

Fort Bend Independent School District

Facilities Master Plan Update

Approved April 21, 2014

Approved September 21, 2015

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In January 2013, the Board approved Jacobs Engineering to assess the condition and capacity of all FBISD facilities with the end goal of using the data to develop a five-year capital improvement plan. Jacobs Engineering assessment teams visited campuses through July 2013 to gather data and delivered a draft *State of the Schools Report* in December 2013.

In September 2013, the Board approved Population and Survey Analysts (PASA) as the district's demographer to provide refreshed projections to verify the facility recommendations developed through the work of the Steering Committee. PASA delivered the projections in February 2014. Of the 20 recommendations, eight required modifications based on PASA's projections; however, none of the recommendations changed direction significantly as shared during the March 2014 Board Workshop.

In September 2013, FBISD engaged the community in building consensus to do what is best for our students. The community partnered in the planning process through public meetings, the formation and work of a community-based Steering Committee, online video of all community meetings, online questionnaires for community input, and regular status updates to the Board. The demographic and school facility planning firm DeJONG-RICHTER facilitated the planning process and developed draft recommendations for each of the three geographic planning areas. The recommendations consolidate the facility data, cost estimates, capacity estimates, and enrollment projections.

The FBISD administration recommends the adoption of the FBISD Facilities Master Plan to serve as a guide for facilities planning. By adopting the Facilities Master Plan, the Board is neither approving a particular project nor assigning project priorities. Rather, the adoption of the Facilities Master Plan sets in motion the next steps in the planning process which include, but are not limited to the following:

1. Prioritize current facility deficiency, educational adequacy needs, and life cycle investment
2. Identify funding sources required to complete the plan
3. Analyze the timing and sequencing of the construction projects and actions
4. Revise local policy regarding facility utilization
5. Develop procedure to support the execution of FBISD local policy

The Facilities Master Plan serves as a guide for the District's current and future planning based on the continuous review of student enrollment projection data, campus capacity, and facility condition. Recommendations are subject to change if the data indicate the need for revision to a particular recommendation. The recommendation to consider and adopt the FBISD Facilities Master Plan will be made to the FBISD Board during the April 21, 2014 Board Meeting.

Executive Summary Update as of September 21, 2015

This update includes information as of August 31, 2015. Updates to the original plan are denoted by a text box stating the section name and date of the update with the updated information indicated in bold and italicized font.

The Facilities Master Plan was adopted by the Board of Trustees on April 21, 2014. By adopting the plan, the Board did not approve any particular project or action. Rather, the adoption of the Facilities Master Plan set the framework for future planning. Following the adoption of the plan current facility deficiency, educational adequacy, and life-cycle investments were prioritized, a District-wide Feeder Pattern and Boundary Study was conducted, funding sources were identified, timing and sequencing of

the projects and actions were analyzed, and Policy FC (LOCAL) regarding school attendance areas was adopted. Technology and Safety and Security Master Plans were also developed during this time and used to inform the Capital Improvement Plan as addressed in Policy CT (LOCAL).

In accordance with Policy FC (LOCAL), administration will review enrollment projections and actual student enrollment to ensure the District is operating as many schools as possible to desired capacity. District staff will work with the principal of each school to determine whether the school can remain at status quo or whether an alternative student enrollment option should be initiated should the campus utilization fall below 80% or above 120%. Based on this review, if administration determines that alternative student enrollment options are necessary for a school the Superintendent will determine which of the following options should be initiated the following school year:

- *Limit student transfers*
- *Move programs to or from a school*
- *Move temporary classrooms on or off of a campus*
- *Cap enrollment*

Should administration determine additional alternative student enrollment options are necessary for a school, the Superintendent will determine which of the following options should be recommended to the Board.

- *Initiate attendance boundary changes consistent with Policy FC (LOCAL)*
- *Consolidate or close a school*
- *Construct an addition to the school*
- *Construct a new school*

It is the goal of District administration to make a recommendation to the Board by January should one of the above alternatives be deemed appropriate for implementation the following school year. In order to meet this timeline, administration reviews actual student enrollment and enrollment projections throughout the fall semester.

The administration will propose updates to the Facilities Master Plan annually. Updates will include changes resulting from the review of the annual demographic update, actual student enrollment, and/or development issues unique to the District. Administration will recommend the updated Facilities Master Plan to the Board each September.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PROCESS

Community engagement is critical to the success of the planning process. To ensure the highest level of participation, information about the process and community meetings was sent via School Messenger and through campus based communication methods. Additionally, the District provided information about meetings and explained how to participate virtually in the process to the news media, linked to the District's website, and through multiple email distribution lists.

Educational Futures Conference

In September 2013, an Educational Futures Conference was held with more than 1,000 community members attending one of two sessions or watching a video of the conference and providing feedback to

an online questionnaire. During the Educational Futures Conferences, members of the community learned about the Board's Core Beliefs and Commitments and discussed the alignment of FBISD's current and future needs to the Core Beliefs and Commitments. Community members were invited to be a part of the planning process by joining the Steering Committee.

