

**GARRETT COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
STRATEGIC FACILITIES COMMITTEE**

**FACILITY RECOMMENDATIONS: CAPITAL PROJECTS AND OTHER
ACTIONS**

Supplements to the Committee Report

November , 2019

DRAFT

**GARRETT COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
FACILITIES STRATEGIC PLAN**

**Strategic Facilities Committee
Facility Recommendations: Capital Projects and Other Actions
Supplements to the Committee Report**

November 11, 2019

Supplement 1: Strategic Facilities Committee Research Subcommittee Reports

I.	Alternative Education (Disruptive Behaviors) Subcommittee	S-1
II.	Grade Band Research Subcommittee	S-6
III.	Community School Research Subcommittee	S-8
IV.	Single High School/CTE Programs Subcommittee	S-19

Supplement 2: Project Cost Calculations

General Notes	S-29
Assumptions for All Projects	S-29
Additional Assumptions for the Southern Middle/Broad Ford Elementary Project	S-30
Cost Estimates:	
Recommendation I.A - Security Vestibule	S-32
Recommendation I.C - Building Systems	S-33
Recommendation I.D - Open Space Pod Conversion	S-35
Recommendation IV.A - Southern Middle/Broad Ford Elementary Project	S-36
Recommendation IV.C.a - Head Start	S-37
Recommendation IV.C.b.1 - Crellin Elementary School	S-38
Recommendation IV.D - Relocate Board of Education Office	S-39

SUPPLEMENT 1: STRATEGIC FACILITIES COMMITTEE RESEARCH SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

This document provides the research undertaken by four subcommittees of the Strategic Facilities Committee between April and July, 2019. The reports of the subcommittees are included here verbatim as written by each team of researchers, with only the formatting altered for the sake of consistency.

I. ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION (DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIORS) SUBCOMMITTEE

June 25, 2019

Subcommittee Members:

Crystal Boal	Parent (Southern area)
Jennifer Paugh	Advocate for Students with Disabilities
Tracie Miller	Principal, Grantsville Elementary School
William Swift	Director of Facilities, Maintenance, Operations, & Security

Garrett County Public School Staff:

Phil Lauver	Supervisor of Pupil Services
Karen Brewer	Secretary, Superintendent's Office

Abstract

The objective of the Alternative Education (Disruptive Behaviors) Sub Committee was centered around the focus and research of exploring best practices that have emerged in Maryland and other parts of the country. This research was completed through walk through programs (STARS), teacher/staff surveys, Board of Education suspension data, medical research and articles. The principal findings suggest that an alternative program is more beneficial than an alternative facility.

Introduction

A voluntary survey was initiated on June 12, 2019 at all 12 school facilities. The intent of the survey was to allow the Alternative Education (Disruptive Behaviors) Sub Committee to understand classroom dynamics as far as behavior. The survey contained 10 questions and participants were encouraged to write additional comments. From this survey it was gathered that Garrett County schools are in need of a behavioral program and/or placement for students at all levels (elementary, middle, high). See Table 1

Garrett County suspension data was also analyzed. From this data the findings also support a need for a behavioral program and/or placement for students at all levels, with a stronger consideration at the middle and high level. See Table 2

Objectives of the Research

The findings will be used to effectively address the needs of disruptive students, while maintaining an orderly school environment that allows other children to go about their educational tasks. If the findings indicate the need for renovations to provide specialized spaces in schools, these will be considered by the Strategic Facilities Committee (SFC) in developing recommendations for the Board of Education to consider.

Research Methodology

Committee members visited the STARS behavioral program at Broad Ford Elementary School. From this visit it was obtained that the program focus is to address individual needs of students and prepare them with the skills needed to return to their individual "home school" setting. It was also gathered that more resources are needed for students to be successful once returning to the home school.

Online research was conducted to find a school system that has an established alternative program and

an alternative placement. Two areas were looked at across Maryland: Charles County and Washington County.

John Hopkins University research, Ohio State University research, and American Institutes for Research were looked at to find best practices for managing disruptive behaviors. Each of these provided examples of the type of programming and strategies that districts should consider in planning for ALL students within their regular education program. These approaches will ensure compliance with state and federal laws.

Findings

From the survey findings, one may obtain that student behaviors are increasing in intensity and are disruptive to the learning environment at all levels (elementary, middle, high). Also from the survey findings, according to the teaching staff, the rise of disruptive behaviors comes in part from lack of support staff and a lack of support from the central office, as well as factors outside of the school environment. We are still in the process of breaking down comments from each school and have asked and received suspension data from the previous year, given that there were 3 schools that had zero suspensions last year. The survey and comments from those three schools reflected there were behavior problems and disruptive behavior that would warrant suspensions. Staff also led us to believe that the current discipline policy needs to be revised for our area.

From the John Hopkins University, Ohio State University and American Institutes for Research findings, best practices for managing disruptive behaviors centered around causes, consequences, and solutions. Each research area focused around the need for trauma sensitive schools with more intensive resources (mental health providers, counselors, behavior support, and specialists on site at each school daily). The research warrants that classroom teachers and administrators may not be specialty trained for the type of behavioral/mental needs that students are presenting in the schools today. Furthermore, the research (e.g. John Hopkins Urban Health Institute Social Determinants of Health #SDH2015, pg. 5) presents the following challenges and recommendations.

Challenges:

- The poorest children in the country, and their parents, are under chronic stress, due to persistent poverty, exposure to violence, discrimination and the lack of resources available to their communities.
- Parents are often unable to meet the needs of their children, despite a willingness and desire to do so. Schools can play a critical role in supporting and education them.
- Half of all children do not attend preschool and receive no early education, leaving them unprepared for the demands of school, and in particular, for the testing environment of today's schools.
- Trauma is common, but manifests differently in each child. It is equally likely for a student to use perfectionism to cope with trauma as it is for the child to be disruptive. Many children who desperately need treatment for trauma will not receive it, because their teachers are not trained to recognize it.
- Unidentified, untreated trauma has lifelong consequences for physical and mental health, as well as for the ability of students to achieve their full potential.
- Children are re-traumatized in environments that punish them for behaviors that stem from traumatic experiences.
- Obsessive testing models lead to stress for students and teachers and eliminate opportunities to strengthen the teacher-student bond and to allow students to share their stories.

Recommendations:

- Provide preschool and early education opportunities for all children.
- Reconsider the testing model for education in favor of one that offers teachers more time for listening and exploring with students.
- Include wraparound services (physical health, mental health, social and legal services) in pre-K education and provide parenting skills training and counseling for parents, rather than castigating them for their lack of knowledge or resources. Remember that parents may be coping with their own trauma.
- Train teachers to recognize the full spectrum of responses to trauma, in order to support students adequately.
- Provide a school environment that is safe, predictable, compassionate, and respectful. Remember that children, in particular, thrive in response to routines and rituals that are positive.
- Avoid being punitive and shift the dialogue from “What is wrong with this child” to “What happened to this child, and how can we help?”
- Offer mindfulness programs in school to help students learn to understand and manage their physical and psychological responses to stress.

From the Charles County proposed alternative elementary school, the Fresh Start Academy (FSA), research findings raised concerns about the program violating Maryland state laws governing suspension of Pre-K through 2nd grade students. Education Article (“ED”), § 7-305.1(b)(1). The Maryland 2017 legislation states that school systems shall utilize restorative practices as an alternative to traditional school disciplinary practices to ensure that developmentally appropriate, age-appropriate, and proportional consequences are applied to the child’s misbehavior in a way that supports personal growth and positive learning opportunities for all students. 2017 legislation Preamble, MD Laws 2017, Chapter 843 and 844; ED § 7-305.1(c)(1)(ii). The regulations of the Maryland State Department of Education (COMAR 13A.08.01.11C(1)(b) and H § (1)-(2)) provided examples of the type of programming that districts should consider in planning for these students, including but not limited to;

- Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) - Implementation framework for maximizing the selection and use of evidence-based prevention and intervention practices along a multi-tiered continuum that supports the academic, social, emotional, and behavioral competence of all students.
- Social Emotional Foundations of Early Learning (SEFEL) - A framework that promotes the social and emotional development and school readiness of young children from birth through age 8.
- Second Step Early Learning through Grade 8 - A program rooted in social-emotional learning (SEL) that helps transform schools into supportive, successful learning environments uniquely equipped to help children thrive.
- The Early Childhood Family Engagement Framework Toolkit - Maryland's Vision for Engaging Families with Young Children, was developed through funding with the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. The Toolkit was organized around the Framework. The Framework is the theory and the Toolkit puts the theory into practice.
- Trauma-Informed Approach and Trauma-Specific Interventions - An approach in the human service field that assumes that an individual is more likely than not to have a history of trauma. A trauma-informed approach can be implemented in any type of service setting or organization and is distinct from trauma-specific interventions or treatments that are designed specifically to address the consequences of trauma and to facilitate healing.
- Restorative Practices - A social science that studies how to improve and repair relationships between people and communities. The purpose is to build healthy communities, increase social

capital, decrease crime and antisocial behavior, repair harm and restore relationships.

(Disabilities Rights Maryland, Amanda R. White, Esq., M.P.H.)

References

AIR.org Trauma and Learning Policy Initiative (TLPI): Trauma-Sensitive Schools Descriptive Study October 2018 Wehmah Jones, PhD, Juliette Berg, PhD, and David Osher, PhD (principal Investigator)

John Hopkins University and John Hopkins Urban Health Institute: The Fourth Annual Social Determinants of Health Symposium Healing Together: Community-Level Trauma Its Causes, Consequences, and Solutions Lessons Learned and the Path Forward

Integrating Trauma Informed Care into an ABA model, Terry J. Page, PhD, BCBA-D

Ohio State University, Best Practices for Managing Disruptive Behavior, Office of the VP for student Life Disability Rights Maryland, Amanda White, Esq. M.P.H. letter to President Reuben Collins, Board of Charles County Commissioners

Counsel to the General Assembly, Sandra Benson Brantley letter to Delegate Erek L. Barron and Delegate Susie Proctor

<https://www.change.org/p/charles-county-public-schools-stop-ccps-from-implementing-the-fresh-start-alt-ernative-program>

How Do We Get There? Becoming a Trauma-Sensitive, Safe and Supportive School by Trauma Learning Policy Initiative (<https://traumasensitiveschools.org/author/tlpi-team/>)

Appendix

Strategic Facilities Committee 2019

Survey Conducted by the Sub Committee...

Alternative Education (Disruptive Behaviors)

1. Are you currently satisfied with the way your school's administration handles behavioral issues? ___ yes ___ no
2. Are you satisfied with the discipline given out for the current behaviors in your classroom? ___ yes ___ no
3. Do you see the consequences changing the student's behavior? ___ yes ___ no
4. Do you think that negative student behavior has increased in the last 5 years? ___ yes ___ no
5. Do you feel the school resource officers are being under-utilized in your school? ___ yes ___ no
6. What level would you rate your student's behavioral needs coming into your classroom? ___ not severe ___ somewhat severe ___ very severe
7. Has student behavior interrupted the learning environment of other students in your classroom? ___ yes ___ no
8. On an average day, how much teaching time is interrupted dealing with behavioral issues? ___ less than 30 minutes ___ up to 1 hour ___ up to 2 hours ___ more than 2 hours

9. Do you perceive that the central office supports an out of school suspension policy? ___ yes ___ no
10. Do you support a behavioral alternative structure program? ___ yes ___ no

School Location _____

Thank you so very much for your time!

Enjoy your summer!

