changes in programming that would better support improvements in student achievement if the building design was improved. All professional staff members

should be encouraged to participate as much as possible in the educational program review.

12. Review of Literature on Educational Facilities Planning –Administration, FAB, and Principals

Articles for Reference been included at the end of this document for your convenience.

13. Review Original LRFP and All Amendments to the Original Document – Administration, FAB, Facilities Manager, Consultants, and BOE

The original LRFP, approved amendments to date, all sites, and projects currently in development or completed is essential for all to review before any serious discussions can begin. If major changes in the LRFP have been made over the last five years, an analysis of the reasons for the changes will be helpful. Most districts will also need to develop a matrix listing all projects, stages of development, locations, architects, construction firms, costs, priority listing from original plan, problems encountered, site issues, swing spaces if students have been or will be moved, and projected dates of completion. The district's project management firm (PMF) should have most of this information.

Supporting questions...

What kind of amendments have been made to the 1999 LRFP plan? Why?

What were the key facility features described in the 1999 LRFP to support the achievement of the district's goals, objectives and programmatic activities? Are these facility features still applicable?

How was the 2005 LRFP process organized to maximize continuing input from students, school administrative and maintenance staff and faculty, neighborhood residents, businesses, civic institutions, higher education institutions and municipal government? In what specific ways did the input received from the interests listed influence or change the substance of the LRFP?

What is the relationship of the recommendations in the 2005 LRFP to the local master plan and/or relevant community scale plans?

If any of the district's buildings have historic or landmark status, how have these buildings been integrated into the district wide plan?

How has the district developed swing space? Has this process of finding temporary space hindered the district's progress toward full implementation of the 1999 LRFP?

Has a strategy for insuring full and effective implementation of the current LRFP been developed, included identification of responsible offices and officials within the district to work with the NJSCC and NJDOE?

Have information systems been created to monitor district progress and highlight problems throughout the process from planning to project completion?

14. Examine Municipal and Neighborhood Plans, Request Resolution - Administration, representative FAB and BOE members, and Consultants

Reviewing the municipal master plan and any neighborhood based and institutional facility plans such as those prepared by hospitals or universities will highlight major trends and service and facility needs of city residents that may be met through the schools, and opportunities for shared facilities and services.

Many agencies have working documents that can provide information on land use, building occupancy, potential redevelopment areas, contaminated sites and so forth. Municipal, county, community development agencies, hospitals, social service and cultural organizations should all be contacted and alerted to the new planning process and asked to provide information or input. The purpose is to identify opportunities for collaboration in the use of facilities and sites, and prevent or minimize site conflicts.

Each municipality is required to review its master plan every six years. Updates are allowed more frequently. The master plan may have a community facilities element, which would analyze needs and recommend facilities and locations for new facilities, including schools. The district should determine whether municipal master planning can occur during the period of the LRFP process. Ideally the municipal master plan review process should occur jointly with the LRFP process. The district should also carefully review the current master plan to examine projected growth rates, policy and land use recommendations and recent demographic trends.

The LRFP process is an opportunity to coordinate design, aesthetics, services and physical linkages with existing and proposed housing and community development opportunities. With the limited resources available to all communities, joint use is often the most viable way to maximize the provision of community services and facilities. It is very helpful to have the municipality behind the plans the district develops. The school district might want to request that the municipal council support the planning process by passing a resolution. (See Appendix #3)

15. Tour School Environments and Neighborhoods - Administration, BOE, FAB, Staff and Community

Walk-throughs of selected schools and the surrounding neighborhoods are worth a thousand words. A principal and facilities manager guiding the facility tour can point out problems that may be difficult to explain without the visit. These walks can provide a great learning opportunity for the public as well. Residents, parents, and students

should join the walk and follow-up tours. This can be one more way to receive community input that will lead to more creative and inclusive plans. Photos should be taken for use in the final report and as input to the planning process. Safety issues in the school and neighborhood should be of particular concern. The participants should be reminded to observe and identify facility problems and assets that affect the ability of teachers to teach and students to learn. Remember all options should be on the table at this point.

Community programs and facilities should also be visited to explore opportunities for joint use, service coordination and/or acquisition of underused facilities. A comprehensive inventory of neighborhood resources should be created or adapted from municipal or other sources. The success of the district's plan will require inventive ways to use space, sites and buildings. Schools do not have to be self sufficient and self-contained buildings. Adaptive reuse of existing non-school buildings and construction of joint use buildings with public and private institutions and businesses should be central to the planning process. Central resource centers, such as libraries and recreational areas can serve groups of schools. Consideration of joint use of facilities and grounds in neighboring municipalities should be considered. Joint and shared use of facilities can provide opportunities for internships, apprenticeships and work-study and mentoring programs. Shared facilities can also enhance neighborhood revitalization and assist businesses and community service providers.

In many cases joint use facilities may require potentially complex arrangements and negotiations with other public and private entities. Innovative means to finance additional facilities, including leasing space to private providers, leasing from private developers and joint financing in partnership with the municipality or the county are among the options that may be required. Starting the LRFP process at this time can help insure that these techniques can be adequately explored and coordinated with the New Jersey School Construction Corporation (SCC) without unduly delaying the facilities development process.