FBISD Steering Committee

The Steering Committee is made up of approximately 100 community members, from the District's three geographic planning areas. From September 2013 through April 2014, seven Steering Committee meetings were held with an approximate 40 to 50 Steering Committee members in attendance representing each of the three planning areas. Steering Committee members reviewed demographic data, feedback from the community, and worked with District leadership to ensure recommendations are accurate, reflective of the desires of the community, and aligned with FBISD's mission: FBISD exists to inspire and equip all students to pursue futures beyond what they can imagine.

Community Dialogue Meetings

The Steering Committee members facilitated two Community Dialogue Meetings. Members of the committee received written and oral feedback from participants, on an individual level and through reaching group consensus to build an Education Framework which guided the planning process during the first Community Dialogue Meetings.

The draft options were presented to the community during the second round of Community Dialogue Meetings. The committee members gathered input from the community about the draft options. The feedback received during this meeting and through the online questionnaire was used to guide the Steering Committee members and district administrators in the process of drafting recommendations for the Board's consideration.

The draft recommendations were presented to the community during the third round of Community Dialogue Meetings. Close to 800 community members attended the information sessions to learn about the recommendations, by planning area, and provide feedback by using a written form or by submitting online through Survey Monkey.

Draft Options and Draft Recommendations Work Sessions

Two Steering Committee members from each planning area were randomly selected through a drawing to participate with district administrators in the draft options and draft recommendations process. During these planning sessions, feedback from the community was reviewed and used as a framework as the team created draft recommendations using enrollment projections, building capacity, historical data, and facility condition for each campus.

DISTRICT-WIDE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Recommendations include new construction, classroom additions, facility deficiencies and life cycle investment, a District-wide Boundary Study and a Feeder Pattern Optimization Study. The recommendations included in the plan will provide relief for over-utilized campuses and allow for future growth.

Deficiency and Life Cycle Investment

Jacobs Engineering conducted a comprehensive facility assessment that included both current deficiencies and building system life cycles. The Facilities Master Plan includes deficiency and current life cycle investment for each campus based on identified needs. As stated in the Jacobs Engineering State of the Schools Facility Report, an example of a life cycle system replacement is a roof with a 20-year life that has been in place for 15 years and may be in need of replacement in five years. An example of a current deficiency is a broken lighting fixture or an inoperable roof top air conditioning unit.

The table below represents the current facility deficiencies and educational adequacy deficiencies, along with the 5-year life cycle renewal forecast projecting future costs by facility type as shared in the Jacobs Engineering *State of the Schools Report*. The amounts below (Table 1) exclude classroom additions and new construction for additional enrollment growth or program expansion. Those costs are contained in Tables 4 and 5.

Table 1: FBISD Facility Deficiencies and Educational Adequacy Deficiencies¹

	Elementary	Middle	High	Alternative	Athletic	Admin	Total
Current Deficiencies	\$ 86,715,640	\$ 57,158,445	\$ 95,182,344	\$ 1,180,623	\$ 6,644,538	\$ 8,116,602	\$254,998,191
Educational Adequacy	\$ 27,057,216	\$ 16,299,155	\$ 20,465,695	\$ 2,332,458	-	-	\$ 66,154,524
5 year life cycle	\$ 51,451,847	\$ 30,474,668	\$ 36,404,516	\$ 1,246,966	\$ 3,148,307	\$ 4,913,676	\$127,639,980
Total	\$165,224,703	\$103,932,268	\$152,052,555	\$ 4,760,046	\$ 9,792,845	\$13,030,278	\$448,792,695

The current deficiencies and educational adequacies from Table 1 are listed by the following priorities in the table below and do not directly align with the deficiency and life cycle investments in the draft recommendation documents as the information in this proposal is comprehensive based on the Jacob's report.

Priority 1: Mission Critical Concerns - Deficiencies or conditions that may directly affect the schools' ability to remain open or deliver the educational curriculum.

Priority 2: Indirect Impact to Educational Mission - Items that may progress to a Priority 1 if not addressed in the near term.

Priority 3: Short-Term Conditions - Repairs that are necessary to the mission of the school, but may not require immediate attention. These items should be considered necessary improvements requiring incorporation in order to maximize efficiency and usefulness of the facility.

Priority 4: Long-Term Requirements - Items or systems which are likely to require attention within the next five years or would be considered an improvement to the instructional environment. The improvements may be aesthetic or may provide greater functionality.

Priority 5: Enhancements - These items are deficiencies that are aesthetic in nature or are considered enhancements.

¹ Totals that appear to differ from the sum of associated columns or rows are the result of rounding.