DRAFT

II. GRADE BAND RESEARCH SUBCOMMITTEE

June-July 2019

Subcommittee Members:

Karen Kamauff DeVore Executive Director of Curriculum, Instruction & Administration
GCPS Carissa Rodeheaver President & CEO, First United Bank & Trust

Garrett County Public School Staff:

Karen Kamauff DeVore Executive Director of Curriculum, Instruction & Administration, GCPS

Abstract

This committee had the task of looking at potential grade band configurations. The difficult question seems to be where 7th and 8th grades best fit. The three configurations that are most commonly recognized are: PK-6 & 7-12; PK-5, 6-8 & 9-12; and PK-8 & 9-12.

Introduction

This committee consisted of only two individuals, both of whom worked independently to research different grade band options. There are many factors that must be taken into consideration when looking at grade band options. The number of transitions that each student makes is an important consideration, as is the connectedness that each student feels with his peers and the school staff. In addition, it is important to consider which configuration works best for the community and to maintain consistency in the school district. What works best for one community or one school district may not work in another. For this reason, the research seems to indicate that there really is not one configuration that improves student learning. One may argue that a K-8 configuration offers students more stability, less discipline issues and fewer transitions, but another will say that a separate middle school model will have a greater impact on students in grades six, seven and eight. Economics certainly play a big part when considering grade band realignments and are often the primary reason that a district makes a change.

Objectives of the Research

The objective of this committee was to determine which grade band configuration best meets the needs of students.

Research Methodology

Formal and informal methods were used in this research. Assistant superintendents from all counties in Maryland were asked to weigh in on their thoughts, studies and observations of grade band alignments throughout their systems. That information was compiled and shared among committee members. In addition, committee members individually researched published articles on the topic of grade band alignment and met to discuss findings.

Findings

The findings were inconclusive across articles and research, but the following excerpt from an article published by EPI (Education Partnerships, Inc.) Research Into Practice on Grade Configuration summarized it best:

“The research on grade configuration is inconclusive at best and there is no research that shows one configuration is better at improving student learning. There is some evidence that each of the three approaches can positively, or negatively impact students. But reorganizing grades is merely a shifting of students, teachers and programs from one site to another. Research shows that there is greater impact on student learning when the emphasis is not on location of the students but on the educational experience students receive. Grade configuration is merely a tool that can create the potential to improve student learning. Here’s a brief summary of what the research says.

- “Grade configuration is not a predictor of student academic success (McKenzie et al., 2006).
- “Students in K-8 settings have beneficial effects on achievement, attendance and behavior over students in separate middle grades programs (Abella, 2005).
- “There is less achievement loss for rural and small-town students when they transitioned to high school from a K-8 setting rather than from a 6-8 middle school (Alspaugh, 1998).
- “Middle grades students located in the same building or on the same campus as high school students had greater access to specialized teachers and more opportunities for advanced classes (Wren, 2003).
- “More grade levels per building (i.e. fewer transitions to new schools) is related to higher achievement and improved behavior regardless of SES (Offenberg, 2001; Wren, 2003)
- “When 7th and 8th graders are part of a K-8 school some studies found more individualized student attention and more personal student-teacher relationships (Weiss & Kipnes, 2006).
- “A separate middle grades program has a greater impact on students from high SES settings than it does for students from low SES settings (Paglin & Fager, 1997).
- “When middle grades students remain in an elementary setting there are fewer discipline problems (Cook, MacCoun, Muschkin & Vigdor, 2007).
- “School size is important. Larger schools were more likely to negatively impact student learning (Weiss & Kipnes, 2006).”

References

EPI: Grade Configuration

The relationship among grade configuration, school attachment, and achievement

Advantages and Disadvantages of Various Grade-Level Organizations

Organizing Schools to Improve Student Achievement: Start Times, Grade Configurations, and Teacher Assignments

Figuring and Reconfiguring Grade Spans

Stillwater Public Schools Review of Literature on Grade Configuration and School Transitions March 2011

Grade Configuration Research Team Research Summary

Grosse Pointe (Mich.) Board Votes to Close 2 Elementary Schools

III. COMMUNITY SCHOOL RESEARCH GROUP

<<date>>

Subcommittee Members:

James Browning	Community Member, Kitzmiller
Steven Kauffman	General Manager, CN Metals
Nathaniel Sorber	Community Member, Northern Area
Duane Yoder	President, Garrett County Community Action Committee

Introduction

The Community Schools Research Sub-Committee of the Garrett County Board of Education Strategic Facilities Committee is pleased to present this report that addresses the research on community schools as educational practice. The committee has found that there is a strong body of evidence supporting community schools as an effective educational strategy.

Furthermore, a robust body of evidence exists to qualify community school practice as an evidence-based intervention under ESSA (Every Student Succeeds Act) Standards. In comprehensive research reviews of the research on the core components of community school practice - a) community-embeddedness, b) integrated student supports, c) expanded learning time and opportunities, d) family and community engagement, and e) collaborative leadership and practice – scholars have concluded that these community school components are associated with positive student outcomes. As this report summarizes, significant evidence exists that community school practices have a positive effect on student achievement (especially mathematics¹), student behavior (attendance and discipline referrals), and student attitudes. This report also highlights that researchers have concluded that these gains in student success are especially evident in economically disadvantaged communities. In other words, community school interventions may be particularly important for closing achievement gaps in low-income and underrepresented populations.

In an assessment of educational structures across Garrett County, the Community Schools Research Sub-Committee has observed several schools that employ community school practices. The Garrett County community school model has received recognition from national organizations for leveraging place-based strategies, community engagement, and extended learning opportunities to promote student success.² Furthermore, there are examples of Garrett County community schools that serve very high economic need populations (Title I Schools at greater than 75% Free and Reduced Lunch) and maintain at least three stars in Maryland School Report Cards.

The report begins by providing a working definition of community schools based on the research-based standard of employing community school practices. Then, the committee summarizes seven main findings from the research on community school practice and student outcomes. Finally, the committee provides an overall summary of the research and offers recommendations on the strategic facilities plan generally and community schools specifically.

¹ Students at fully implemented community schools scored 8.2 points above the sample average of 745 for mathematics, and 6 points above the sample average of 730 for reading, see Heers, M., Van Klaveren, C., Groot, W., & Maassen van den Brink, H. (2016). “Community schools: What we know and what we need to know,” *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 1016–1051

² See for example, Crellin Elementary School’s recognition by Edutopia as a “School that Works”: <http://www.edutopia.org/schools-that-work>

Definitions

What is a community school?

The Coalition of Community Schools states that community schools represent a “place-based strategy” where locally-embedded schools engage with community partners and agencies “to provide an integrated focus on academics, health and social services, youth and community development, and community engagement.”³ In both rural and urban settings, many community schools have emerged in contexts where “structural forces . . . linked to poverty shape the experiences of young people and erect barriers to learning and school success.”⁴ In other words, community schools often exist in communities where families have few resources to supplement what a typical school provides. Community schools represent a model that can support struggling communities and help close achievement gaps. Today’s increasing economic inequality has led to a resurgence of interest in community schools in urban contexts and a renaissance in community-based pedagogy in rural locations.

For the purpose of definitional clarity, research has shown that in addition to being imbedded in a local context (place-based), there are four core features that exist in community schools that researchers suggest promote positive educational outcomes. For this report, Community Schools would be those schools that exhibit the following features supported by the research:

- Place-Based (Imbedded in a local community context)
- Integrated student supports
- Expanded learning time and opportunities
- Family and community engagement
- Collaborative leadership and practice

Understanding the Place-Based Framework of Community Schools

Placed-based education refers to an educational framework for instruction, curriculum development, and outreach that aims to “direct student’s attention to local culture, phenomenon, and issues” by engaging with local community to promote student learning.⁵ This place-based concept could be applied to an array of educational institutions that seek to engage a local context in the educational process. However, according to the Rural School Collaborative, typical community schools that are geographically embedded in a local community with easy and natural access to local students, resources, and community members are well positioned to employ place-based learning strategies.⁶

³ Coalition for Community Schools. (n.d.). “What is a community school?” http://www.communityschools.org/aboutschools/what_is_a_community_school.aspx

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Gregory A. Smith, “Place-Based Education,” *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*. (July, 2017).

⁶ See <http://ruralschoolscollaborative.org/place-based-education/what-is-place-based-education>

Defining Community Schools in Garrett County

Creating a simple typology of community schools is complicated by idiosyncrasies of local school conditions. However, as the typology in the next section illustrates, there are several schools in Garrett County – Accident, Crellin, Friendsville, Grantsville, and Swan Meadow – that are clearly embedded in local municipalities or natural communities that would meet the standard research and common-sense definitions of community schools. These schools employ place-based learning strategies, and seem well-positioned to leverage their location, organizational structure (i.e. size), and connections to local community to facilitate the four components (integrated student supports, expanded learning time and opportunities, family and community engagement, and collaborative leadership and practice) that research suggests promotes achievement, behavioral, and attitudinal gains.⁷

There are other elementary schools in Garrett County that do not seamlessly align with community school definitions, largely because of location, size, and/or organizational structure. This requires a more in-depth assessment of these schools.

First, Route 40 Elementary School has a geographical location outside a municipality or natural community. In other words, there are few families or students proximate to the school that would affect ease of access, potentially moderate community engagement, and possibly mitigate the student success benefits of community schools. However, in assessing Route 40 Elementary School's educational practices, community outreach, and size, it appears that the school's location is not hindering the ability to successfully employ the other components of community schools that promote student success, including the promotion of integrated student supports, expanded learning time and opportunities, family and community engagement, and collaborative leadership and practice. Indeed, through deliberative effort of school leadership, faculty, and staff, Route 40 has pursued deep engagement with its local area - for example, in collaboration with community members, it constructed a comprehensive outdoor educational area, bee-keeping project, a natural playground, and others. In conclusion, despite lacking a natural community context, Route 40 meets all the other place-based components outlined above and seems to meet the definitional standard of a community school.

Second, Broadford Elementary and Yough Glades Elementary do not meet straightforward definitions of community schools due to size, location, and/or organizational structure.

Broadford Elementary School no doubt exists in a municipality and a natural community. However, due to its size, it serves a much broader student population that extends well-beyond its immediate neighborhood. Yough Glades Elementary, a product of more recent consolidation, is not situated in a municipality or natural community, and maintains a size that leads it to serve a student population well-beyond its immediate geographical proximity.

Conceptually, the combined effects of size and location could serve to mitigate the student success benefits of community schools. This is not to suggest, however, that these two schools do not employ place-based practices, community and parental engagement, and other strategies that promote student success. Yet, because of the size and/or location of these two institutions, Yough Glades and Broadford Elementary Schools do not seem to meet research-based definitions of community schools and are probably better defined as *Exhibiting Some Characteristics of Community Schools*.

⁷ To understand and identify current practices at Garrett County Schools, the committee consulted online documents of Garrett County Public Schools, documents from the previous Rise Strategic Plan, school websites, and community feedback.

Community School Typology in Garrett County

Schools in Garrett County that exhibit attributes of community schools as defined in the literature, and could thus be defined as community schools are as follows:

- Accident Elementary
- Crellin Elementary
- Friendsville Elementary
- Grantsville
- Route 40 Elementary
- Swan Meadow Elementary

The following schools would not typically be defined as community schools (primarily due to previous consolidation that has increased size and scope), but still exhibit characteristics of community schools:

- Broadford Elementary
- Yough Glades Elementary

The following schools would rarely be characterized as community schools, but this does not suggest that these schools currently do not or could not benefit from community school strategies outlined in this report:

- Northern and Southern Middle Schools
- Northern and Southern High Schools

Review of the Extant Literature

According to a 2017 comprehensive review of literature on community schools and student learning by researchers at the Learning Policy Institute and the National Education Policy Center, “well-implemented community schools lead to improvement in student and school outcomes and contribute to meeting the educational needs of low-achieving students in high-poverty schools.” The researchers summarize this as follows, “strong research reinforces the efficacy of integrated student supports, expanded learning time and opportunities, and family and community engagement as intervention strategies.” Stated even more strongly, Maier, Daniel, Oakes, and Lam (2017) conclude, “study after study confirms what we all know: Such schools [community schools] make a difference in the lives of children and in the health of our society. Although there is no doubt that every student would be better off attending a school with the attributes described above, children from low-income families see the biggest benefit.”⁸

The National Learning Policy Institute and the National Education Policy Center summarize the following findings regarding the effect of community schools on educational outcomes after a meta-review of the literature in 2017:⁹

⁸ Anna Maier, Julia Daniel, Jeannie Oakes, and Livia Lam (2017), *Community Schools as Effective School Improvement Strategy: A Review of the Evidence*. Washington DC: Learning Policy Institute and National Educational Policy Center.