Buildings and streets with special architectural and/or historical significance should be identified for preservation and enhancement where possible.

The need for outdoor play and learning spaces should be incorporated into the planning process. Research has shown the critical importance of carefully designed outdoor play areas, gardens, and ecological areas in the cognitive, emotional and physical development of children. Given the shortage of suitable land in many Abbott communities, shared use of space and location of outdoor areas on rooftops should be considered. Quite simply, outdoor spaces should be given as much attention as indoor spaces in the LRFP process.

16. Update Enrollment Projections, Demographics, and District Organization - Certified Demographer, Administration, Board of Education

Every district will need updated enrollment projections based on the most current information available. Enrollment projections should be coordinated with municipal and

state provided local population projections. The NJDOE has specific requirements listed in 6A:26. School size, class size, and grade configuration all play a role in the organization of planning for facilities.

Supporting questions...

Compare the actual enrollments and demographic patterns district wide and by school facility to the projections contained in the 1999 Plan. What accounts for the differences, if any?

What are the projected enrollments and demographic patterns for 2005 – 2010? How could district realignment of sending areas support improved district facilities planning and a more equitable educational program for children in some areas?

How were these projections developed? In what way were citywide and neighborhood development trends factored into the projections?

What impact have charters, home schooling and private schools had on enrollments and demographic patterns? What impact are they projected to have for 2005-2010?

Has the district considered the latest research on school size? Is the development of small elementary schools with enrollments of from 200 to 400 a viable model for the district? Could it be in certain areas or in situations where land is a problem? Given the benefits of small schools, what justification does the district have for planning for “large” schools? (see Section 20 for secondary education issues relating to small schools)

Were changes in grade configuration recommended in the 1999 plan? Are these changes in grade configuration still valid? Will any further changes be recommended for 2005-2010? Is a neighborhood school concept a priority for the district or will magnet schools be recommended and why?

Has an initial assessment of preschool provider buildings been done? What were the results of assessments of these preschool buildings? How many classrooms are in each providers’ building? How is the preschool program to be managed over the next five years? What mix of private and public facilities are recommended and why?

How will building upgrades change the way special education is offered in the district? Will more students be included in regular classrooms? Will some children be brought back into the district? How will supporting services be offered?

17. Technology Program Review - Administration, Facilities Manager, Technology Consultant, Technology Director, Curriculum Director

The district may need technology consultants to help deal with the second component (see #9), the educational programs for technology. The technology programs are represented in the newly adopted Technology Standard #8 that includes computer and

information literacy (Standard 8.1) and technological literacy (Standard 8.2). Program and facility plans may need to be revisited in light of the stated dimensions of literacy in 8.1 that include (1) basic computer tools and skills, and (2) application of productivity skills. The district may also wish to review the plans for information and computer technology programs and facilities in light of the new technological developments and new insights about how computers impact upon how students learn.

The direction and intent of Standard 8.2 for technological literacy represents a major curricular change, with implications for the elementary, middle school and high school levels, that will result in significantly different facilities. Within Standard 8.2, students are expected to gain understanding and competencies related to the (1) nature and impact of technology, (2) design process and impact assessment, and (3) systems in the designed world. Additionally, technology education, through its “design-based learning,” could play an important role in helping to integrate what students learn in other subjects as well as developing “positive attitudes about technology, math, science and learning in general.” The district, therefore, may wish to secure consultant help to insure that the program and facility plans are adequate to support the implementation of technology education—including engineering and technological design—as an essential component of a thorough and efficient K-12 education that provides all students with opportunities to work in a 21st century environment.

18. Inventory and Analyze Sites - Consultants, Administration

Before the inventory begins, site evaluative criteria should be developed including such factors as:

- public and environmental safety,
- community preferences,
- opportunities for joint development,
- need for play space, recreation, and parking,
- safety for children walking to school,
- the need for student transportation,
- impact on neighborhood revitalization,
- cost,
- capacity
- availability.

Because it is often difficult to locate a site that meets all the criteria agreed on, priorities should be set that will enable some compromises to be made. Starting with all district owned and controlled sites, preliminary site identification should be undertaken (site analysis is part of predevelopment and must be undertaken only after DOE and SCC approves a project, but the district is responsible for initially identifying the locations of potential sites).

Urban districts often have a particularly difficult time selecting sites for schools simply because the options are very limited. Creativity is important in many urban environments. Thinking only of schools as having acres of green space around the periphery can be extremely problematic. Campus schools, multiple story buildings,

shared use buildings, conversions of old buildings, distributed sites, and corridors of green space shared by schools are just a few ideas that can be explored. In addition, buildings in urban settings will probably have to be designed to be “up” not “out” to allow small sites to accommodate play space and parking. A report of findings should be prepared and reviewed by the FAB.

Supporting questions...