Table 2: FBISD Building System Deficiencies by Priority Level²

Building System	Priority 1	Priority 2	Priority 3	Priority 4	Priority 5	Total
Site	\$ 340,155	\$ 549,639	\$ 6,419,322	\$ 3,471,576	\$ 4,121,922	\$ 14,902,615
Roofing	\$ 23,943,401	\$ 3,000,647	\$ 6,135,059	\$ 376,953	\$ 21,246	\$ 33,477,305
Exterior	\$ 10,067	\$ 3,988,403	\$ 2,211,675	\$ 491,540	\$ 1,475,468	\$ 8,177,152
Structure	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,630,769	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,630,769
Interior	\$ 35,023	\$ 2,058,861	\$ 43,430,444	\$ 2,201,401	\$ 13,133,753	\$ 60,859,481
HVAC	\$ -	\$ 75,570,932	\$ 23,479,258	\$ 3,527,591	\$ 1,350,292	\$103,928,073
Plumbing	\$ 827,128	\$ 124,610	\$ 14,676,576	\$ 4,442,590	\$ 7,605,224	\$ 27,676,177
Electrical	\$ 1,658,968	\$ 8,515,538	\$ 3,912,249	\$ 1,735,053	\$ 6,795,680	\$ 22,617,488
Technology	\$ -	\$ 5,397,378	\$ -	\$ 28,780	\$ 6,376,519	\$ 11,802,677
Fire and Life Safety	\$ 1,178,519	\$ 1,339,650	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,518,169
Conveyances	\$ 40,096	\$ 248,577	\$ 2,207,872	\$ 56,323	\$ 856	\$ 2,553,724
Specialties	\$ 1,217,062	\$ 2,149,125	\$ 11,168,614	\$ 4,497,589	\$ 10,976,696	\$ 30,009,085
Total	\$ 29,250,469	\$ 102,943,359	\$ 116,271,838	\$ 20,829,397	\$ 51,857,654	\$ 321,152,715

The life cycle data obtained during the facility condition assessment categorized by building system is shown in the table below in order of the year needed and do not directly align with the deficiency and life cycle investments in the draft recommendation documents as the information in this proposal is comprehensive based on the Jacob's report.

Table 3: FBISD 5-year Life Cycle Forecast by Building System³

Building System	Year 1 2014	Year 2 2015	Year 3 2016	Year 4 2017	Year 5 2018	Total
Site	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 43,875	\$ 1,377,900	\$ 530,190	\$ 1,951,965
Roofing	\$ 1,613,242	\$ 101,098	\$ 3,457,500	\$ 127,209	\$16,345,369	\$ 21,644,419
Exterior	\$ 573,697	\$ 200,994	\$ 1,347,239	\$ 260,319	\$ 1,194,125	\$ 3,576,374
Interior	\$ 53,917	\$ 13,251,681	\$ 5,848,841	\$ 39,540,201	\$ 4,156,878	\$ 62,851,518
HVAC	\$ 1,977,939	\$ 6,996,014	\$ 3,153,401	\$ 5,502,414	\$ 7,601,914	\$ 25,231,682
Electrical	\$ 25,840	\$ 439,080	\$ 198,120	\$ 974,225	\$ 5,568,724	\$ 7,205,989
Plumbing	\$ -	\$ 29,475	\$ 86,211	\$ 1,260,331	\$ 19,896	\$ 1,395,913
Fire and Life Safety	\$ -	\$ 23,112	\$ 2,196,884	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,219,996
Technology	\$ -	\$ 8,392	\$ 2,592	\$ 801,157	\$ 7,704	\$ 819,845
Conveyances	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 90,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 90,000
Specialties	\$ 135,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 517,280	\$ 652,280
Total	\$ 4,379,635	\$ 21,049,847	\$ 16,424,663	\$ 49,843,755	\$35,942,081	\$127,639,981

Deficiency and Life Cycle Investment Update as of September 21, 2015

Information from the 2014 Facilities Master Plan was used to develop the Capital Improvement Plan. The 2014 Bond reflects Educational Adequacy Deficiencies and Current Facility Deficiencies from Priorities 1 and 2 on Table 2 and Facility Life-Cycle Needs covering Year 1 and 2 indicated on Table 3.

The total 2014 Bond amounts for these categories differ due to items that were purposely removed by staff during the data validation process and the addition of selected year three items. For example, during the Facilities Study, Jacobs Engineering indicated the need for roofing replacement at various campuses. Staff reviewed and determined the square footage used for the estimate was reflective of the

² & ³ Totals that appear to differ from the sum of associated columns or rows are the result of rounding.

square footage of the entire facility and not just the area of the roof. In this example, roof estimates for two story buildings were adjusted accordingly. Additionally, items that were completed by maintenance staff were removed from the total.

The Capital Improvement Plan includes the 2014 Bond and non-Bond funding for Deficiency and Life Cycle Deficiency costs as indicated in the table below.

Projects	Approved 2014 Bond	Other Capital Funds	General Funds (Items <\$5K)	Phase 1 Total
Current Facility Deficiencies	\$113,869,021		\$277,545	\$114,146,566
Educational Adequacy Deficiencies	\$3,826,189		\$72,139	\$3,898,328
Facility Life-Cycle Needs	\$25,336,856		\$98,582	\$25,435,438

New Construction

Based on the work of the Steering Committee, the construction of nine elementary schools and two middle schools is recommended. Although the construction of a new high school is not included in this proposal because the need is outside of the current planning period, it is anticipated to be required soon after. Therefore, the District recommends a study for land acquisition. The recommended new construction is listed below in order of the year needed and is based on projected student enrollment data and the current permanent capacity of existing buildings.

Estimated cost of new construction includes, but is not limited to, construction, project contingency, furniture, fixtures, and equipment (FFE), temporary housing and security, professional services and a 24 month construction inflation factor. The cost of land acquisition is not included in the estimated cost and final cost will be determined as each project is developed.