⁹ The following finding titles and categories are drawn directly from Maier, Daniel, Oakes, and Lam (2017).

Finding 1. The evidence base on community schools and their core components justifies the use of this approach as a school improvement strategy. Community schools in many different locations show improvements in student outcomes, including attendance, academic achievement, high school graduation rates, and reduced racial and economic achievement gaps.

There is strong evidence that supports positive effects of community school strategies on students' academic, behavioral, and social-emotional outcomes. The bulk of the evidentiary basis comes from program evaluations that were conducted to assess the implementation and impact of community school programs, often in a specific location, and to inform leadership practices and educational policy. Many of these studies employ careful designs and rigorous methods and are published in peer-reviewed journals or in books published by research centers or university presses.¹⁰

A 2016 summary report on how community schools influence student outcomes drew upon 57 academic studies to examine how community school activities influence student outcomes. The authors found that across several studies, community engagement and parental involvement are associated with improved academic achievement and reduced risky behavior rates. The authors also concluded that there is "promising evidence of positive short-term and longer term student outcomes, including attendance gains and improved academic achievement" (particularly for mathematics).¹¹ See Table 1

Finding 2. The evidence base on community schools and their core components justifies the use of community schools as a school improvement strategy, and sufficient evidence exists to qualify the community school approach as an evidence-based intervention under ESSA (Every Student Succeeds Act) Standards

There is a compelling body of evidence on community school strategies and practices, using a wide variety of methodologies, which is available to inform and guide policymakers. Thus, there is sufficient research in this area for community school strategies to qualify as evidence-based interventions under the ESSA standards.

Note from the researchers:

"Sufficient evidence exists to support the inclusion of community schools in state and local ESSA plans for comprehensive and targeted interventions in high-poverty schools supported with federal funds, as well as to qualify community schools for specially designated federal grants. ESSA requires that, to be considered evidence-based, a program or intervention must have at least one well-designed study that fits into its four-tier definition of evidence: (1) strong, (2) moderate, (3) promising, or (4) demonstrating a rationale. ESSA provides states with the flexibility to use any level of evidence in developing school improvement plans. The research on community schools meets this evidentiary threshold."¹²

¹⁰ See Blank, M. J., Melaville, A., & Shah, B. P. (2003). *Making the difference: Research and practice in community schools*. Washington, DC: Coalition for Community Schools; Adams, C. (2010). *The Community School Effect: Evidence from an Evaluation of the Tulsa Area Community School Initiative*. Tulsa, OK: University of Oklahoma, Oklahoma Center for Education Policy; Dobbie, W., & Fryer, R. G. (2011). "Are high-quality schools enough to increase achievement among the poor? Evidence from the Harlem Children's Zone," *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 3(3), 158–87; LaFrance Associates. (2005). *Comprehensive Evaluation of the Full-Service Community Schools Model in Iowa: Harding Middle School and Moulton Extended Learning Center*. San Francisco, CA: Milton S. Eisenhower Foundation; LaFrance Associates. (2005). *Comprehensive Evaluation of the Full-Service Community Schools Model in Maryland: General Smallwood Middle School*. San Francisco, CA: Milton S. Eisenhower Foundation; LaFrance Associates. (2005). *Comprehensive Evaluation of the Full-Service Community Schools Model in Pennsylvania: Lincoln and East Allegheny Middle Schools*. San Francisco, CA: Milton S. Eisenhower Foundation; LaFrance Associates. (2005). *Comprehensive*

Finding 3. The evidence base provides a strong warrant for using community schools to meet the needs of low-achieving students in high-poverty schools and to help close opportunity and achievement gaps.

The positive results from research on community schools and their component parts suggest that the community schools approach can contribute to closing previously documented economic achievement gaps.¹³ There is also evidence that community schools, especially those that employ expanded learning time and opportunities, have stronger positive effects on students from low-income families than on more advantaged students. According to scholars, “this is not surprising, given that low-income students typically have fewer learning opportunities, resources, and supports both in and out of school.”¹⁴

Finding 4. The core components of community schools promote conditions and practices found in high-quality schools and address out-of-school barriers to learning.

Researchers have found a high degree of alignment between the core components of community schools and the documented features of high-quality schools. Community schools that align with practices identified in the literature as components of “high-quality schools” include: “academic and emotional support, a positive school climate and trusting relationships, meaningful learning opportunities, sufficient money and resources, strong family and community ties, a collaborative learning environment for teachers, and assessment used as a tool for improvement.”¹⁵

Researchers at the Learning Policy Institute and the National Education Policy Center conclude that community school components can nurture high-quality learning environments. For example, the researchers highlight the work of community school coordinators or community- engaged principals that can “help to forge partnerships with community-based organizations, thereby making integrated student supports available at a school site and providing extra academic and emotional support for students who need it.”¹⁶

Evaluation of the Full-Service Community Schools Model in Washington: Showalter Middle School. San Francisco, CA: Milton S. Eisenhower Foundation.

¹¹ Heers, M., Van Klaveren, C., Groot, W., & Maassen van den Brink, H. (2016). “Community schools: What we Know and What We Need to Know,” *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 1016–1051.

¹² Note reprinted from Anna Maier, Julia Daniel, Jeannie Oakes, and Livia Lam, *Community Schools as Effective School Improvement Strategy: A Review of the Evidence*. Washington DC: Learning Policy Institute and National Educational Policy Center, 2017.

¹³ On child poverty and education effects, see Vans, G. W. (2004). “The Environment of Childhood Poverty,” *American Psychologist*, 59(2), 77–92; Thompson, T., & Massat, C. R. (2005). “Experiences of Violence, Post-Traumatic Stress, Academic Achievement and Behavior Problems of Urban African-American Children,” *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 22(5–6), 367–393; Reardon, S. F., Robinson, J. P., & Weathers, E. S. (2015), “Patterns and Trends in Racial/Ethnic and Socioeconomic Academic Achievement Gaps,” in H. A. Ladd, & E. B. Fiske (Eds.) *Handbook of Research in Education Finance and Policy* (Second ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

¹⁴ See Anderson-Butcher, D., & Palut, L. (2013). *Evaluation of the Canyons Community Schools Initiative: Findings after Two-Year Post-Adoption and Implementation*. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Community and Youth Collaborative Institute; Gandhi, A., Slama, R., Park, S-J., Russo, P. S., Bzura, R., & Williamson, S. (2015) *Focusing on the Whole Student: Final Report on the Massachusetts Wraparound Zones*. Waltham, MA: American Institutes for Research; Adams, C. (2010). *The Community School Effect: Evidence from an Evaluation of the Tulsa Area Community School Initiative*. Tulsa, OK: University of Oklahoma, Oklahoma Center for Education Policy.

¹⁵ Anna Maier, Julia Daniel, Jeannie Oakes, and Livia Lam, (2017) *Community Schools as Effective School Improvement Strategy: A Review of the Evidence*. Washington DC: Learning Policy Institute and National Educational Policy Center.

¹⁶ Ibid.

The research suggests that community school practices allow educators and community partners to “instantiate the conditions and practices found in effective, high-quality schools,” which is supported by additional studies that community schools have positive effects on student outcomes.¹⁷

Finding 5. Thoughtfully designed expanded learning time and opportunities provided by community schools—such as longer school days and academically rich and engaging after-school, weekend, and summer programs—are associated with positive academic and nonacademic outcomes, including improvements in student attendance, behavior, and academic achievement

Extended learning time both during school and in after school activities is a practice that can be facilitated by the location, structure, size, and community-engagement practices of community schools. In summarizing the literature on this component, researchers state, “an extensive body of evidence examines the relationship between expanded learning time and student outcomes, including rigorous research reviews, randomized control trials, and well-designed quasi- experimental evaluations. Although some mixed findings emerge, the evidence is overwhelmingly positive, particularly for expanded learning time programs that use the extra hours to provide students with carefully structured learning and enrichment opportunities.”¹⁸

Finding 6. The meaningful family and community engagement found in community schools is associated with positive student outcomes, such as reduced absenteeism, improved academic outcomes, and student reports of more positive school climates. Additionally, this engagement can increase trust among students, parents, and staff, which has positive effects on student outcomes.

Family and community engagement strategies include various ways in which families and community members engage in activities with schools. Activities include supporting student learning at home, high levels of communications between guardians and teachers, volunteering, and community organizing of educational purposeful activities. There is substantial research that examines how family and community partnerships influence student success. According to the National Policy Center researchers, robust parent and community engagement is associated with “reduced absenteeism . . . decreased discipline referrals, improved academic outcomes, longer term academic success, and student reports of more positive school climates.”¹⁹

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ See Jacobson, R., Jamal, S. S., Jacobson, L., Blank, M. J. (2013). *The Growing Convergence of Community Schools and Expanded Learning Opportunities*. Washington, DC: Coalition for Community Schools; Redd, Z., Boccanfuso, C., Walker, K., Princiotta, D., Knewstubb, D., and Moore, K. (2012). *Expanding Time for Learning Both Inside and Outside the Classroom: A Review of the Evidence Base*. Bethesda, MD: Child Trends; After-school Alliance. (2012). *Principles of Effective Expanded Learning Programs: A Vision Built on the After-School Approach*. Washington, DC: After-school Alliance; Vadeboncoeur, J. A. (2006). “Engaging Young People: Learning in Informal Contexts,” *Review of Research in Education*, 30, 239–278; Patall, E. A., Cooper, H., & Allen, A. B. (2010). “Extending the School Day or School Year: A Systematic Review of Research (1985–2009),” *Review of Educational Research*, 80(3), 431.

¹⁹ Anna Maier, Julia Daniel, Jeannie Oakes, and Livia Lam (2017). *Community Schools as Effective School Improvement Strategy: A Review of the Evidence*. Washington DC: Learning Policy Institute and National Educational Policy Center.

Case studies of various community schools illustrate how successful engagement efforts have the ability to build trusting, two-way relationships with family and community members.

Community schools are well-positioned to engage families and communities meaningfully through the employment of integrated student supports, expanded learning opportunities, and collaborative practices. As one scholar notes, “the combination of these factors can make schools more welcoming for families and community members, and bring students into the surrounding community for educational purposes.”²⁰

Finding 7. The collaborative leadership, practice, and relationships found in community schools can create the conditions necessary to improve student learning and well-being, as well as improve relationships within and beyond the school walls.