Have locations for new or expanded facilities been identified? What has the district done to minimize the relocation of families and businesses?

How have opportunities for joint use of sites, either public or private uses, been identified? In particular, have joint use opportunities that provide tax revenue to the municipality been identified?

How do the opportunities for joint use and creative uses of land support the city’s master plan vision for its future?

How could rooftops be used to augment the need for outdoor spaces or other functions where land is scarce?

How could outdoor spaces be used jointly with the community?

How could alternative parking arrangements such as underground parking and/or shared use of existing parking in the vicinity of the facility help alleviate parking problems?

Development of Plan

19. Development of a Preschool Master Plan including Providers - Administration and Early Childhood Advisory Council

In order to develop a long-term plan for Abbott preschool programs, each district should develop a framework for where their preschool children will be housed over the next decade. This framework should be developed by the Early Childhood Advisory Council. For the purposes of long-range planning, preschool students should be considered housed only if the buildings conform to DOE’s preschool planning standards as observed in the initial screening. (See step #8 above)

With the information obtained from the initial screening process, all provider buildings that will continue to house preschoolers, should be assessed as part of the district’s LRFP according to the same rigorous assessment process as school district buildings. (The DOE and SCC will have to develop additional guidelines for assessments of buildings that are non-traditional school buildings.)

The district must include all provider buildings in their LRFP that will continue to be used long-term with recommendations of how the buildings will be brought up to DOE’s standards to meet the “educational adequacy” requirement of *Abbott V*. In addition, the district must plan for additional spaces either by converting other buildings, or new

construction to accommodate “unhoused” students in programs run by providers. Leasing buildings to providers is one option available. More options for correcting deficiencies and upgrading providers’ buildings will have to be explored not only by districts but also by the State. Additional funding options will also need to be explored by the State to support upgrading eligible providers’ buildings.

20. Organize District Teams for Educational Review - Administration, Educational Consultant, and School Staff Representatives

Curriculum supervisors, principals, and other staff representatives should be organized into teams that reflect the district school structure (example: grades preK-8, K-5, 6-8, 9-12, magnets, alternative). The number of these teams will be dependent on the size and needs of the district. Smaller districts may only need one team. The initial meeting should consist of all the teams in order to explain the process the district will use to review the school staff input (See step #11 above), study curriculum needs related to space requirements, review equity in programming between the district’s schools and develop potential space needs. This process should relate directly to core curriculum requirements and local needs, and should be in lieu of relating the curriculum to the specific room and space requirement in the FES. These teams should be guided to be cognizant of needs, not wants. This review should not be designed to be a wish list, because the NJDOE will require that all needs be documented in relation to the educational needs of the students in the district. The architect hired by the district for the LRFP should be invited to the initial meeting to answer questions about the connection between space and educational programs. **Remember the architect is trained to design buildings, not to develop and evaluate educational programs.**

Step 1 – Review district’s educational goals

Step 2 – Review current building plans and progress

Step 3 – Review district grade structure (grade alignments), class sizes, school sizes, projected enrollments, placement of special education programs, preschool, racial/ethnic balance

Step 4 – Review availability of technology across the district

Step 5 – Review equity in programming across the district

Step 6 – Review needs for programs that require additional space; for example art and music, science, Abbott whole school reform, supplemental programs, health and social services

Step 7 – Review need for outdoor play space, recreational space, “learning landscapes” and parking.

Step 8 – Review teaching methods, current and planned

Step 9 – Review scheduling efficiencies

Supporting questions...

Has the district reviewed each school's program offerings based on the updated State's Core Curriculum Content Standards?

Does the district have a master program list identifying programs offered in each school? How often in the week is each program offered?

Is there equity across the district in program offerings?

What teaching methods are used in the district? At what levels? What kinds of learning spaces need to be included in school buildings to support the teaching methods proposed?

How do the present district buildings constrain district program offerings? Are there any proposed changes in programmatic approaches recommended to help achieve the district's goals and objectives?

What are the programmatic approaches undertaken by the district - such as use of a Whole School Reform model, supplemental programs, early literacy programs - to achieve the goals and objectives?

How could alternative or enhanced program delivery through use of communication technologies such as the Internet and distance learning provide improved educational programs at some age and ability levels?

How will planned spaces accommodate the requirements of the new Abbott regulations for middle and high schools, particularly:

- Provisions calling for the creation of "smaller organizational structures" – small learning communities or small schools either within existing schools or in new schools;
- The creation of teacher and student teams to remain together through multiple years in both middle and high schools;
- The creation of student family advocacy and support systems;
- The availability of a variety of electives for students with special interests;
- School initiated program activities to bring families together; and
- Increase in attendance by 2008.

21. Examine the NJDOE Software Required for Reporting –Administration and Consultants

The NJDOE/SCC will provide new software for reporting the basic LRFP requirements including: enrollments, functional capacity of the buildings; number of unhoused students; inventory of building systems and life expectancy of the systems; preliminary cost estimates of renovation vs. new construction. Hopefully, most districts will not have to repeat the massive volume of data input that was required in the first round of planning especially if the district's construction program is underway. Some updates to the major building deficiencies recognized in 1999 will be necessary. Printouts of this required information will serve as a tool in the later stages of planning. If the new software is well designed it should be flexible enough to provide for integration of information collected under this framework design.