Table 4: FBISD Recommended New Construction

School	Location	Estimated Year Needed	Planning Area	Comments	Estimated Cost
Elementary 46	Aliana	2015-16	A	To address over-utilization at Oakland	\$ 25,330,510
Elementary 47	Riverstone	2015-16	B	To address over-utilization at Commonwealth	\$ 35,760,720
Elementary 48	TBD	2015-16	C	To address growth in Schiff area	\$ 25,330,510
Elementary 49	TBD	2016-17	A	To address growth in area west and south of Aliana	\$ 25,330,510
Middle School 15	TBD	2017-18	C	To address over-utilization at Baines	\$ 44,923,200
Elementary 50	TBD	2017-18	A	To address growth in Grand Mission/Vista area	\$ 25,330,510
Elementary 51	TBD	2019-20	C	To address growth in area south of Aliana	\$ 25,330,510
Elementary 52	TBD	2019-20	A	To address growth in Sienna Plantation area	\$ 25,330,510
Elementary 53	TBD	2020-21	A	To address growth in Grand Mission/Vista area	\$ 25,330,510
Elementary 54	TBD	2020-21	C	To address growth in Fort Bend Toll Way Corridor	\$ 25,330,510
Middle School 16	TBD	TBD	C	To address growth after construction of MS 15	\$ 44,923,200
TOTAL					\$328,251,200

New Construction Update as of September 21, 2015

The table below provides updates to Table 4 based on the results of the District-wide Feeder Pattern and Boundary Study and updated projected enrollment provided by PASA in April 2015. Changes from Table 4 are noted in bold and italics in the following table.

Updated Table 4: FBISD Recommended New Construction

School	Location	Estimated Year Needed	Planning Area	Comments	Estimated Cost
Elementary 47	Riverstone	2016-17	B	To address over-utilization at Commonwealth	\$ 35,760,720
Elementary 48	<i>Sienna Plantation</i>	2017-18	C	To address growth in <i>Sienna Plantation</i>	\$ 25,330,510
Elementary 49	<i>Harvest Green</i>	2017-18	A	To address growth in area west and south of Aliana <i>including over-utilization at Oakland</i>	\$ 25,330,510
Middle School 15	<i>Sienna Plantation</i>	2017-18	C	To address over-utilization at Baines <i>and First Colony MS</i>	\$ 44,923,200
Elementary 50	<i>Grand Vista</i>	2017-18	A	To address growth in Grand Mission/Vista area	\$ 25,330,510
Elementary 51	<i>South Aliana</i>	2019-20	C	To address growth in area south of Aliana	\$ 25,330,510
Elementary 52	<i>Sienna Plantation</i>	2023-24	A	To address growth in Sienna Plantation area	\$ 25,330,510
Elementary 53	<i>Northwest</i>	2023-24	A	To address growth in Grand Mission/Vista area	\$ 25,330,510
Elementary 54	<i>Fort Bend Toll Way Corridor</i>	2024-25	C	To address growth in Fort Bend Toll Way Corridor	\$ 25,330,510
TOTAL					\$ 257,997,490

The 2014 Bond budget is based on the Facilities Master Plan adopted by the Board in April 2014 and provides for 850 seat elementary schools and 1,200 seat middle schools. However, during the Feeder Pattern/Boundary planning process, it was discussed that future elementary schools should be built with a capacity of 1,000 students and future middle schools should accommodate 1,400 students.

The Board approved the attendance boundaries and feeder patterns based on the moderate growth scenario; however, the decline in oil prices gave staff cause to consider the campus utilization rates at the low growth scenario. Using the low growth scenario, ES 48, 49 and 50 will suffice for the next five years if built for 850 student capacity, and MS 15 will be adequate if built for 1,200 students.

Staff believes that it would be prudent to design schools that are comfortably expandable and able to support future growth. The core elements of the school, such as the cafeteria, library, administration, and parking areas, could be designed and built for 1,000 elementary school students and 1,400 middle school students. The footprint of the additional classrooms would be designated on the plan so that no utilities or other site features would be located in that future-use area.

Based on the low growth scenario provided by PASA, the following table shows the utilization rates for the 850 student elementary campuses and the 1,200 student middle school campus through the year 2021 based on theoretical boundaries. Theoretical boundaries represent possible boundaries noted in the District-wide Feeder Pattern and Boundary Plan as possible attendance boundaries for future

consideration provided that enrollment projections and actual student enrollment continue in the expected direction. It is important to note that any future boundary recommendation will require community engagement and approval by the FBISD Board of Trustees.

Campus Capacities Based on Low Growth Scenario

School	Location	Student Capacity	Utilization 2017-18	Utilization 2018-19	Utilization 2019-20	Utilization 2020-21
ES 48	Sienna Plantation	850	53%	63%	70%	81%
ES 49	Harvest Green	850	70%	82%	93%	102%
ES 50	Grand Vista	850	39%	45%	50%	55%
MS 15	Sienna Plantation	1200	54%	58%	62%	68%

The tables below contain PASA's utilization rates at neighboring campuses if the recommended opening dates are not met. The utilization rate is underlined and in bold font for ES 48, 49, and 50 in the year that administration recommends opening each campus. These tables reflect the Low Growth Scenario. The alternate boundaries for ES 50, suggested by PASA, are noted in the table below and explained on the following page.