As defined in the research, “collaborative leadership entails parents, students, teachers, and principals with different areas of expertise working together, sharing decisions and responsibilities to reach a common vision or outcome.” While not only confined to community schools, this is often a normative reality at community schools that require substantial collaboration between school staff, community partners, students, and parents to advance programs and objectives. Collaborative relationships among teachers, family members, students, and community members can increase commitment to the school and trust among the various partners. The increased level of trust and commitment helps facilitate the integration of student supports, expanded learning time, and meaningful family and community engagement that positively affect student achievement.²¹

²⁰ See Mattingly, D. J., Prislin, R., McKenzie, T. L., Rodriguez, J. L., & Kayzar, B. (2002). “Evaluating Evaluations: The Case of Parent Involvement Programs,” *Review of Educational Research*, 72(4), 549–576; Epstein, J. (2001). *School, Family, and Community: Preparing Educators and Improving Schools*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press; Henderson, A. T., & Mapp, K. L. (2002). *A New Wave of Evidence: The Impact of School, Family, and Community Connections on Student Achievement*. Austin, TX: National Center for Family and Community Connections with Schools; McCarthey, S. J. (2000). “Home–School Connections: A Review of the Literature,” *The Journal of Educational Research*, 93(3), 145–153.

²¹ See Jacobson, R., & Blank, M. (2015). *A Framework for More and better Learning through Community School Partnerships*. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership; Jacobson, R., Jacobson, L., & Blank, M. (2012). *Building Blocks: An Examination of the Collaborative approach Community Schools are Using to Bolster Early Childhood Development*. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership;

TABLE 1: Summary of Community School Strategy Effects on Academic Outcomes, behavioral Outcomes, and Social-Economic Outcomes

Academic Outcomes	
Student Achievement	<p>37 studies in the extant literature addressed community school strategies and student achievement. 29 found positive effects.</p> <p>Overall, community school strategy associated with improved academic performance, most notably in mathematics, and some evidence exists of strategy closing achievement gap for low-income students.</p>
Behavioral Outcomes	
Attendance	<p>29 studies considered community school strategy on attendance and 21 found positive effects. Participation in extended or extra learning time and school engagement were positive mediating factors.</p>
Discipline	<p>20 studies considered the relationship between community school strategy and office referral and suspension rates. 9 studies found community school strategy reduces referrals and the remainder found no effect.</p>
Social-Emotional Outcomes	
Student Attitudes	<p>14 studies considered the relationship between community school strategies and student attitudes. 12 studies found positive effects regarding sense of safety and student engagement with school.</p>
Peer and Adult Relationships	<p>9 studies addressed community school strategies and peer/adult relationships. Eight found positive association between community school strategy and relationships between students and adults.</p>
School Climate	<p>8 out of 10 studies found that community schools strategies had a positive effect on student, teacher, and parent perceptions of level of support at school and positive effect on relational trust.</p>

Summary Statement on Research Findings

Perhaps the most important take away from this report is that community schools are not just buildings. Community schools are educational institutions that employ specific strategies that researchers suggest affect student achievement, student behavior, and student attitudes. In the same way one can assess how different grade-bands may relate to student outcomes, organizing students in community schools is an ESSA practice that can be leveraged and developed to improve student success. Parents, teachers, and community members in places like Crellin, Friendsville, Accident, Route 40, Swan Meadow, etc. shared their stories with the facilities committee that seem to echo what we found in the research. These individuals spoke about a tight engagement between principals, teachers, and community members that not only nurture deep, positive attitudes about the school community, but sustain partnerships that support student learning, provide additional opportunities beyond traditional curricula, and allow parents and teachers to work together to respond to the panoply of issues that can lead to behavior issues.

After previous decades of consolidation of community schools, several states and school districts have returned to community school practices to serve low-income students and close achievement gaps. Even in our own state, Baltimore schools have embraced community and neighborhood school strategies to achieve the community engagement and expanded opportunity benefits that are discussed in this report. In a rural context like Garret County with higher than average rates of poverty and ongoing issues of opioid abuse, community school strategies seem uniquely fitted to address the multifaceted challenges facing children and families.

The research strongly supports the educational efficacy of community schools.

Community School Research Group Recommendations

Due to a wealth of research that supports community school structure and strategies on academic outcomes, behavioral outcomes, and social-emotional outcomes, the Community Schools Research Sub-Committee of the Garrett County Board of Education Strategic Facilities Committee supports the following recommendations for Garrett County. These recommendations address capital funding realities and facility issues while preserving, when possible, the educational benefits of community schools in our system:

- 1) **Different Approaches in the North and South** - We believe the best way to address facility issues in a difficult economic context is to deal with the capital issues where they exist.
 - a. We strongly support advancing different solutions to different problems in the North and South.
 - b. We have been given no evidence to suggest that different models in the North and South would have detrimental effects on student outcomes.
 - c. We strongly object to any plan that closes or consolidates schools or adjusts grade bands in one region just to mirror the other region. This is not equity. This is similarity for administrative purposes.
- 2) **Southern Restructuring and Renovation Plan**
 - a. According to the capital needs matrix and assessments, we believe that significant investment and restructuring is unavoidable and needs to happen in the South.
 - b. We support closing Broadford Elementary, renovating Southern Middle School, and repurposing available space in Southern High School
 - c. We support adjusting Southern grade bands and realigning school zones where necessary to accommodate students and alleviate overcrowding.

- d. We support increasing capacity and renovating Crellin Elementary school as a quality community school in need of capital investment.
- e. Swan Meadow
 - Despite anecdotal concerns that Swan Meadow is not in compliance with COMAR, we have been presented with no clear evidence that Swan Meadow is not in compliance
 - Absent such evidence, we find little financial or educational justification for closing Swan Meadow
 - We encourage ongoing monitoring of COMAR compliance.

3) Maintaining Northern Schools

- a. We find **no** educational or facilities' need assessment reason to either close, consolidate, or realign schools in the Northern part of the county.
- b. We recommend the preservation of Accident, Grantsville, Friendsville, Route 40, and Northern Middle School in their current configuration.
- c. As possible projects (but with lower priority than all Southern projects), we suggest renovation of Grantsville Elementary and Friendsville Elementary to eliminate open classrooms.
- d. We believe that these schools are well designed to leverage community school components to promote student success and that this region is well positioned for enrollment growth.
- e. We believe that despite revised State Enrollment Capacity Numbers, schools in the North are making reasonable educational use of space in embracing community school strategies that are promoting student success.

4) Repurpose Administration Space

- a. We support removing administration from the Central Office building and distributing them to open spaces at Dennett Road, Southern High School, and Northern Middle School.
- b. There should be a consideration of realignment of administrative functions from the South to available space at Northern Middle School.

5) Raising Revenue

- a. We support a movement for a county referendum to raise revenue for our community schools.
- b. We support an intentional and collaborative effort to make changing the wealth formula the primary lobbying effort of our county.

IV. SINGLE HIGH SCHOOL/CTE PROGRAMS

August 14, 2019

Subcommittee Members:

Patrick J. Damon
Kevin Null

Garrett County Education Association President, Teacher
Garrett County Administrator

Garrett County Public School Staff:

Richard Wesolowski

Director of Transportation

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Consolidation - the process of uniting

Educational costs - instructional costs, student service costs, operational costs, leadership costs

High school - a school especially in the U.S. usually including grades 9–12 or 10–12

Non-educational costs - facilities funds (debt service), extracurricular activities, other.

Rural education - of or relating to education in the country

CTE - Career and Technical Education

Abstract

Schools consolidations have been a topic of discussion for many decades and consolidation discussions begin with ongoing financial perils of the school district. Local, state and federal educational decisions influence smaller rural school districts to the same extent that larger districts are influenced. The broader discussion of consolidation is directly related to the student achievement and fiscal efficiency impacts. This review examines research on the effects of consolidation on student achievement and fiscal responsibilities and the influence of CTE programs on student success. The research is inconclusive and shows no significant statistical data that consolidating schools negatively impact student achievement or save money for a school district. CTE benefits are supported in various capacities and are described specifically to geographic areas.

I. Introduction

The Garrett County Public Schools created the Strategic Facilities Committee (SFC) to review the facility aspect of the school system. The SFC consists of various individuals who were asked by the Garrett County Board of Education to participate. Following the initial meeting of the SFC, individuals, as well as the committee, created goals and prioritized them to initiate the focus and direction of the group.

The SFC identified specific areas of research needed to fulfill the requirements of the committee. The Single High School/CTE Programs Committee emerged from this discussion. The charge of the Single High School/CTE Programs Committee was to investigate the possibility of a centralized high school in Garrett County. Both Southern High School and Northern High School would be consolidated upon the completion of a newly constructed high school. The focus of the research would be to identify the advantages and disadvantages of a central high school and how the instructional programs, CTE particularly, would be impacted by such consolidation.

Therefore, public school and district consolidation has been and continues to be a nation-wide phenomenon that elicits the attention of a multitude of stakeholders, including parents, students,

teachers, administrators, lawmakers, and a host of other individuals. It has been a topic of heated discussion for over eight decades.

The highest number of public school districts in the United States was, on record, for the school year 1929 - 30, with 117,108 districts (Snyder & Dillow, 2011). The total number of campuses during the same year was 248,000 (U.S. Department of Education, 2019). Today, the number of public school districts in the United States has decreased by more than 79% to 13,629 (Snyder & Dillow, 2011), and in 2015 - 2016 there were 98,000 campuses (U.S. Department of Education, 2019). For the same time frame, students enrolled in public schools have increased by 190%. This scenario provides insight into the complexity of conceptual understanding surrounding the decisions that have to be made associated with school consolidation.

Factors that must be considered in such decisions include, but are not limited to, transportation, facility, instructional support, fiscal requirements, and student enrollment. The research findings of this subcommittee provide a limited and brief overview of the in-depth and detailed task of making informed and adequate decisions regarding school consolidation.

Objectives of the Research

The single high school/ CTE programs subcommittee was to determine the advantages and disadvantages of building one (1) centralized high school for Garrett County Public Schools.

In addition, the subcommittee was charged with reviewing CTE programs and the advantages for such programs to be part of the high school curriculum and whether the CTE programs should remain within the high school or supported in a separate career or technical center.

Research Methodology

Formal research methods were used in the research. Educational journals were the primary sources of the research. Empirical studies and research articles provided the basis and foundation for the facts and findings that were shared among the subcommittee members.

Findings

Background

There is no dispute that the Garrett County School System is facing financial constraints related to school operation and construction. This is due to several factors; declining or flat enrollment trends, State aid formula, County maintenance of effort funding, and the age of the school buildings. Southern High School was built in 1958 (61 years old, with an adjusted age of 30.6 years old), has a State Rated Capacity of 1,450 students, and has a deferred maintenance cost of \$4.1 million. Currently there are 715 enrolled, or is at 49% utilization. Northern High School was built in 1952 (67 years old, with an adjusted age of 29.7 years old), has a State Rated Capacity of 903 students, and has a deferred maintenance cost of \$2.3 million. Currently there are 431 students enrolled, or is at 48% utilization. The 2018 -2019 operating costs of Northern High school are \$671,707 per year and at Southern High School the costs are \$662,290 per year. This equates to \$1,558 per pupil at Northern High school and \$939 per pupil at Southern High. These figures are exclusive of salary, benefits, transportation and associated costs.

The analysis of the consolidation of Northern Garrett and Southern Garrett High Schools involved numerous factors including, but not limited to, facility maintenance and operating costs, capital improvement projects, course offerings, class sizes and community impact.

Historically, the number of school districts in the United States has decreased despite the dramatic increase of number of students enrolled. This is not specific to rural areas but to the United States as

a whole. Although consolidation has impacted districts of all sizes since the 1930s, smaller rural districts facing dwindling communities, resources, and population have been impacted the schools within the school district. When school districts consolidate, all aspects of the newly formed blueprint are affected. Each year, lawmakers and rural school district administration face financial constraints and each year the decision makers question how to address the fiscal perils. Proponents tout the benefits of fiscal efficiency, increased exposure to curriculum, and a projection of student achievement.

School consolidation has been and continues to be a phenomenon that draws attention from parents, teachers, communities, lawmakers, and a host of other individuals. The research presented to the SFC provides substantial evidence that the current blueprint of the Garrett County Public School System has reached the point where continued improvements will not be possible absent significant change, whether the change takes the form of increased funding, improved efficiencies, or better methods of education.

