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Agenda

• Opening remarks from Interim Committee
• Framing remarks
• Capital Construction
• District Organization
• Next steps – working groups discussion
  – Working groups
  – Deeper analysis; move to design
• Public testimony
Framing: How Do We Think About Systemic Approaches to Meeting These Challenges?
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CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION
Capital Construction Assistance

• Building Excellent Schools Today (BEST) program.
  – Sliding scale matching grants program
  – Similar in purpose to most states in the nation
    • Small handful of states require no matching funds
    • Handful of states provide no assistance

• Charter School Capital Construction.
  – Annual Legislative appropriation distributed to charter schools on a per-pupil basis for capital construction needs
  – $25 million in 2016-17
Building Excellent Schools Today (BEST)

- Established in 2008 to provide matching grant funding to education institutions for major maintenance and construction.
- Nine-member appointed Capital Construction Assistance Board work with staff to review grant applications annually.
- Local match determined by several measures of district wealth (assessed value per pupil, median household income), student needs (FRL eligibility), bonding capacity & bonding success.
BEST Program Revenue

Revenue Sources

Revenues received by BEST by fiscal year and funding sources for the past five years *(through June 2017)*
BEST Prioritization

• Applications prioritized:
  – Health, safety, security issues & technology
  – Relieve overcrowding
  – Other capital needs

• Facility Insight
  – Physical condition assessment
  – Educational adequacy (suitability)
Distribution of BEST Grant Funding
BEST Projects Funded By Types

- New School / School Replacement, 16.42%
- Roof, 28.43%
- HVAC, 10.06%
- Fire Alarm / Sprinkler, 8.09%
- Security, 5.96%
- Boiler, 3.94%
- Addition, 3.56%
- Water Systems, 3.30%
- Asbestos, 3.12%
- ADA, 1.28%
- Other, 4.98%
- Renovation, 10.87%
BEST Projects Funded By Dollar Amount

- New School/School Replacement, 68.41%
- Renovation, 16.40%
- Addition, 5.95%
- Roof, 3.83%
- HVAC, 1.33%
- Water Systems, 1.08%
- Security, 0.76%
- Boiler, 0.74%
- ADA, 0.09%
- Other, 0.24%
- Asbestos, 0.47%
- Fire Alarm/Sprinkler, 0.70%
DISCUSSION
District Organization
History of Local Schools in Colorado

• From 1876-1945, Colorado law allowed for the parents of 10 school-age children to petition the county superintendent to create a new school district.
  – Amended in 1945 to be 15 children

• 685 school districts within 10 years of statehood.

• Peaked in 1935 with 2,105 school districts.
District Reorganization

- Reorganization began in earnest beginning in late 1940s and continued through the 1960s.
  - 181 districts in 1965
- Boards of Cooperative Services Act enacted in 1965 to help address economies of scale issues, such as serving low-incidence, high-cost special education students, mechanism for cooperative purchasing and shared services.
  - Stemmed the tide of school district reorganization
District Reorganization

• School District Reorganization Act of 1992 allowed for “de-consolidation.”
  – In 2000, West Yuma School District RJ-1 was dissolved with two new districts formed – Yuma School District 1 and Liberty School District J-4
  – In 2000, East Yuma School District was dissolved with two new districts formed – Wray School District RD-2 and Idalia School District RJ-3
District Names Reflect History of Reorganization

- Re, RE, R – reorganized.
  - “R” for those reorganized in 1953
  - “Re” for those reorganized through consolidation in 1959
- RD – reorganized/deconsolidated
- C – consolidated
- J, Jt, (J) – joint, crosses county lines
- RJ, REJ, Jt-R – reorganized joint
District Organization

• El Paso County has 15 districts; Weld County has 12 districts; Adams and Arapahoe counties each have 7 districts.
• 148 school districts comprise ~16% of state’s total student population
  – 88 districts have less than 500 students
  – 109 of 178 districts meet the definition of “small rural”
  – 39 of 178 districts meet the definition of “rural”
WORKING GROUPS
Working Groups

• Move from general description to in-depth description and analysis.
  – What is happening with whom and why?
  – Checking system performance against values

• Begin design work consistent with stated values to improve system effectiveness and efficiency.
Working Groups

• Revenues – state and local.
• Addressing student needs.
• Addressing school and district needs.
• Performance and accountability.