	School	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Schools Impacted by ES 48 under Theoretical Boundaries	Heritage Rose	86%	87%	89%	91%
	Scanlan Oaks	100%	101%	102%	104%
	Schiff	108%	109%	110%	109%
	Sienna Crossing	92%	94%	96%	98%
	ES 48 (cap = 850)	<u>53%</u>	63%	70%	81%
If ES 48 <u>IS NOT</u> opened	Heritage Rose	127%	139%	150%	163%
	Scanlan Oaks	97%	96%	96%	95%
	Schiff	122%	125%	129%	130%
	Sienna Crossing	86%	85%	85%	84%

	School	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Schools Impacted by ES 49 under Theoretical Boundaries	Oakland	89%	90%	91%	92%
	Pecan Grove	102%	101%	101%	100%
	ES 49 (cap = 850)	<u>70%</u>	82%	93%	102%
If ES 49 <u>IS NOT</u> opened	Oakland	161%	172%	183%	191%
	Pecan Grove	108%	111%	114%	117%

	School	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Schools Impacted by ES 50 under Theoretical Boundaries	Seguin	92%	98%	103%	107%
	Jordan	133%	137%	140%	142%
	ES 50 (cap = 850)	39%	45%	50%	55%
Schools Impacted by ES 50 under Alternate Boundaries	Seguin	92%	98%	103%	107%
	Jordan	95%	94%	95%	95%
	ES 50 (cap = 850)	<u>75%</u>	86%	93%	100%
If ES 50 <u>IS NOT</u> opened	Seguin	143%	157%	169%	180%
	Jordan	133%	137%	140%	142%

	School	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Schools Impacted by MS 15 under Theoretical Boundaries	Baines	97%	98%	99%	101%
	First Colony	81%	81%	82%	82%
	MS 15 (cap = 1200)	<u>54%</u>	58%	62%	68%
If MS 15 <u>IS NOT</u> opened	Baines	113%	117%	121%	127%
	First Colony	114%	115%	116%	116%

Based on clarification provided by PASA, the district's demographer, regarding the timing of ES 50 it is important to note that the theoretical boundaries for ES 50 pull students only from Seguin, but NOT from Jordan (despite the overcrowding at Jordan), and show ES 50 opening underutilized. It is PASA's opinion that ES 50 is in fact needed in 2017, but should pull students from Seguin AND Jordan. Information is included in the preceding tables with the projections under both the 'theoretical boundaries' from the Feeder Pattern and Boundary Plan as well as 'alternate boundaries' which represent PASA's suggested boundaries.

Based on the April 2015 student enrollment projections, actual student enrollment as of September 1, 2015, and the low growth scenario, staff recommends the following school opening dates and campus capacities for the respective new school construction projects. Consideration was given to scheduling MS 15 for a fall 2018 opening due to concerns about projected utilization if the school were to open in fall 2017. However, after extensive discussion with the Board at the September 14, 2015 Board Workshop, the recommendation is to open the school during the 2017-18 school year due to the historically volatile nature and unique development characteristics of the Sienna Plantation master planned community. Due to the timing of this decision and planned construction schedule, it is possible the school could open during the 2017-18 school year and not in August 2017.

Campus	Recommendation
ES 48	Open August 2017, design building core for 1000 students; build classrooms for 850 students
ES 49	Open August 2017, design building core for 1000 students; build classrooms for 850 students
ES 50	Open August 2017, design building core for 1000 students; build classrooms for 850 students, consider filling the school with students from Seguin <u>and</u> Jordan ES
MS 15	Open 2017-18 school year, building core is already designed for 1450 students; build classrooms for 1200 students

District-Wide Career and Technology Education (CTE) Center

After the second Community Dialogue meeting and during the Recommendations work session, two Steering Committee members from each planning area met with district administrators and consultants from Jacobs Engineering and DeJONG-RICHTER. During this work session, the team discussed the continued growth of the district, the need for future additional space at the high school level, the strong desire of the community to have enhanced partnerships with local businesses, and career exploration opportunities for students. Based on these expressed need and discussion with the Steering Committee, a District-wide Career and Technical Education (CTE) Center is recommended to be constructed at a site to be determined. The estimated cost to construct the District-wide CTE Center is \$ 46,000,000. Due to implementation of *House Bill 5* (HB5) and the needs expressed during the community engagement process, the District may consider the addition of a second CTE Center. This could include repurposing Lake Olympia Middle School by moving the Tech Ed Center, presently located on the Dulles High School Campus, to the Lake Olympia site.

Lake Olympia Middle School currently serves students from several different neighborhoods making it difficult for students and parents to become a part of the school culture. A broader community discussion around the possibility of repurposing the school will engage the community about how to best serve the middle school students while increasing participation and programming in CTE courses.