Most school district consolidations involve small rural school districts and in some cases school building consolidation. In the past, however, published research about rural education issues has been limited, with relatively few scholars studying rural education issues found specifically in small rural settings (Cooley & Floyd, 2013). This void in research is of particular concern because rural students present a significant population that is, and has been, affected by local, state, and federal level educational decisions. In his study, Arnold (2004) found that school finance is one of the areas where rural education policymakers have sought assistance through research.

However, is there clear evidence that small-school consolidation makes a real and measurable difference in the areas of financial savings and student achievement for the school district? A review of the research and literature seems inconclusive. There is research dating back from 1960 through 2004 that found no evidence that consolidation has reduced fiscal expenditures per pupil (Cooley & Floyd, 2013).

Advocates for consolidation tout efficiency and lack of breadth in available course offerings (Brent, Slipple, Killeen, & Wischnowski, 2004). The U.S. Department of Education, in a 1930 pamphlet with information from 105 consolidated schools, detailed several reasons for considering consolidation, including increasing demand on the school, State encouragement, increasing opportunities for students, and efficiency (Self, 2001). School district consolidation could result in a greater specialization of teachers, and districts could save on administrative costs by merging (Self, 2001).

Conversely, further research has found the economic and educational advantages of some large schools and districts has been exaggerated by suggesting that money and resources could be saved by combining two smaller districts or schools into a larger organizational unit. Further, district consolidation and school consolidation could prove to be cost-effective in some cases. However, no compelling evidence exists that school district consolidation is a cost-effective alternative to small rural schools (Brent, et. al., 2004). A number of studies found that, in some cases, school district consolidation even worsened financial, academic, and social outcomes (Patterson, 2006).

Regarding academics, a growing body of literature has reported that small, community schools had positive effects on educational achievements (Mathis, 2006). Students in some rural areas were achieving at high levels despite the challenges faced in rural settings. A number of research studies have indicated that students in small schools and districts appear to have better achievement, particularly students from less affluent communities. On the other hand, in a number of states where consolidation has occurred, standardized test scores were among the lowest in the nation (Silverman, 2005). Studies have shown that the larger schools were found to have more bureaucracy, lower test scores, higher dropout rates, and more problems with behavior.

School district consolidation could also create higher transportation costs. School busing becomes a major administrative cost. Rural districts spend disproportionately on student transportation services and rural schools may spend upwards of 6 to 8 percent of their budget on school busing (Killeen and Sipple, 2000). Students attending larger consolidated schools receive less attention, endure longer bus rides, and have fewer opportunities to participate in extracurricular activities (Eyre and Finn, 2002).

In contrast to school consolidation, federal legislation continues to authorize funding for secondary vocational education, increasingly known as career and technical education (CTE), and has placed greater accountability requirements for local programs. Dating back to the early 1900s educational improvement concerns were recognized and two stand out today: furthering democratic ideals through a broadly educated citizenry, and obtaining a viable economic future for all of our citizens (Stringfield & Stone, 2003).

Formal education is society's best available route to ensure citizens' participation in the world of work. The relationship between education and income has never been stronger than at the present. Clearly, the "college-for-all" goal as expressed by bachelor's degrees is unrealistic and not even necessary for successful student transitions to adult work roles (Rosenbaum, 2002). Some studies provide evidence of the value of CTE in secondary schools. Mané's analysis (1999) of national datasets showed high short and medium term payoffs of high school vocational courses for students who did not attend college. The overall goal of CTE is for all students to finish high school prepared to either enter the workplace (which has come to demand strong academic skills and other "new basic" skills) or to begin postsecondary education.

Students should have the opportunity to learn school subjects with work as the context of learning. Dewey called this "Education through occupations" (1916, pg. 309). Work based learning and "the new vocationalism" (Benson, 1997). Stone (1995) described ways in which workplace learning could be harnessed to reduce the achievement gap, especially in rural locations. Opportunities were recognized in communities with work or learning potential. Communities with work and learning potential have the power to transform the entire CTE curriculum.

Education about work, education for work, tech prep, curriculum integration, work-related experiences, career magnets and pathways and additional secondary school reforms demonstrate research based benefits for student learning and career employability. Although the trajectories of research and practice on CTE have a seriously underdeveloped, important intersection, research conducted over the past few decades and reviewed provide valuable clues to the most productive new paths and practice.

Research Questions

One overarching question was provided to the subcommittee to review.

1. What are the advantages and disadvantages of a single high school in Garrett County?

One underlying question was generated from the original question.

1. What impact will a single high school have on CTE programs and will the benefits of course offerings be advantageous to the students of Garrett County?

Effect on Student Achievement

Researchers have offered no convincing evidence that students from small, rural schools receive less effective educational program than children in larger schools. Studies offered evidence that favored small rural schools over larger consolidated systems (Brent, et. al., 2004). A preponderance of data showed that small schools provide greater educational benefit than larger schools (Patterson, 2006).

Truancy rates, classroom disruptions, vandalism, theft, substance abuse, and gang participation were lower in small rural schools (Cushman, 2000). Several other studies confirmed that large schools have more bureaucratic and administrative costs, lower attendance, lower grade point averages, higher dropout rates, and more problems with violence, security and drug abuse (Patterson, 2006). Conversely, Nelson (1985) identified several liabilities to consolidation, including more red tape, teacher disconnectedness, increased discipline problems, and decreased parental involvement.

Analysis of the Data

Overarching question - There are numerous studies and research that show diversity in the data regarding consolidated schools. The results of the studies and the data are inconclusive and are supportive of CTE programs that address the needs of the community in which they live.

Community engagement can structure the CTE programs and provide educational benefits for students who are not focused on postsecondary education opportunities.

Results

The results suggest that school districts did not save money by consolidating. Even though per-pupil expenditures decreased for joining schools, the savings were minimal and, therefore, not statistically significant. It can be concluded that there has been no compelling evidence that consolidation is a cost-effective alternative to small, rural schools (Brent, et. al., 2004).

The term “large” and “small” school were not clearly defined or consistently compared in the review of the literature. Generalizations were made regarding the optimal number of students in elementary and secondary schools. On average, the research concluded that an effective elementary school should have between 400 - 500 students and secondary schools should have between 400 - 800 students. Similarly, Leithwood and Jantzi (2009) concluded that the ideal size for an elementary school serving a large number of disadvantaged students is 300, while the best size for an elementary school with a more diverse population is 500. The same recommendations applied to secondary schools where the exemplar size is 600 - 1000 students respectively.

Lee and Smith (1997) examined student growth in reading and mathematics achievement through high school to measure changes in student learning. The result of the analysis resolves that the ideal high school size ranges from 600 - 900 students based on the level of student learning. It was also discovered that secondary students in schools with a population smaller than 600 - 900 students tend to learn less than students enrolled in schools with larger enrollments (2100+) learn significantly less.

Class size research was focused primarily in the elementary schools. Dee and West (2008) examined the long-term effects of Tennessee’s STAR engagement. Project STAR was a randomized evaluation of class-size reduction in kindergarten through 3rd grade launched in 1985 in Tennessee. Evidence from Project STAR on the cognitive benefits of smaller classes has been extraordinarily influential in building support for class-size reduction in the early grades (Krueger 1999, Krueger and Whitmore 2001, Schanzenbach 2007). The positive results of this engagement did not persist in students by the time they reached grade 8. The study further explored test scores of students who had different class sizes across various subjects and found that students did not perform better in subjects in which they had smaller class sizes. It is also apparent that class-size reduction initiatives are most cogent for students in early elementary grades and those students from underprivileged backgrounds.

For many students who live in rural communities, taking lower-level courses is not a matter of choice but a matter of access. The average rural school offered half as many advanced mathematics courses as those in the urban areas and nearly half of the rural students attended a school that offers only one to three advanced mathematics courses (Graham & Teague, 2011).

Transportation is a large budget item for consolidated rural schools. Students are required to be transported for longer distances, often spanning the entire county. Although consolidated schools may have supportive services from the county or regional level, the budget of transportation is constantly impacted. Most of West Virginia schools are considered rural and are consolidated along county lines which often span hundreds of square miles. Consequently, WV schools must rely on extended bus routes and contend with the lower rate of instructional to transportation dollars in the United States (Johnson, Showalter, Klein & Lester, 2014).

Extended bus routes negatively impact students both in and out of the classroom. One quarter of the students from rural areas have daily bus routes over one hour in length and about 85% have rides at least 30 minutes in length (Howley & Howley, 2001).

Any movement of the students from either Northern or Southern Garrett High Schools will have to contend with the natural and topographical boundaries of Garret County. Therefore, analysis of roads, current bus routes, budgetary costs and practical implications must be considered.

Implications

When school districts consolidate, smaller rural schools close, which can adversely affect the community. For rural communities, community is a core value, and to rural citizens, consolidation creates a loss of community and culture (Mathis, 2006). When consolidation occurs, many rural communities become financially strangled and lose population. Eventually, some communities cease to exist. Consolidation could result in the loss of employment, fosters a decline in retail sales, property values, and tax revenues (Brent, et al, 2004). Critics of consolidation say that, if decision makers focus only on numbers, they miss the value of a school and the community in which it belongs (Burton, 2010).

Further Research

The literature does not provide adequate or clear conclusions about the functions and dysfunctions of consolidation in small, rural areas. It remains uncertain whether consolidation improves efficiency and student learning. Education officials have relied solely on the “economies of scale” model from the Industrial Age when deciding whether to consolidate (Cooley & Floyd, 2013).

The educational needs of the students must be combined with the needs of the community (Self, 2001). Because there is no compelling evidence suggesting that school consolidation is a cost-effective or achievement effective alternative to small rural schools, policymakers should take into consideration the quality of education that rural students receive before moving to consolidation (Silverman, 2005).

CTE programs need to consider communities and educational opportunities within the community in which the schools serve. Technological advancements need to be considered when projecting CTE curriculums, community needs, and student learning.

Instead of consolidating small schools and creating larger, more crowded schools, other measures should be considered to improve fiscal efficiency or educational outcomes. The phenomenon, referred to as “shared services,” allow school districts to band together with other agencies to eliminate duplication and streamline functions and services (Patterson, 2006). Shared services can yield efficiencies around facilities, transportation, food service, procurement, human resources, information technology security, and instruction (Deloitte, 2005). For example, one school district has joined county forces to complete payroll and accounting services to several agencies. These districts report savings between 50- 80 percent annually (Patterson, 2006). Currently, the only services shared

between the GCPS and Garrett County are the Informational Technologies (IT) program. Further investigation should be considered in sharing personnel and finance opportunities.

The RISE Initiative

The information is inconclusive as to whether there are financial benefits to be achieved by consolidating the two high schools, but it does appear that academic advantages would include increasing the number and types of class offerings and expanding the opportunities for students to participate in extra-curricular activities. The following information was presented to the GCBOE during the RISE initiative.