22. Organize Community wide Workshops/Charrettes - Administration, Consultants, FAB, Staff, and Community

Broad community input into the planning process leads to better plans and easier plan implementation. Full day/weekend/evening workshops to develop a vision for the district's programs and facilities should be held either citywide or in neighborhoods in larger communities. These workshops should be designed to provide information to residents and to receive input from residents as to the kinds of programs, services and facilities that the district - with support from the municipality - should consider as part of the LRFP.

District students can play an important role in assisting in the organization and

participating in these workshops. The LRFP process can provide an opportunity to mobilize students at all grade levels to participate in and learn from the planning process. In addition, student learning can occur as part of implementation process, through observation of construction, post occupancy surveys and other means.

23. Develop Initial Concept Plans to Reflect District Needs - Administration, Consultants, FAB

Based on input from the workshops and synthesis of feedback from staff, community, city, enrollment reports, and technical analyses of all information, a preliminary report that outlines basic needs, and alternative ways of meeting educational and facility goals should be prepared. Models should be developed for individual schools or types of schools listing the types and number of spaces that will be needed in the buildings. ELC recommends that educational needs and community needs be the determining factor in the models not the rigid classroom and administrative spaces in the DOE's FES. (See Appendix #4 and 5) Attention, however, must be paid to the limits on the total building square footage, as specified in EFCFA (125 sq ft. for pre-K to 5, 134 sq ft for grades 6-8, and 151 for high school). Square footage above those limits will require justification on the basis of particularized need.

Supporting questions...

How could facility recommendations in the 2005 plan specifically advance the district's educational goals and objectives?

Has a technology plan for district-wide systems and educational programming support been developed by district that would provide clear guidance in the design of new or upgraded facilities?

What policies has the district recommended in the 2005 LRFP to maximize flexibility in the design of each facility? How has the LRFP developed approaches for maximizing use of facilities through flexible spaces, after school, evening, weekend and summer use?

How have the resources and facilities of community organizations, civic groups, hospitals, higher education institutions, libraries, indoor and outdoor recreational facilities and other such institutions been examined as a means to enhance the educational program and meet facility needs through shared spaces, internships, work study, mentoring and other such programs and approaches?

How has the district considered a full range of community functions and uses in each existing or proposed facility? What kinds of input from users and providers occurred in the planning and development of these facilities and programs?

What type of guidelines to physically incorporate community uses been developed? How has the operation and financing of these community facilities and functions been addressed?

Have guidelines to integrate these uses into the educational programs been developed?

How has the LRFP addressed the potential use of outdoor spaces as integral components of the educational programs? In what ways have different kinds of outdoor space been considered in the LRFP (grassy areas, hard surfaces, gardens, environmental classrooms)?

Which facilities and neighborhoods would be candidates for the state demonstration project program?

In what ways has the whole community been invited to help shape the vision for the district's facilities plans?

How have field visits by board members, facilities advisors, district administrators, city officials or community members to other cities that have integrated schools and community development influenced the discussions around the LRFP? How might new approaches complement the district's present situation?

How has the district been working with the city to assure that the school construction program will be a major asset to the whole community?

How have the major assets available to the district (colleges, parks, hospitals, transportation, rivers, museums, vibrant sections of the city, etc.) been utilized to support the district's educational programs and facility proposals?

How has the LRFP incorporated policies that are designed to support system wide efficiencies, rather than simply considering the LRFP as a series of individual projects (particularly applicable in areas such as technology, security, food service, maintenance)?

How does the district plan to maximum energy efficiency and environmental sustainability in the design of schools?

24. Complete Initial Draft of DOE Required Reports using DOE Software – Architects, Engineer, Consultants

25. Public Hearings and Meetings to Present Initial Report - Consultants, Administration, FAB, Staff, and Community

Summaries of the recommendations should be prepared and distributed to residents well before any meetings or official comment times elapse. These summaries should contain graphic and photographic representations of concepts and locations contained in the LRFP. Meetings to answer questions and take input should be attended by the entire planning team and the FAB. Local papers, school and municipal websites and other outreach opportunities should be utilized.

26. Revise LRFP Based on Public Comments - Consultants, Administration, FAB

Based on the input received from the public and further review by the planning team and FAB a revised LRFP should be prepared. If significant changes in educational and or facility philosophy and locations result from this process, these changes should be highlighted as part of a final public hearing.

27. Prepare Final LRFP for Submission to DOE - Administration, BOE, Consultants

Based on input and feedback from the final public hearing and the FAB the final plan is prepared for submission to DOE and municipal planning board. Given the participation by the planning board during the entire process the planning board review should go smoothly!