District-Wide Career and Technology Education (CTE) Center Update as of September 21, 2015

In the fall of 2014, all high school campus CTE spaces were reviewed by district staff to determine facility utilization in order to determine available space for growth in the CTE programming. Through the Spring and Summer of 2015, District administration conducted the following actions as part of the CTE review process:

- *Commissioned Region IV Educational Service Center (ESC) to complete an asset inventory and facility review in order to provide feedback and recommendations to the District.*
- *Established an internal task force comprised of representatives from campus administration, College Career Readiness (CCR), facilities, CTE teachers, curriculum and instruction, and the Deputy Superintendent*
- *Conducted multiple task force meetings during the spring of 2015 to review workforce needs and projections, TEA TEKS updates, and student interests in order to make recommendations for CTE program delivery options in Fort Bend ISD*
- *Convened the CTE Business Advisory Committee to offer suggestions and recommendations for consideration.*

Beginning in September 2015, administration will present several options for the Board's discussion with the intention to bring a recommended educational plan and related facilities needs for consideration in December 2015.

Campus Additions

Based on the work of the Steering Committee, 14 campus additions are recommended to relieve over-utilization or increase net capacity on existing campuses through 2018-2019. The recommended campus additions are listed below in order of the year needed and is based on projected student enrollment and the current permanent capacity of each campus.

Estimated cost of additions includes, but is not limited to, construction, project contingency, furniture, fixtures, and equipment (FFE), temporary housing and security, professional services and a 24 month construction inflation factor.

Table 5: FBISD Recommended Additions

School	Location	Year Needed	Planning Area	Comments	Estimated Cost
Holley ES	Current Site	2015-16	A	10 classrooms to relieve over-utilization	\$ 2,616,000
Oyster Creek ES	Current Site	2015-16	A	10 classrooms to relieve over-utilization	\$ 2,616,000
Cornerstone ES	Current Site	2015-16	A	12 classrooms to relieve over-utilization	\$ 3,139,200
Sugar Mill ES	Current Site	2015-16	B	4 classrooms to relieve over-utilization	\$ 1,046,400
First Colony MS	Current Site	2015-16	B	8 classrooms to relieve over-utilization	\$ 2,092,800
Scanlan Oaks ES	Current Site	2015-16	C	10 classrooms to relieve over-utilization	\$ 2,616,000
Schiff ES	Current Site	2015-16	C	10 classrooms to relieve over-utilization	\$ 2,616,000
Sienna Crossing ES	Current Site	2015-16	C	10 classrooms to relieve over-utilization	\$ 2,616,000
Palmer ES	Current Site	2016-17	B	10 classrooms to relieve over-utilization	\$ 2,616,000
Elkins HS	Current Site	2017-18	B	10 classrooms to relieve over-utilization	\$ 2,616,000
Austin HS	Current Site	2018-19	A	10 classrooms to relieve over-utilization	\$ 2,616,000
Travis HS	Current Site	2018-19	A	10 classrooms to relieve over-utilization	\$ 2,616,000
Townewest ES	Current Site	2018-19	B	6 classrooms to relieve over-utilization	\$ 1,569,600
Lakeview ES	Current Site	2018-19	B	Reno/Demo/New for net capacity of 700	\$ 10,800,000
TOTAL					\$ 42,192,000

Campus Additions Update as of September 21, 2015

The 2014 Bond includes funding for nine building additions at Cornerstone, Holley, Oyster Creek, Scanlan Oaks, Palmer, Schiff, Sienna Crossing, Sugar Mill, and First Colony Middle School. Based on the April 2015 PASA projections and the District-wide Feeder Pattern and Attendance Boundary recommendations, the additions at Sugar Mill, Palmer, Townewest, and First Colony are not recommended in the next five years. The table on the next page contains updated information with changes from Table 5 denoted in bold and italicized font.

It is important to note that the need for classroom additions is eliminated in some instances and postponed in others due to the balance in enrollment created through the feeder pattern alignment process and approved attendance boundaries. Although the need for classroom additions was established for the 2015-16 school year the classroom additions will not be completed until the Spring of 2017 at Holley, Oyster Creek, Cornerstone, Scanlan Oaks, Schiff and Sienna Crossing per the 2014 Bond Master Schedule .

Updated Table 5: FBISD Recommended Additions

School	Location	Year Needed	Planning Area	Comments	Estimated Cost
Holley ES	Current Site	2015-16	A	10 classrooms to relieve over-utilization	\$ 2,616,000
Oyster Creek ES	Current Site	2015-16	A	10 classrooms to relieve over-utilization	\$ 2,616,000
Cornerstone ES	Current Site	2015-16	A	12 classrooms to relieve over-utilization	\$ 3,139,200
Sugar Mill ES	Current Site	<i>Not recommended</i>	B	<i>Feeder pattern realignment eliminated the need for this addition</i>	\$ 1,046,400
First Colony MS	Current Site	<i>Not recommended</i>	B	<i>Feeder pattern realignment eliminated the need for this addition</i>	\$ 2,092,800
Scanlan Oaks ES	Current Site	2015-16	C	10 classrooms to relieve over-utilization	\$ 2,616,000
Schiff ES	Current Site	2015-16	C	10 classrooms to relieve over-utilization	\$ 2,616,000
Sienna Crossing ES	Current Site	2015-16	C	10 classrooms to relieve over-utilization	\$ 2,616,000
Palmer ES	Current Site	<i>Not recommended</i>	B	<i>Feeder pattern realignment eliminated the need for this addition</i>	\$ 2,616,000
Elkins HS	Current Site	<i>Date to be based on further study</i>	B	<i>Feeder pattern realignment postponed the need for this addition</i>	\$ 2,616,000
Austin HS	Current Site	<i>Date to be based on further study</i>	A	<i>Feeder pattern realignment postponed the need for this addition</i>	\$ 2,616,000
Travis HS	Current Site	<i>Date to be based on further study</i>	A	<i>Feeder pattern realignment postponed the need for this addition</i>	\$ 2,616,000
Townewest ES	Current Site	<i>Not recommended</i>	B	<i>Feeder pattern realignment eliminated the need for this addition</i>	\$ 1,569,600
Lakeview ES	Current Site	<i>Date to be based on further study</i>	B	Reno/Demo/New for net capacity of 700; <i>potential future bond project</i>	\$ 10,800,000
Total					\$ 42,192,000