Benefits to a single high school

- *Class offerings would increase:*
 - *Foreign Language – right now GCPS only offers Spanish*
 - *In the new world order Spanish, Mandarin, Arabic, and Indian are the major languages for businesses and French and German are still being taught heavily throughout the state. We could offer three languages with 4 teachers. 2 teachers would be needed for Spanish and then one each for whichever languages we'd like to offer. This does not include virtual learning, which could be an option, as well.*
 - *Music – more band and individual class opportunities. Concert band, stage band, marching band, piano, guitar, voice could all be offered with 3 teachers. Chorus could be a stand alone program, as well.*
 - *All students would have an opportunity to take Foods, all AP courses, marketing, foreign language, etc. Also, SkillsUSA and the electric car would now be county wide and not school specific.*
 - *GCPS could staff and offer all AP courses every year, as well as all levels of CTE courses. GCPS would not have to combine levels II and III.*
 - *GCPS could offer multiple classes of PLTW a year to increase completers and enrollment (ex. – DE and CIM), as well as possibly add other specialty class like aerospace and civil engineering and architecture! We could also offer more computer science classes and AG classes for varied levels of interest and expertise.*
 - *GCPS could consistently staff a school newspaper every year for every student to have an opportunity to participate.*
 - *GCPS could embed robotics into the school day. Why not a pathway in robotics to capitalize on all the work of 1629? No one in the state is doing this and the school district can lead the way.*
 - *GCPS could offer more kids physical education and weight training.*
 - *Garrett County could add more CTE options due to the increase in student population to support Teacher Academy, Homeland Security and Emergency Preparedness, and the Maryland Fire and Rescue Institute (MFRI)*
- *At these staffing numbers we would average around 17 kids per class – an ideal amount with room for fluctuation either way. Furthermore, the number of assistants would make it easier to meet all accommodations for special education.*
- *GCPS could maintain and increase sports opportunities (numbers keep dropping so rosters are smaller. Makes it less likely to field JV for soccer, softball, etc. – this many students would actually increase opportunity by keeping sports fully rostered, and by also adding freshman teams to JV and Varsity). Could also potentially add swimming, bowling for all, and 3 full unified sports.*
 - *Our sports would be very competitive – nothing brings a school together like winning.*

- *Savings in other areas would bring back activity busses and allow free participation (no pay to play) – allowing greater access.*
- *State of the art facilities will aid the coming together of the two schools and entice home school kids who want to play sports to come back to public education.*
- *Build an auditorium – major improvement for all students and the arts program in particular. Again, another enticement for home-school kids to re-enroll or enroll for the first time.*
- *PD would be simplified, as all staff would be centrally located. This would allow much greater collaboration and create (hopefully) better instruction. This also negates travel and those reimbursements, as well.*
- *Having all high school students under one roof simplifies and makes possible more collaboration with the college to share staff in dual enrollment courses.*

Cost Savings

- *GCPS could remove about 25 mixed full time positions (teachers, secretaries, etc.) and an additional 30 extra-curricular positions.*
- *Staff to student ratio would be close to 1:17 at those numbers*
- *GCPS could eliminate extra-curricular busing and save about \$50,000 a year based off of the current budget and basing travel from a central location instead of either school and cutting all trips in half. This allows for an increase in money for sports and band for further trips to compete.*
- *Textbook purchases would be approximately ½ of the number of books currently purchased (those requiring only a classroom set – art, many CTE classes, etc.)*
- *Software and testing site licensing fees of PLTW engineering, PLTW Bio-med, Mitchell (Automotive), ToolingU (NIMS), Adobe (Business and Computers) and any credentialing exams. Furthermore, we could cut in half the cost of Mock Trial, Envirothon, and any other programs that require a fee. Total estimated savings \$10,000 per year.*
- *CTE equipment purchases can be maximized by only having to buy one piece of equipment instead of one for each school. This could save hundreds of thousands of dollars in a short period of time and allow for more advanced equipment to be purchased. Also, for any programs that require someone to be trained to offer the courses (PLTW), this could half that expense, as well.*
- *All service contracts can be cut in half.*
- *Computer purchases can be cut by about a third, as well as actual classrooms would be cut by approximately 1/3 and you would only have one library. PLTW classes and traveling carts would be in one school, as opposed to trying to meet the technological needs of two separate schools.*

Big Picture

- *A single high school will cut down on the demands of the county businesses to support two of everything. Most businesses would probably love to donate to a single yearbook or newspaper or band or football team, rather than two.*
- *A state of the art high school would bring the county together and be a source of pride in its accomplishments. It would entice home-schooled kids to come to public school to experience the increased curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular opportunities that a single high school could offer (outlined above).*
- *By these estimates, and acquiescing that an increase in daily busing would result in taking students the 15 miles more each day to the lake from their original school sites, the savings*

should be well over 1.5 million per year. Most importantly, it would provide for greater academic and extra-curricular opportunities for all of our students.

- The closest school comparison at the time of this analysis to this new school would be Walkersville High School (Frederick County). Garrett would have approximately slightly under 1100 students at the time of open and Walkersville had 1108. Staffing projections line up pretty well with Walkersville.

References

Arnold, M. (2004). *Guiding Rural Schools and Districts: A Research Agenda*. US Department of Education.

Benson, C. S. (1997). *New vocationalism in the United States: Potential problems and outlook*. *Economics of Education Review*, 16(3), 201-212.

Brent, B. O., Sipple, J. W., Killeen, K. M., & Wischnowski, M. W. (2004). *Stalking cost-effective practices in rural schools*. *Journal of Education Finance*, 29(3), 237-256.

Burton, W. (2010). *Consolidation would free up funds*. *MuskogeePhoenix.com*.

Cooley, D. A., & Floyd, K. A. (2013). *Small rural school district consolidation in Texas: An analysis of its impact on cost and student achievement*. *Administrative Issues Journal*, 3(1), 7.

Dee, T. and M. West. "The Non-Cognitive Returns to Class Size." *National Bureau of Economic Research*, May 2008. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w13994>
Impact of School and Class Size on Student Outcomes, January 2015, Hanover Research page 9.

Deloitte Consulting, L. L. P. (2005). *Calling a change in the outsourcing market*.

Dewey, J. (1985). *Democracy and education* (1916). *The middle works*, 9, 4-58.

Eyre, E., & Finn, S. (2002). *Closing costs: School consolidation in West Virginia*. *Charleston Gazette*.

Graham, Suzanne E. & Christine Teague. 2011. "Reading levels of rural and urban third graders lag behind their suburban peers." *Carsey Institute Issue Brief no. 28*, Spring 2011. Durham, NH: University of New Hampshire Carsey School of Public Policy. *Out of the Loop*, National School Boards Association, Center for Public Education, January 2018 page 10.

Howley, Aimee & Craig Howley. 2001. "Rural school busing." *ERIC Digest*. Charleston, WV: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools. *Out of the Loop*, National School Boards Association, Center for Public Education, January 2018 page 21.

Johnson, Jerry, Daniel Showalter, Robert Klein, & Christine Lester. 2014. *Why Rural Matters 2013-2014*. Washington, DC: Rural School and Community Trust. *Out of the Loop*, National School Boards Association, Center for Public Education, January 2018 page 20.

Killeen, K., & Sipple, J. (2000). *School consolidation and transportation policy: An empirical and institutional analysis*. Arlington, VA: Rural School and Community Trust.

Krueger, A. B. (1999). *Experimental estimates of education production functions*. *The quarterly journal of economics*, 114(2), 497-532.

Krueger, A. B., & Whitmore, D. M. (2001). *The effect of attending a small class in the early grades on college-test taking and middle school test results: Evidence from Project STAR*. *The Economic Journal*, 111(468), 1-28.

Lee, V. E. (2001). *Restructuring High Schools for Equity and Excellence: What Works*. *Sociology of Education Series*. Teachers College Press, 1234 Amsterdam Avenue, New York, NY 10027.

Lee, V. and J. Smith. "High School Size: Which Works Best and for Whom?" *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 19:3. September 1997. <http://epa.sagepub.com/content/19/3/205.short> Impact of School and Class Size on Student Outcomes, January 2015, Hanover Research page 16

Leithwood, K. and D. Jantzi. "A Review of Empirical Evidence About School Size Effects: A Policy Perspective." *Review of Educational Research*, 79:1. March 2009. <http://rer.sagepub.com/content/79/1/464>. Impact of School and Class Size on Student Outcomes, January 2015, Hanover Research page 16

Mathis, W. (2006, March). *Anything but research-based: State initiatives to consolidate schools and districts*. Arlington, VA: Rural School and Community Trust: Retrieved from http://www.ruraledu.org/search.php?kw=Vermonty&pager_view.

Mane, F. (1999). *Trends in the payoff to academic and occupation-specific skills: the short and medium run returns to academic and vocational high school courses for non-college-bound students*. *Economics of education review*, 18(4), 417-437.

Nelson, E. (1985). *School consolidations (Report No. 1985-00-00)*. Eugene, OR: Clearinghouse on Educational Management. Retrieved from <https://www.ericdigest.org/pre-925/school.htm>.

Patterson, C. (2006, February). *School district consolidation and public school efficiency*. *Policy Perspective: Texas Public Policy Foundation*. Retrieved from <http://www.texaspolicy.com/pdf/2006-02-PP-consolidation-cp-pdf>.

Rosenbaum, J. E. (2002). *Beyond Empty Promises: Policies To Improve Transitions into College and Jobs*.

Schanzenbach, D. W. (2014). *Does class size matter?*

Self, T. (2001). *A post-consolidation evaluation - The effects eight years later*. Ashland University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 475 492).

Silverman, F. (2005). *All Alone*. *District Administration*, pp. 32-35. Retrieved from <http://www.thefreelibrary.com/2005/October/>

Snyder, T. D., & Dillow, S. A. (2011). *Digest of Education Statistics, 2010*. NCES 2011-015. National Center for Education Statistics.

Stone III, J. R. (1995). *Cooperative vocational education in the urban school: Toward a systems approach*. *Education and Urban Society*, 27(3), 328-352.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2019). *Digest of Education Statistics, 2017 (NCES 2018-070)*, Table 105.50.

SUPPLEMENT 2: PROJECT COST CALCULATIONS

General notes

The unit cost estimates for project costs include the following assumptions. For each assumption, the basis is provided. Assumptions unique to the Southern Middle/Broad Ford Elementary Project are shown separately.

The costs shown in the spreadsheets are for units that would be built in the summer of 2020. The unit costs assume that all projects of a similar type, e.g. Security Vestibules, will have the same expenses. In actuality, each improvement must be designed separately, and differences in existing conditions will have a large impact on the final construction and project costs.

The costs shown in the Six-Year Capital Funding Model (Exhibit 2) of the full Report are escalated for each fiscal year in which a unit or multiple units are built; consequently, the totals in Exhibit 2 cannot be derived from simple multiplication of the unit costs.

Cost calculation is not shown for the Disruptive Behavior classrooms, as these are very small projects and will be carried out through the operating budget.

Variables that may affect future cost projections include local and regional market conditions, the scope of projects that evolve during planning and design, unforeseen conditions latent in older school buildings, changes in the State cost allocation methods and rules, changes in local code requirements, and new State and federal mandates that may affect instructional programs and educational facilities.

Assumptions for All Projects:

- Construction cost is escalated at 4% per annum to the beginning of construction.

Basis: 4% per annum is a baseline figure that has been used by the State Department of Budget and Management in developing cost estimates as well as by industry sources. The Interagency Commission on School Construction based their FY 2021 figure on recent bids, with an increase of 3.5% over the FY 2020 figure. Edward Zarenski, a nationally recognized expert in construction economics, indicates that construction cost escalation for non-residential work will exceed 4% in FY 2019.¹ Given the extreme uncertainties in the market due to tariffs and local market conditions, use of 4% is considered a reasonable factor. Annual percentages can vary widely from this figure due to many factors, including local market conditions for projects in Garrett County, that may differ substantially from those affecting regional and national markets.
- The cost for construction of projects that will begin in summer of 2020 is \$329/sf (building only), the figure used by the State of Maryland Interagency Commission on School Construction (IAC) for new construction projects submitted in the FY 2021 CIP. This figure is for new vertical construction, building only. This figure is adjusted for other types of projects where it is anticipated that the level of construction effort will be less than for new construction.

Basis: Interagency Commission on School Construction *Instructions for Submission of FY 2021 Capital Improvement Program*, July 19, 2019, page 7.
- Sitework for renovation is calculated at 5% of the building construction cost, and for new construction at 19% of building construction cost.