28. Delivery to DOE and Municipal Planning Board –Administration

29. Distribution of LRFP- Administration

The approved LRFP, at least in summary form, should be distributed to district staff, city and neighborhood officials, and to all design professionals involved in each facility project. The superintendent and school board should use the plan as the working document to guide the district in its quest for educational excellence.

Articles for Reference

Breaking Ground: Rebuilding New Jersey's Urban Schools

Education Law Center, 2004

http://www.edlawcenter.org/ELCPublic/Publications/PDF/BreakingGround_April2004.pdf

Planning for Quality: Ensuring the Educational Adequacy for All Abbott Preschool Facilities

Education Law Center, September 2004

<http://www.edlawcenter.org/ELCPublic/AbbottSchoolFacilities/FacilitiesPages/Resources/PlanningforQuality.pdf>

Do School Facilities Affect Academic Outcomes? Mark Schneider, National Clearinghouse for Educational Facilities, Washington, DC, November 2002

<http://www.edfacilities.org/pubs/outcomes.pdf>

Linking School Facility Conditions to Teacher Satisfaction and Success.

Schneider, Mark

National Clearinghouse for Educational Facilities, Washington, DC. , Aug 2003

<http://www.edfacilities.org/pubs/teachersurvey.pdf>

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973

"Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Handicap in Programs and Activities Receiving or Benefiting From Federal Financial Assistance"

<http://www.edlaw.net/service/504partc.html>

For Generations to Come, A leadership guide to renewing public school buildings

Mary Filardo

21st Century School Fund

<http://www.21csf.org>

Dollars & Sense: The Cost Effectiveness of Small Schools

Knowledge Works Foundation, 2002

<http://www.dollarsandsense.org>

School Facility Conditions and Student Achievement.

Earthman, Glen I.

University of California Los Angeles, Institute for Democracy, Education & Access , Oct 2002

<http://repositories.cdlib.org/idea/wws/wws-rr008-1002/>

The Jefferson Center Principles of Good Educational Design

Duke, Daniel L.

Paper presented at the 1999 Rowlett Lecture Series, sponsored by the CRS Center and the Texas A&M College of Architecture, Feb 12, 1999

<http://www.tjced.org/PDF>

Classrooms of the Future: Thinking Out of the Box.

This presentation on educational facilities design emphasizes the overarching strategy of observing the activities of learning that take place in and ...

This citation appears on the following NCEF resource lists:

[Case Studies-- K-12 School Buildings](http://www.edfacilities.org/rl/case_studies.cfm) <http://www.edfacilities.org/rl/case_studies.cfm>

[Educational Facilities Design](http://www.edfacilities.org/rl/design.cfm) <<http://www.edfacilities.org/rl/design.cfm>>

Prioritization of 31 Criteria for School Building Adequacy.

Earthman, Glen I.

American Civil Liberties Union Foundation of Maryland, Baltimore, Jan 05, 2004

http://www.aclu-md.org/facilities_report.pdf

Guide to School Site Analysis

California Department of Education, 2000

<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/fa/sf/documents/schoolsiteanalysis2000.pdf>

Where Do Our Children Play? The Importance and Design of Schoolyards

Selim litus and Renee Steinhagen

New Jersey Appleseed Public Interest Law Center

<http://www.edfacilities.org/rl/playgrounds.cfm>

Building Healthy, High Performance Schools

Environmental Law Institute

http://www.elistore.org/reports_detail.asp?ID=10925

School Design Process

Seattle School District

<http://www.seattleschools.org/area/facilities/DesignStandards/SchoolDesignManual.pdf>

Creating Communities of Learning: School and Smart Growth

Ellen Shoshkus

<http://www.edlawcenter.org/ELCPublic/AbbottSchoolFacilities/FacilitiesPages/FacilitiesResources.htm>

British School Design Initiative

http://www.edfacilities.org/rl/British_Initiative.cfm#8730

Websites of Interest

Education Law Center - <http://www.edlawcenter.org>

21st Century School Fund – <http://www.21csf.org>

New Schools Better Neighborhoods - <http://www.nsbnn.org>

National Clearinghouse for Educational Facilities – <http://www.edfacilities.org>

U.S. Green Building Council - <http://www.usgbc.org/>

Appendix

Section #1

Background

The Requirement for Long-Range Facilities Plans

Abbott V affirmed that adequate school facilities are an essential component of a “thorough and efficient” education in New Jersey. To ensure compliance with this mandate in the Abbott districts, the Supreme Court directed the State to implement a comprehensive program of school facilities improvements, including long range district-wide facilities planning under state standards; project approvals for repair, new construction and renovation consistent with the district-wide plans; priority for safety repairs; sufficient classrooms to eliminate overcrowding and to implement universal preschool; and 100% State financing and construction management of all projects. These directives were then enacted by the Legislature in EFCFA.¹

Abbott V

Long-range, or district-wide, facilities plans are central to the school construction mandate in *Abbott V*. At the heart of the ruling is the Supreme Court’s insistence that program implementation must drive facilities’ needs. To effectuate this requirement, *Abbott V* specifically directed districts to complete a comprehensive five-year plan to guide the district and NJDOE in making necessary facilities improvements. The Court also specified that these plans must address three basic components:

- **Safety:** Schools must be safe, in good repair, and meet fire, health and construction codes.
- **Reasonable Class Size:** Current and future overcrowding must be eliminated by reducing – and maintaining -- class sizes at 15 children in preschool, 21 children in kindergarten to third grade, 23 children in grades four through eight, and 24 students in high school.
- **Educationally Adequate:** Schools must have adequate space to deliver a rigorous curriculum based on New Jersey’s core curriculum content standards, special education programs, and Abbott K-12 supplemental programs. The Court accepted a set of “minimum standards for instructional areas” recommended by the State as the baseline for educational adequacy. However, the Court authorized districts to “demonstrate the need for additional, specialized spaces” beyond the minimum standards, and ordered the State to fund the construction of such additional spaces “whenever such a need is demonstrated.”²
- All new school designs shall incorporate the guidelines developed by the United States Green Building Council known as “Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (“LEED”), Version 2.0 to achieve maximum energy efficiency and environmental sustainability in the design of schools.

The Court directed that the five-year plans serve as the framework for the district and the State

¹ EFCFA directs all school districts in the state to prepare an LRP as a prerequisite to seeking state funding for specific facilities projects. EFCFA authorizes funding for all school districts, with the level determined by community income and property wealth. State funding ranges from 40% in high wealth districts to 100% in the Abbott districts. NJ Stat. Ann. 18A:7G-4 and 5.

² 153 N.J. 521.

to “work together” to reach critical decisions about the scope of the district’s facilities improvement program. The Court identified the full range of issues that must be addressed in the plans, including: “how to make the ‘best use’ of existing space;” “grade configurations, school sending areas, school size, and each district’s individualized need for instructional space;” and the “site sensitive decision of whether to renovate existing buildings or to construct new ones.”³ Thus, the plans are the point when the most critical decisions about the district’s facilities will be made: the extent of building repairs or renovations, along with preliminary determinations for the construction of new schools.

EFCFA

EFCFA, in implementing *Abbott V*, reaffirms the Court requirement for a planning process to assess districts’ school facilities needs and the preparation of a five-year Long Range Facilities Plan to address those needs. Under EFCFA, LRFPs must “conform to the “guidelines, criteria and format” prescribed by the State, and must include:

? Enrollment projections completed by a qualified demographer to serve as the basis for identifying the capacity and program needs;

? An educational adequacy inventory of all existing schools in the district, the identification of all deficiencies in the current inventory of buildings and proposed plans for future constructions and renovation;

? A determination of the number of “unhoused students” for the next five years, or the number of full time students in all categories – preschool, K-12, special education -- who are projected to be enrolled within the next five years in excess of the “functional capacity” of the district’s school buildings to deliver educationally adequate programs and services. “Functional capacity” is “determined by dividing the existing square footage of a school building by the minimum area allowance per FTE (full time equivalent) student.”⁴

? A determination of “the minimum area allowance per FTE student” by using “facilities efficiencies standards,” or FES. In developing the FES, the Commissioner must determine the “instructional spaces, specialized instructional areas, and administrative spaces” that are “educationally adequate” to support delivery of the State’s academic content standards and the “required programs in Abbott districts.” **The FES however, are to be used solely for the purpose of fixing the minimum amount of space per student that the state will support financially, and are not to be used as “construction design standards.”**⁵

? Review by municipal planning board before submission to the NJDOE.⁶

EFCFA also provides that an application for a school facilities project cannot be approved unless the district has filed an LRFP, and the NJDOE has approved the plan. A district can submit an amendment to the LRFP at any time to the NJDOE for review and approval.⁷

Executive Order No. 24

³ 153 N.J. 521.

⁴ N.J. Stat. Ann. 18A:7G-3, 4 and 8.

⁵ N.J. Stat. Ann. 18A:7G-4h and 8.

⁶ N.J. Stat. Ann. 18A:7G-4.

⁷ N.J. Stat. Ann. 18A:7G-4b and c.

In July 2002, Governor James McGreevey issued Executive Order #24 creating the New Jersey Schools Construction Corporation (SCC) to oversee the design and construction of facilities projects.⁸ This Order also established several critical standards for the planning of facilities, also known as “high performance” standards, and directed adherence to these standards in implementing the school construction program. Specifically, the Order directed the SCC, the NJDOE and the school districts to:

? “attempt to incorporate community design features to maximize public access to the building and enhance the utility of the building to the needs of the community;”

? “provide opportunity for the community at large to have meaningful participation in the site selection process...and in the design of school facilities;” and

? “incorporate the guidelines developed by the United States Green Building Council known as “Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (“LEED”), Version 2.0 to achieve maximum energy efficiency and environmental sustainability in the design of schools.”

In addition, the Order prohibits NJDOE from approving any school facilities project “**unless the project is designed using best practices to create space that enhances the learning process and accommodates modern teaching techniques.**” Finally, the Order requires NJDOE to adopt regulations that contain standards and criteria governing the use of community provider facilities to provide preschool education.