DISTRICT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

District local policy and administrative procedures will be reviewed, revised, and created, as needed, to address student participation in instructional programs not located on their home campus, building use and capacity, attendance boundaries, and rezoning.

Instructional Programs

Policy and supporting administrative procedures will be developed to address increasing or decreasing enrollment at a campus, or in a specific program. The process will include engagement with the appropriate District and campus staff and the community to determine whether the school or program can remain at status quo or if alternatives should be considered.

The criteria for determining status shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- a) Welfare, health and safety of students and staff
- b) Impact on the overall facility
- c) Schedule for planned future renovations or replacement of facility
- d) Current classroom utilization and programs such as Head Start, academies, kindergarten and pre-kindergarten, programs for LEP students, and special education students at the school

Instructional Programs Update as of September 21, 2015

The adoption of the Facilities Master Plan set in motion the next steps in the planning process, including the Board's development and adoption of FBISD Policy FC (LOCAL) in August 2014. The policy serves as the foundation for the feeder pattern and attendance boundary recommendations. The policy was approved to ensure that the Board upholds the District's primary responsibility to provide school facilities that address changing enrollment patterns and that sustain high quality education programs.

In Policy FC (LOCAL), the Board commits to distribute programs, design boundary and feeder patterns, and employ alternative student enrollment options in a manner that best utilizes District facilities and meets students' needs. The policy states that the purpose of establishing attendance areas shall be to:

- *Maintain the neighborhood concept;*
- *prevent and eliminate overcrowding;*
- *allow for future growth;*
- *keep distances traveled by students as short as possible;*
- *minimize the need for student transportation; and*
- *allow campuses to house students safely and provide adequate services to all students.*

The Global Studies Academy, previously located at Clements HS, and the International Business and Marketing Academy, previously located at Bush HS, were both relocated to Travis HS for the 2015-16 school year. In both instances, incoming 9th grade students entered the academy at Travis HS and incoming 10th, 11th, and 12th grade academy students continue to attend the academy at the previous campus through graduation.

Future Boundary Study

Policy and supporting administrative procedures will be reviewed and revised to support a future Boundary Study, engaging the community, to begin in the fall of 2014. There are no rezoning or boundary changes for the 2014-2015 school year. Any new construction or added seats to a campus will necessitate boundary changes in addition to the possible boundary changes identified by the Steering Committee for future consideration to address fast growth or declining enrollment. The possible boundary changes, not related to new construction, are listed below for the Board's review; however, review does not imply the approval of the possibilities that are listed.

Table 6: FBISD Possible Boundary Changes

School From/School To	Planning Area(s)	Comments
Walker Station to Brazos Bend	A	Rezone Walker Station West of Grand Parkway to Brazos Bend
Colony Meadows to Walker Station	B,A	Rezone Colony Meadows North of I69 (Hwy 59) to Walker Station
Kempner to Austin	B,A	Rezone Cornerstone to Austin High School, Cornerstone will continue to feed Sartartia MS
Colony Meadows to Colony Bend	B	Rezone Foundations Lexington at Austin Parkway
Colony Meadows to Commonwealth	B	Rezone Avalon @ Telfair
Lakeview to Colony Meadows	B	Rezone disconnected boundary (The Triangle)
Schiff to Heritage Rose	C	Rezone Schiff to Heritage Rose

Future Boundary Study Update as of September 21, 2015

The District conducted a District-wide Feeder Pattern and Attendance Boundary study during the 2014-15 school year resulting in the Board of Trustees' adoption of new attendance boundaries and feeder pattern alignment in January 2015. The approved attendance boundaries include the boundaries for both Madden Elementary (ES 46) and Sullivan Elementary (ES 47). The future boundaries for ES 48, 49, 50, and MS 15 will require future study and community engagement before administration makes a recommendation to the Board.

Key boundary changes noted in Table 6 did occur along with other changes that are memorialized in the District-wide Feeder Pattern and Boundary Plan located on the District website under Planning for Our Future.