Basis: Interagency Commission on School Construction “Instructions for Submission of FY 2021 Capital Improvement Program,” July 19, 2019, page 7, 13; IAC FY 2021 Forms, “Computation Supplement 102”.
- Construction contingency is included at 2% for the new work and 12% for the renovation work.

¹ “Anticipate construction inflation for nonresidential buildings for 2018 and 2019 at 5%, rather than the long term average of 3.5% to 4.0%.” <https://edzarenski.com/2016/09/12/construction-cost-inflation-commentary-e/>. See also “2019 Construction Economic Forecast – Nonresidential – Dec 2018” at <https://edzarenski.com/2018/11/23/2019-construction-economic-forecast-nonresidential-dec-2018/>

Basis: LEA experience with similar projects. Construction contingency largely covers unforeseen conditions that may emerge during construction. For new work, these are generally confined to soil conditions, and 2% is usually adequate. For renovation work, the nature of unforeseen conditions can vary widely among projects; contingencies can range from 5% to 12% or even higher. A high figure of 12% is used here to ensure that the budget will cover the most likely unforeseen conditions.

- Project development costs are calculated at 15% of total building and sitework costs for major projects; project development costs do not include furniture, furnishings and equipment (FF&E). The figure is applicable to major projects, and covers design fees, site survey, permits where needed, testing and inspections, and miscellaneous project development costs (e.g. pre-construction 3D virtual filming, unique professional services). Project development costs are reduced for simpler project types, for example building system replacement.

Basis: General experience with new construction projects.

- The State share of project costs is based on current practices, including the State-local cost share applicable to Garrett County Public Schools, and on the categories of work that are eligible for State funding participation.

Basis: COMAR 23.03.02.05 and .06.

Additional Assumptions for the Southern Middle/Broad Ford Elementary Project:

- The renovation of the Southern Middle portion of the facility is based on the estimate of the Department of Facilities, February 2018, escalated forward to the start of construction. Design contingency is included at 5% to account for additional work that may be needed. Sitework and construction contingencies are added.

Basis: Department of Facilities estimate. The estimate included the scope of work remaining after recent replacement of specific building systems. The estimate did not comprise a complete renovation, but rather targeted replacement of specific building systems and renovation of specific programmatic areas.

- The addition portion is calculated at \$329/sf, escalated forward to the start of construction.

Basis: Interagency Commission on School Construction *Instructions for Submission of FY 2021 Capital Improvement Program*, July 19, 2019, page 7.

- The cost of the feasibility study is based on a range provided by LEA facility planners with experience with projects of similar complexity.
- Site acquisition costs are not included. It is assumed that either the existing site will be used, or another site within public ownership will be made available.
- To determine the total square footage for each enrollment option:
 - September 30, 2018 enrollments are projected forward to the 2023-2024 school year (the year in which funding approval would be requested).
 - The current State square foot-per-student allocations are used (as provided in the IAC forms for completion of the FY 2021 Capital Improvement Program), including allocations for special education students.
 - It is assumed that there will be a reduction in total program area of at least 18,000 square feet to account for joint-use functions, for example in physical education, cafeteria, media center, administrative space, and community use space. The potential areas of reduction will be determined through the educational specification process.
 - It is assumed that both schools will operate at 100% of capacity. Most major projects are not designed for 100% utilization; at roughly 95% utilization, the school administration has more flexibility to adjust spaces to meet the needs of the students

and to accommodate unexpected growth, if it should occur. However, in a situation of declining enrollments and severe fiscal constraints, planning for 100% utilization may be warranted.

DRAFT

RECOMMENDATION I.A – SECURITY VESTIBULE

GARRETT COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS					
STRATEGIC FACILITIES PLAN					
COST ESTIMATE CALCULATION					
PROJECT CATEGORY: SECURITY VESTIBULE					
DATE: 10/15/2019					
COST ASSUMPTIONS					
Costs escalated to:	Summer 2020	start of construction			
State share of eligible costs	50%				
Construction cost escalation	4%	/year			
Sitework	None required				
A/E	Full design services required				
Other	Unit costs may vary considerably among schools, based on configuration of existing entry area				
COST ESTIMATE					
Basis of cost estimate	Recent experience of other school systems in Maryland				
Area	Varies by school; generally less than 1,000 sf affected				
			Total	State	Local
Unit cost			\$ 70,000 /vestibule		
Base building cost			\$ 70,000 /vestibule	\$ 35,000	\$ 35,000
Sitework	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A
Design contingency	10%	of Building + Sitework	\$ 7,000	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500
Subtotal, Construction			\$ 77,000	\$ 38,500	\$ 38,500
Construction Contingency	12%	of Construction	\$ 9,000		\$ 9,000
Total Construction			\$ 86,000	\$ 38,500	\$ 47,500
Project development costs	15%	of total Project cost	\$ 15,000		\$ 15,000
Total Project			\$ 101,000 /vestibule	\$ 39,000	\$ 62,000

RECOMMENDATION I.C – BUILDING SYSTEMS

GARRETT COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS					
STRATEGIC FACILITIES PLAN					
COST ESTIMATE CALCULATION					
<hr/>					
PROJECT CATEGORY:	BUILDING SYSTEMS				
DATE:	10/15/2019				
<hr/>					
COST ASSUMPTIONS					
Costs escalated to:	Summer 2020	start of construction (escalated 2.5 years, Feb. 2018 to mid-2020)			
State share of eligible costs	50%				
Construction cost escalation	4%	/year			
Sitework	5%	of building cost			
A/E	Full design services required				
Other	Costs must be escalated to time of bid				
<hr/>					
COST ESTIMATE					
Basis of cost estimate	GCPS Department of Facilities estimates, February 2018, w/ sitework, contingencies, & escalation added				
Area	Varies per project scope				
<hr/>					
Southern High School - Front Exterior Renovation			Total	State	Local
Unit cost			N/A	N/A	N/A
Area			N/A	N/A	N/A
Base building cost	February 2018		\$ 2,037,000		
Escalated building cost	Summer 2020		\$ 2,246,852	\$ 1,123,426	\$ 1,123,426
Sitework	5%		\$ 112,343	\$ 56,171	\$ 56,171
Design contingency	5%	of Building + Sitework	\$ 117,960	\$ 58,980	\$ 58,980
Subtotal, Construction			\$ 2,477,154	\$ 1,238,577	\$ 1,238,577
Construction Contingency	12%	of Construction	\$ 297,258		\$ 297,258
Total Construction			\$ 2,774,000	\$ 1,238,577	\$ 1,535,835
Project development costs	10%	of total Project cost	\$ 308,000		\$ 308,000
Total Project			\$ 3,082,000	\$ 1,239,000	\$ 1,843,000
<hr/>					
Northern High School - Boiler and Pavement Replacement			Total	State	Local
Unit cost			N/A	N/A	N/A
Area			N/A	N/A	N/A
Base building cost	February 2018		\$ 1,103,600		
Escalated building cost	Summer 2020		\$ 1,217,293	\$ 608,646	\$ 608,646
Sitework	5%		\$ 60,865	\$ 30,432	\$ 30,432
Design contingency	5%	of Building + Sitework	\$ 63,908	\$ 31,954	\$ 31,954
Subtotal, Construction			\$ 1,342,065	\$ 671,033	\$ 671,033
Construction Contingency	12%	of Construction	\$ 161,048		\$ 161,048
Total Construction			\$ 1,503,000	\$ 671,033	\$ 832,080
Project development costs	10%	of total Project cost	\$ 167,000		\$ 167,000
Total Project			\$ 1,670,000	\$ 671,000	\$ 999,000
<hr/>					
Yough Glades Elementary - Paving/Bus Loop			Total	State	Local
Unit cost			N/A	N/A	N/A
Area			N/A	N/A	N/A
Base building cost	February 2018		\$ 1,258,500		
Escalated building cost	Summer 2020		\$ 1,388,151	\$ 694,075	\$ 694,075
Sitework	5%	additional to paving work	\$ 69,408	\$ 34,704	\$ 34,704
Design contingency	5%	paving + additional sitework	\$ 72,878	\$ 36,439	\$ 36,439
Subtotal, Construction			\$ 1,530,436	\$ 765,218	\$ 765,218
Construction Contingency	12%	of Construction	\$ 183,652		\$ 183,652
Total Construction			\$ 1,714,000	\$ 765,218	\$ 948,870
Project development costs	10%	of total Project cost	\$ 190,000		\$ 190,000
Total Project			\$ 1,904,000	\$ 765,000	\$ 1,139,000

RECOMMENDATION I.C – BUILDING SYSTEMS (continued)

Route 40 Elementary - Boiler Replacement			Total	State	Local
Unit cost			N/A	N/A	N/A
Area			N/A	N/A	N/A
Base building cost	February 2018		\$ 491,050		
Escalated building cost	Summer 2020		\$ 541,638	\$ 270,819	\$ 270,819
Sitework	5%		\$ 27,082	\$ 13,541	\$ 13,541
Design contingency	5%	of Building + Sitework	\$ 28,436	\$ 14,218	\$ 14,218
Subtotal, Construction			\$ 597,156	\$ 298,578	\$ 298,578
Construction Contingency	12%	of Construction	\$ 71,659		\$ 71,659
Total Construction			\$ 669,000	\$ 298,578	\$ 370,237
Project development costs	10%	of total Project cost	\$ 74,000		\$ 74,000
Total Project			\$ 743,000	\$ 299,000	\$ 444,000
Grantsville Elementary - Electrical Replacement			Total	State	Local
Unit cost			N/A	N/A	N/A
Area			N/A	N/A	N/A
Base building cost	February 2018		\$ 212,000		
Escalated building cost	Summer 2020		\$ 233,840	\$ 116,920	\$ 116,920
Sitework	5%		\$ 11,692	\$ 5,846	\$ 5,846
Design contingency	5%	of Building + Sitework	\$ 12,277	\$ 6,138	\$ 6,138
Subtotal, Construction			\$ 257,809	\$ 128,904	\$ 128,904
Construction Contingency	12%	of Construction	\$ 30,937		\$ 30,937
Total Construction			\$ 289,000	\$ 128,904	\$ 159,841
Project development costs	10%	of total Project cost	\$ 32,000		\$ 32,000
Total Project			\$ 321,000	\$ 129,000	\$ 192,000
Broad Ford Elementary - Roof Replacement			Total	State	Local
Unit cost			N/A	N/A	N/A
Area			N/A	N/A	N/A
Base building cost	February 2018		\$ 1,679,640		
Escalated building cost	Summer 2020		\$ 1,852,676	\$ 926,338	\$ 926,338
Sitework	1%		\$ 18,527	\$ 9,263	\$ 9,263
Design contingency	5%	of Building + Sitework	\$ 93,560	\$ 46,780	\$ 46,780
Subtotal, Construction			\$ 1,964,763	\$ 982,382	\$ 982,382
Construction Contingency	12%	of Construction	\$ 235,772		\$ 235,772
Total Construction			\$ 2,201,000	\$ 982,382	\$ 1,218,153
Project development costs	10%	of total Project cost	\$ 245,000		\$ 245,000
Total Project			\$ 2,446,000	\$ 982,000	\$ 1,464,000