New Opportunities for Planning in 2004-05

The Abbott school districts began their initial long range planning in mid 1998 (non-Abbotts in 2000). Essentially the Abbott districts were beginning a process without a framework and with a time line that forced decision making without a total district wide review of the key elements for successful planning. Most larger districts around the country complete long range planning in one to three years. Due to the time limit of six months, the first round of planning did not emphasize the following two critical components for planning:

- Educational Adequacy – Facilities planning is an opportunity to improve educational curriculum, change grade structure, resolve overcrowding, upgrade technology, and add new programs. It is also a chance to review current teaching methods and make changes that may require new types of spaces.
- Community Centered Schools – Since schools play a major role in every community, planning should be centered around the needs not only of the students attending the schools, but around the communities that they serve. School planning should be linked to the city’s master plan, engage all stakeholders, and consider joint use spaces that might serve the community.

The current LRFPs were based on guidelines established by the NJDOE in September 1998.⁹ The process, initially scheduled for completion by January 1999, was extended to March 1999. Most of the Abbott districts completed the LRPF in early 1999, and submitted to NJDOE. In 2001, NJDOE completed the review process and approved the plans for all districts. From 2000 through 2003, most districts have proposed, and NJDOE has approved, amendments to the original LRFPs.

⁸ See www.state.nj.us/infobank/circular/eom24htm.

⁹ NJDOE, “Facilities Management Planning Guidelines,” Sept. 22, 1998. This document is available on ELC’s website at http://www.edlawcenter.org/ELCPublic/AbbottSchoolFacilities/FacilitiesPages/Fac_Mgt_Guidelines.pdf

Not only did the districts have only a few months to develop the current LRFPs in 1998-99, in order to meet the deadlines established in *Abbott*, the software was not completed when the districts began entering data, causing frustration for all involved. As a result, the process was completed under serious time pressure and resulted in plans with significant deficiencies especially in the area of educational program review.

The second round of planning will be an **opportunity** to improve on the first round of planning. In particular, Abbott districts will be able to devote the 2004-05 school year to a more comprehensive planning approach with a goal of "high performance" schools. A new software system will be developed by SCC/NJDOE that will integrate planning with implementation of the construction program.

During this round, Boards of Education will have the time to appoint a more representative Facilities Advisory Board (FAB) to guide the long range planning process. In addition, the FAB will have significantly more information about the school construction process in New Jersey and the specific problems and opportunities within their district that affect the success of the program. District administrators and the FABs will be able to seek broader community input in assessing community and neighborhood needs and plan and design "community centered" schools, where feasible.

In 1998, districts were required to develop an educational program summary, including an inventory of all existing or proposed programs, within one month. Districts did not have the time to allow curriculum experts, principals, teachers, parents or school management teams to develop a comprehensive program assessment or a vision of how the educational programs might change in the future. A longer time frame in the second round of planning will provide an opportunity to review the district's programs and plan for school facilities that contribute to the improvement of teaching and learning. This type of thorough planning will provide the basis for the documentation required by the department when deviating from the facilities efficiency standards (FES) and for particularized needs.

Probably the most pressing problem that must be addressed in many districts at this time is school siting. In some of the districts where little progress has been made during the last few years, finding appropriate sites is the issue. During the first round of planning, there was little time to consider all options. Not all proposals for sites were viable and/or available. New plans must be developed around the realities of the district's geography, population density, political implications, community development, and environmental problems. Moving forward will require hard work and creative thinking on the part of all involved.

Section #2

Resolution supporting the preparation of a comprehensive Long Range Facilities Plan by the (blank) Board of Education

Whereas the New Jersey Supreme Court, the Educational Facilities Construction and Financing Act, and the New Jersey Department of Education require that each school board in New Jersey prepare a five year Long Range Facilities Plan, and

Whereas such Plan is required to be submitted to the Department of Education and the ____ Planning Board by October of 2005, and

Whereas the ____ District has developed a set of policies and standards for implementing the Long Range Facilities Planning process based on the framework developed by Education Law Center and the Center for Architecture and Building Science Research at NJIT, shown as Exhibit A, and

Whereas the ____ District has developed a timeline for long range planning during the 2004-05 school year, shown as Exhibit B, and

Whereas it is critical to achieving the educational goals of _____ that a comprehensive planning process begin as soon as possible, and

Whereas recent updates to the New Jersey's Core Curriculum Content Standards and No Child Left Behind requirements could impact school facilities planning, and

Whereas the adoption of new state standards for technology establish additional expectations that entail new problems and possibilities for the _____ Districts, and

Whereas the Long Range Facilities Plan is an opportunity to insure that the educational philosophy, goals and programs of _____ be integrated with and supported by 21st Century High Performance School Facilities as required by Executive Order No. 24, and

Whereas the Long Range Facilities Plan also presents an opportunity to contribute to the revitalization of the municipality, and

Whereas the completion of a comprehensive Long Range Facilities Plan requires the commitment and participation of both the educational community and the citizenry of _____, and