The Board approved a resolution that governed the implementation of the approved school boundaries and included the "grandfathering" of students at certain grade levels as well as the provision of district transportation during the implementation. This allowed incoming fifth and eighth grade students to remain at their current campus, provided the campus was not over 120% utilization. It also allowed incoming tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grade students to continue at their current high school campus through graduation with transportation provided. Incoming ninth grade students were rezoned to the new high school campus unless they have an older sibling in which case they could apply to attend the campus with their sibling through graduation. Students who chose to attend high school with an older sibling will be provided transportation until the older sibling is no longer attending the campus.

Administration will engage with the community, as directed in Policy FC (LOCAL), in the Fall of 2016 to establish attendance boundaries for the opening of new schools, review and analyze theoretical boundaries, and assess the need for boundary changes due to additions at identified elementary schools.

Feeder Pattern Optimization Study

During the recommendations work session, community feedback regarding the desire to improve feeder patterns was discussed. It became apparent, from the written and oral community feedback, that there is a desire to improve feeder pattern alignment district-wide. Policy and administrative procedures will be developed to govern the process for a district-wide feeder pattern optimization study which is recommended to take place with community engagement beginning in the fall of 2014.

Feeder Pattern Optimization Study Update as of September 21, 2015

As referenced in the Future Boundary Study Update section above, a feeder pattern optimization study was conducted resulting in the District-wide Feeder Pattern structure which was approved by the Board of Trustees in January 2015. The feeder pattern structure includes approved boundaries as well as future theoretical boundaries and can be found in the District-Wide Feeder Pattern and Boundary Plan located on the District website under Planning for Our Future.

The approved feeder pattern structure created aligned pathways from elementary through high school, to the greatest extent possible. The new feeder pattern structure resulted in a decrease in the number of feeder pattern splits for the 2015-16 school year. Administration anticipates the continued decrease in the number of feeder pattern splits as the district implements new boundaries associated with the opening of future schools beginning in the 2017-18 school year.

FUTURE COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Community engagement is a vital part of planning and developing effective procedures and policy. The district will develop local policy and supporting procedures to govern the community engagement process. The engagement process will serve as the District model for reviewing high profile academic programs and support services to ensure maximum awareness and input from the public prior to changing and implementing a new policy, procedure, process or plan. The process may also be used where applicable to develop actions in support of the District Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives and the Master Facilities Plan.

Community Engagement Implementation

The Superintendent is responsible for implementing a procedure that codifies the process that engages local community members, school staff and parents through participation in working groups assigned to review issues and develop options for further consideration. The Superintendent shall report progress to the Board on a regular basis as part of the Board's responsibility for management oversight that ensures effective and efficient public service.

Community Engagement Process

The purpose of the working group, such as the Steering Committee in the District's Strategic Planning Process, is to focus on an issue in detail, review all data and other factors, and then develop and present

options for review in a larger community meeting. The working group will finalize a set of options to be presented to District leadership. Working groups will be formed with broad membership to represent all schools involved in any review or scenario which will capture the unique geographic and demographic factors that may exist. Membership is open to parents, school staff, members of the community and supporting organizations. Working groups will be provided training in this process and will meet on a regular basis in open public meetings.

This recommended process will support open, transparent communication with the public on critical and highly sensitive issues. Working as a team, the working group will review data, history and facts in developing options. The following are key aspects of the community engagement process:

1. The School District will be analyzed by region
2. Geographic planning areas will be established considering
 - a. Facilities master planning areas
 - b. Local government jurisdictions
 - c. Existing neighborhood integrity
 - d. Natural boundaries such as waterways and major thoroughfares
 - e. Other criteria related to the specific issue

For each program or project designated for review through this recommended process, each affected group or organization will establish a local working group (or District wide group) comprised of parents, school staff, students, school organizations, local community members, civic organizations, and business owners. Working groups will be supported by District staff that provides data and advice as needed. Consultant assistance may be provided by the District to maximize the value of the community process.

Working groups will use a repeatable decision making approach to develop and rank possible options in order of preference. All developed options will be provided to the Superintendent for consideration as possible recommendations to be submitted to the Board of Trustees. Leadership will provide updates on the community process in Board workshops, regular Board meetings and via the District website.

Ultimately, the Superintendent will present final recommendations to the Board of Trustees for review and discussion prior to a final decision.

Community Engagement Update as of September 21, 2015

The engagement process guided by Policy FC (LOCAL) serves as the District model for reviewing future adjustments to the District-wide Feeder Patterns or attendance boundaries on a scheduled basis as outlined in policy. This continued review of feeder patterns and boundaries with community input is essential in order to manage student enrollment to ensure maximum awareness and input from the public prior to determining alternative student enrollment options such as initiating attendance boundary changes, consolidating or closing a school, constructing an addition to a school, or constructing a new school in the future.

Community engagement on attendance boundaries for new elementary or middle schools will be conducted during the fall prior to the scheduled opening of a campus. For new high schools, process will take place during the fall two years prior to the scheduled campus opening. When building additions or other construction designed to expand a school's capacity are planned, community

engagement will occur during the fall prior to the scheduled opening of the newly constructed learning spaces. Recommendations resulting from the community engagement and boundary change process will be presented to the Board in January for implementation the next school year. This timeline has been designed to allow parents and students ample time to receive communication and respond to any recommended changes.