RECOMMENDATION I.D – OPEN SPACE CLASSROOMS

GARRETT COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS					
STRATEGIC FACILITIES PLAN					
COST ESTIMATE CALCULATION					
PROJECT CATEGORY: OPEN SPACE POD CONVERSION					
DATE: 10/15/2019					
COST ASSUMPTIONS					
Construction cost	\$	225.00	/SF (2/3 of State FY 2021 new construction figure)		
Costs escalated to:		Summer 2020	start of construction		
State share of eligible costs		50%			
Construction cost escalation		4%	/year		
Sitework		5%			
A/E	Full design services required				
Other	Unit consists of a 2-classroom (CR) open space pod				
	Construction cost taken at 2/3 of full construction (\$329/sf)				
COST ESTIMATE					
Basis of cost estimate	2/3 of standard cost to build new				
Area	Assumes pod = 2 classrooms @ 750 NSF ea, 70% efficiency				
			Total	State	Local
Unit cost			\$ 225	/2 CR Pod	
Area			2,100	GSF	
Base building cost			\$ 472,500	/2 CR Pod	\$ 236,250
Sitework	5%		\$ 23,625		\$ 11,813
Design contingency	10%	of Building + Sitework	\$ 49,613	\$ 24,806	\$ 24,806
Subtotal, Construction			\$ 545,738	\$ 272,869	\$ 272,869
Construction Contingency	12%	of Construction	\$ 65,489		\$ 65,489
Total Construction			\$ 611,000	\$ 272,869	\$ 338,357
Project development costs	15%	of total Project cost	\$ 108,000		\$ 108,000
Total Project			\$ 719,000	\$ 273,000	\$ 446,000

RECOMMENDATION IV.A – SOUTHERN MIDDLE/BROAD FORD ELEMENTARY PROJECT

GARRETT COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS			
STRATEGIC FACILITIES PLAN			
COST ESTIMATE CALCULATION			
PROJECT CATEGORY: SOUTHERN MIDDLE/BROAD FORD ELEMENTARY PROJECT			
DATE: 10/15/2019			
COST ASSUMPTIONS			
Scope of Work:	Renovation of existing Southern MS facility, expansion for combined enrollment; 18,000 GSF reduction due to program efficiencies		
Construction cost	\$ 329.00	/SF; State cost, FY 2021 (Instructions for FY21 CIP, July 2019)	
Costs escalated to:	Summer 2024	start of construction	
Escalated construction cost:	\$ 384.88	/SF; State cost, FY 2024 (assumed, based on escalation)	
State share of eligible costs	50%		
Construction cost escalation	4%	/year	
Sitework, Renovation	5%		
Sitework, New	19%		
A/E	Full design services required		
Other			
COST ESTIMATE			
Enrollment:	843	Option 5: Redistrict S. to N.; 5th up, 8th up South only	
Basis of cost estimate	Southern Middle School facility renovation: Department of Facilities scope of work, February 2018		
	Expansion: Based on State of MD per-student square foot allocations		
Area	Renovation:	92,000	GSF
	New:	17,700	GSF
	Total:	109,700	GSF
Partial Renovation - Existing area (Southern Middle School facility)			
		Total	State
Unit cost		N/A	
Area		92,000	GSF
Base building cost		\$ 10,917,400	
Escalated building cost		\$ 14,087,565	escalated \$ 7,043,782 \$ 7,043,782
Sitework	5%	\$ 704,378	\$ 352,189 \$ 352,189
Design contingency	5%	\$ 739,597	\$ 369,799 \$ 369,799
Subtotal, Construction		\$ 15,531,540	\$ 7,765,770 \$ 7,765,770
Construction Contingency	12%	\$ 1,863,785	\$ 1,863,785
Total Construction		\$ 17,395,000	\$ 7,765,770 \$ 9,629,555
Project development costs	15%	\$ 3,070,000	\$ 3,070,000
Total Project		\$ 20,465,000	\$ 7,766,000 \$ 12,699,000
Addition			
		Total	State
Unit cost		\$ 385	/SF
Area		17,700	GSF
Base building cost		\$ 6,812,437	\$ 3,406,219 \$ 3,406,219
Sitework	19%	\$ 1,294,363	\$ 647,182 \$ 647,182
Design contingency	5%	\$ 405,340	\$ 202,670 \$ 202,670
Subtotal, Construction		\$ 8,512,140	\$ 4,256,070 \$ 4,256,070
Construction Contingency	3%	\$ 255,364	\$ 255,364
Total Construction		\$ 8,768,000	\$ 4,256,070 \$ 4,511,434
Project development costs	15%	\$ 1,547,000	\$ 1,547,000
Total Project		\$ 10,315,000	\$ 4,256,000 \$ 6,059,000
Total			
		Total	State
Unit cost			
Area		109,700	GSF
Base construction cost		\$ 20,900,002	\$ 10,450,001 \$ 10,450,001
Sitework		\$ 1,998,741	\$ 999,371 \$ 999,371
Design contingency		\$ 1,144,937	\$ 572,469 \$ 572,469
Subtotal, Construction		\$ 24,043,681	\$ 12,021,840 \$ 12,021,840
Construction Contingency		\$ 2,119,149	\$ 2,119,149
Total Construction		\$ 26,163,000	\$ 12,021,840 \$ 14,140,989
Project development costs		\$ 4,617,000	\$ 4,617,000
Total Project		\$ 30,780,000	\$ 12,022,000 \$ 18,758,000

RECOMMENDATION IV.C.a – HEAD START

GARRETT COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS					
STRATEGIC FACILITIES PLAN					
COST ESTIMATE CALCULATION					
PROJECT CATEGORY:	HEAD START				
DATE:	10/15/2019				
COST ASSUMPTIONS					
Costs escalated to:	Summer 2020 start of construction				
State share of eligible costs	Local funding only				
Construction cost escalation	4% /year				
Sitework	None required				
A/E	Full design services required				
Other	Unit costs may vary considerably among schools, based on configuration of existing entry area				
COST ESTIMATE					
Basis of cost estimate	Recent GCPS experience with similar projects				
Area	620 GSF/classroom - Early Head Start				
	920 GSF/classroom - Head Start				
Early Head Start Classroom			Total	State	Local
Unit cost			\$ 50 /SF		
Area			620 GSF		
Base building cost			\$ 31,000		\$ 31,000
Sitework	N/A		N/A		N/A
Design contingency	10%	of Building + Sitework	\$ 3,100		\$ 3,100
Subtotal, Construction			\$ 34,100		\$ 34,100
Construction Contingency	12%	of Construction	\$ 4,000		\$ 4,000
Total Construction			\$ 38,000		\$ 38,100
Project development costs	15%	of total Project cost	\$ 7,000		\$ 7,000
Total Project			\$ 45,000 /classroom		\$ 45,000
Head Start Classroom			Total	State	Local
Unit cost			\$ 50 /SF		
Area			920 GSF		
Base building cost			\$ 46,000		\$ 46,000
Sitework	N/A		N/A		N/A
Design contingency	10%	of Building + Sitework	\$ 4,600		\$ 4,600
Subtotal, Construction			\$ 50,600		\$ 50,600
Construction Contingency	12%	of Construction	\$ 6,000		\$ 6,000
Total Construction			\$ 57,000		\$ 56,600
Project development costs	15%	of total Project cost	\$ 10,000		\$ 10,000
Total Project			\$ 67,000 /classroom		\$ 67,000

RECOMMENDATION IV.C.b.1 – CRELLIN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

GARRETT COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS					
STRATEGIC FACILITIES PLAN					
COST ESTIMATE CALCULATION					
PROJECT CATEGORY: CRELLIN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL					
DATE: 10/15/2019					
COST ASSUMPTIONS					
Scope of Work: Renovation: Partial renovations, using an annual allocation.					
Relocatable classrooms: Remove 2 older relocatables, install 4 relocated from Broad Ford Elementary School					
Additions: 4,000 square feet of new construction for programmatic purposes					
Construction cost	\$	329.00	/SF; State cost, FY 2021 (Instructions for FY21 CIP, July 2019)		
Costs escalated to:		Summer 2020	start of construction		
State share of eligible costs		50%			
Construction cost escalation		4%	/year		
Sitework, Renovation		5%			
Sitework, New		19%			
A/E Relocatables: In-house; Renovations and New: Full design services required					
Other Relocatables are locally owned, State will not participate in relocation					
COST ESTIMATE					
Basis of cost estimate	Renovation: Allocation of \$100,000/year in construction cost				
	Relocatables: \$40,000 per classroom unit to move; \$25,000 to demolish existing.				
	New: \$329/sf, plus sitework and contingencies				
Area	Renovation:		N/A	Projects will be targeted based on priorities	
	New:		4,000	GSF	
Renovation - Existing areas					
Unit cost			Total	State	Local
Area			N/A		
			GSF		
Base building cost			\$ 100,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000
Sitework	5%		\$ 5,000	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500
Design contingency	10%	of Building + Sitework	\$ 10,500	\$ 5,250	\$ 5,250
Subtotal, Construction			\$ 115,500	\$ 57,750	\$ 57,750
Construction Contingency	12%	of Construction	\$ 13,860		\$ 13,860
Total Construction			\$ 129,000	\$ 57,750	\$ 71,610
Project development costs	15%	of total Project cost	\$ 23,000		\$ 23,000
Total Project			\$ 152,000	\$ 58,000	\$ 94,000
Relocatable Classrooms					
Unit cost			\$ 40,000	/Relocatable to move	
Number of units			4	Units	
Base building cost			\$ 160,000		\$ 160,000
Sitework	10%		\$ 16,000		\$ 16,000
Design contingency	2%	of Building + Sitework	\$ 3,520		\$ 3,520
Demolition of existing units			\$ 25,000		\$ 25,000
Subtotal, Construction			\$ 204,520		\$ 204,520
Construction Contingency	10%	of Construction	\$ 20,452		\$ 20,452
Total Construction			\$ 225,000		\$ 224,972
Project development costs	8%	of total Project cost	\$ 20,000		\$ 20,000
Total Project			\$ 245,000		\$ 245,000
Additions					
Unit cost			\$ 329		
Area			4,100	GSF	
Base building cost			\$ 1,348,900	\$ 674,450	\$ 674,450
Sitework	19%		\$ 256,291	\$ 128,146	\$ 128,146
Design contingency	10%	of Building + Sitework	\$ 160,519	\$ 80,260	\$ 80,260
Subtotal, Construction			\$ 1,765,710	\$ 882,855	\$ 882,855
Construction Contingency	5%	of Construction	\$ 88,286		\$ 88,286
Total Construction			\$ 1,854,000	\$ 882,855	\$ 971,141
Project development costs	15%	of total Project cost	\$ 327,000		\$ 327,000
Total Project			\$ 2,181,000	\$ 883,000	\$ 1,298,000

RECOMMENDATION IV.D – RELOCATE BOARD OF EDUCATION OFFICE

GARRETT COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS					
STRATEGIC FACILITIES PLAN					
COST ESTIMATE CALCULATION					
PROJECT CATEGORY: RELOCATE BOARD OF EDUCATION OFFICES					
DATE: 10/15/2019					
COST ASSUMPTIONS					
Costs escalated to:	Summer 2020 start of construction				
State share of eligible costs	Local funding only				
Construction cost escalation	4% /year				
Sitework	None required				
A/E	In-house design				
Other	Site to be located				
COST ESTIMATE					
Basis of cost estimate	Recent GCPS experience with similar projects				
Area	620 GSF/classroom - Early Head Start				
	920 GSF/classroom - Head Start				
Relocate Board of Education Offices					
			Total	State	Local
Unit cost			N/A		N/A
Area			N/A		N/A
Base building cost			\$ 100,000		\$ 100,000
Sitework	N/A		N/A		N/A
Design contingency	0%	of Building + Sitework	\$ -		\$ -
Subtotal, Construction			\$ 100,000		\$ 100,000
Construction Contingency	0%	of Construction	\$ -		\$ -
Total Construction			\$ 100,000		\$ 100,000
Project development costs	Unit price		\$ 5,000		\$ 5,000
Total Project			\$ 105,000	/classroom	\$ 105,000