Whereas the completion of a comprehensive Long Range Facilities Plan also requires that specialized consultants and staff be dedicated to this effort and that adequate funds be budgeted for such an effort

Now therefore be it resolved by the ____ Board of Education that:

The superintendent is hereby authorized and directed to begin implementing the development of a Long Range Facilities Plan in accordance with the requirements of the Supreme Court, the Act, the Executive Order and New Jersey Department of Education regulations and the district's timeline, including but not limited to securing an adequate budget and soliciting professional services as necessary

And be it further resolved the creation of such plan shall have the full involvement of the teachers, staff, students and administrators of this district as well as the involvement of municipal officials and citizens through the creation of a Facilities Advisory Board

And that such plan shall consider all feasible options for the development of facilities which both advance the educational goals of the district and contribute to the revitalization of the larger community

And be it further resolved that monthly reports shall be given to this body on the status of the Plan.

Section #3

Resolution supporting the preparation of a comprehensive Long Range Facilities Plan for the _____ School District by the _____ Municipal Council

Whereas the _____ School Board is required by the state to prepare a five year Long Range Facilities Plan by October 2005 and,

Whereas such plan will describe the kinds of facilities and educational services necessary to insure a thorough and efficient education for each child in _____

Whereas the Long Range Facilities Planning process is also an opportunity to insure that the planning and development of new and renovated educational facilities is coordinated with and supported by neighborhood and municipality wide planning and,

Whereas such coordination is best achieved with the active participation of the municipal council, planning board and other municipal entities, as well as community and citizen participation

Now therefore be it resolved that the Council of _____ supports the Long Range Facilities Planning process being undertaken by the _____ School Board and pledges its material and human support for this effort in the recognition that a comprehensive Long Range Facilities Plan will further the beneficial development of _____ and help implement the _____ Master Plan.

Copies of this resolution shall be distributed to the Planning Board, Mayor, Economic Development office and School Board

Section #4

Recommendations from FES Committee

Governor's Working Group on Abbott Facilities, Legislation, Regulations, and Standards

Sub-Committee on the Department of Education's Facility Efficiency Standards

July 29, 2003

The goal of the meeting was to finalize the Sub-Committee's recommendations regarding improvement of the Department of Education's Facility Efficiency Standards and to make recommendations regarding placing the Department of Education's response to the design and submission of Abbott Community Design Features and Community Schools on a more rational basis. The recommendations were finalized as follows:

1. The Facility Efficiency Standards should incorporate the "Envelope Concept" in which square footages are allotted to the school facility construction/reconstruction project as a whole. The school district should be allowed to make decisions regarding the allocation of space based upon its current educational programs and potential future needs. In Abbott districts, the total square foot allotment as legislated can be supplemented by "particularized need" space when adequately documented by the district.

In this manner, flexibility in structure can be maximized and a transformable environment may be achieved within an agreed upon total square footage. Further, this allows for the maximization of educational adequacy and adaptability, as defined by the school district and the local community.

2. The space planning process for Abbott schools should be accomplished "up front." The school district, community and Abbott architects and engineers should work together focusing on the current and future educational and curricular vision of the school district before space is allocated to the schematic design of the project facility.

Such planning sessions should incorporate the thinking of educators, planners, architects, academic specialists, teachers, students and community members. These sessions should incorporate a "Best Practices" models for school design with the particular attention to exemplary models developed around educational programs.

3. The model of choice for design planning should be the "Best Practices" model in which a confluence of those design practices and design outcomes maximize flexibility, transferable environments, adaptability, efficiency, and current and future educational adequacy prevail.

Section #5

ELC's Position on the Use of Facilities Efficiency Standards

By “incorporating” the FES in the LRFPs, the DOE’s regulations require all proposed new construction and rehabilitation of school facility projects to conform to the FES. N.J. Admin. Code 6A: 26-2.1(e). Indeed, districts must seek a waiver from the NJDOE for any proposed project in the LRFP “that does not meet” the FES. Thus, unless clarified, the regulations continue to impose the FES on the districts as a one-size-fits-all, cookie cutter project design standard, contrary to EFCFA. N.J. Stat. Ann. 18A:7G-4h.

Recommendations:

The regulations must be revised to make clear that the FES, as required by EFCFA, only represent the minimum square footage allowance per student necessary to ensure delivery of the state content standards, required Abbott programs and preschool. N.J. Stat. Ann. 18A:7G-4h. Further, the regulations must also specifically reference the explicit prohibition in EFCFA that the FES “shall not be construction design standards,” and that the specific design of a facility project – new school construction and rehabilitation of an existing school – is at the “discretion” of the district, provided the overall space allowance per student meets the FES, as adjusted for particularized need under *Abbott V*. N.J. Stat. Ann. 18A:7G-4h. Such clarifications are necessary not only to ensure compliance with EFCFA, but also with the *Abbott V* requirement that any NJDOE established space requirements serve as “minimum” allowances only, subject to revision based on districts’ particularized needs.