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Introduction

Following the March 2015 property tax referendum, Baldwin County Board of Education (BCBE) established a Community Advisory Task Force (CATF) of concerned citizens to thoroughly examine and provide counsel for actionable steps regarding the future of public education in Baldwin County in each of five areas: Communication, Curriculum, Facilities, Funding and Leadership.

These citizens are diverse in many ways: geographic region of the county, life stage, area of expertise and, importantly, appointees represented both the “for” and “against” referenda positions. The common thread for all these volunteers is their belief in and commitment to excellent public education in Baldwin County. This was a formidable charge and CATF members collectively invested more than 1,200 volunteer hours into this initiative. This time included informational sessions, self-education, investigation, discussion, report preparation and even visits to Baldwin County public schools. Each group had a plethora of information and Subject Matter Experts at their disposal and no subcommittee found even a trace of lack of cooperation from all entities involved. This report contains the charter, task force member roster, and recommendations from each of five subcommittees along with supporting materials for these recommendations. The Task Force respectfully submits this Final Report and requests BCBE officially adopt the recommendations therein.

A formidable charge, the Community Advisory Task Force (CATF) members collectively invested more than 1,200 volunteer hours into this initiative.

Kevin Corcoran, Chair
PURPOSE:
This charter governs the operations of the Baldwin County Board of Education (BCBE) Community Advisory Task Force. The Task Force has been appointed by the BCBE to develop recommendations for the county’s five priorities for action: funding, facilities, curriculum, leadership, and communications.

ORGANIZATION:
The Task Force shall be an external advisory committee to BCBE and comprised of at least 20 members. Mayors from the county’s municipalities shall nominate at least one and no more than three members. The Baldwin County Commissioners shall nominate representatives to meet the 20-member minimum, if necessary.

No elected officials may be appointed.

Selection and appointment will be made giving consideration to student population in each community, geographic representation, and apparent knowledge and/or expertise in one of the five priority areas. Final approval will be given by BCBE.

The Task Force will form and delegate authority to subcommittees focused on the five priorities for action. The qualifications of individuals to serve on the Task Force shall include:

- Understands the importance of education to creating quality of life
- Are active and respected in the community
- Have a broad range of backgrounds and experiences
- Have good judgment and integrity
- Can leave personal agendas behind
- Are not afraid to speak up and present new thoughts & perspectives
- Have strong communication skills
- Knowledge and/or expertise in one of the five priority areas

The Baldwin County Education Coalition shall facilitate the Task Force and subcommittees.
OBJECTIVES AND RESPONSIBILITIES:
Determine a Task Force Chairman and Sub-Committee Co-Chairs to frame agendas, manage meetings, provide minutes and report work of the committees.

Confine recommendations to local issues; state or national level issues which the board has no jurisdiction shall not be addressed. The scope of the recommendations should be limited to high-level goals and objectives and not a detailed Plan of Work.

Review and report progress to the districts Co-owned Strategic Plan adopted in August 2011.

Work collaboratively and build consensus on the recommendations that will be made to BCBE.

Conduct business using relaxed Roberts Rules.
In carrying out its responsibilities, the Superintendent will make available district level administrative employees as needed to provide information and serve as advisors to assist the Task Force with its work.

MEETINGS:
The Task Force shall meet bi-weekly, or more frequently as necessary to carry out its responsibilities, over a period of three months and will provide a final report with recommendation to BCBE at its September 2015 board meeting.

Meetings will be held at Robertsdale High School at 5:30pm (dates TBD) and shall begin with a general session of all members, break into sub-committee sessions, and conclude with a closing session with each sub-committee reporting and making recommendations on the agenda for the next meeting.

Meetings shall be open to the public and posted on the BCBE calendar. Time shall be given for public comment at the closing session of each meeting.

Upon request of the BCBE, the Task Force shall submit the minutes of meetings or discuss the matters of the meetings with the board.

CHARTER APPROVAL:
President, Baldwin County Board of Education
Date

STATEMENT OF COMMITMENT:
I,______________________________, agree to serve as a Baldwin County Board of Education Community Advisory Task Force member. I agree to commit the necessary time and will actively participate in meetings and work in good faith with other members to accomplish our goals and responsibilities. I also commit to communicating and sharing information about the work of the Task Force in my respective community.

Task Force Member
Date
Community Advisory Task Force Members

CHAIR
Kevin Corcoran
Gulf Shores
Owner/Broker, RE/MAX of Gulf Shores
Three children, Gulf Shores High School
& Gulf Shores Elementary

CURRICULUM SUBCOMMITTEE
Kelly McGriff
Montrose, Curriculum Subcommittee Chair
Attorney, Brackin, McGriff, & Johnson, PC
Two children, Fairhope Middle & Fairhope High

Doug Warren
Ono Island
President/CEO, Community Health Systems
One child, Gulf Shores High School

Jon Archer
Magnolia Springs
Attorney/Developer
Young Business Professional - no children

Jennifer Watkins
Foley
Planning Department, City of Gulf Shores
Two children at Foley Elementary

Barbara Brown
Bay Minette
Retired Educator, State Dept. of Education, AMSTI
Grandchildren in Bay Minette schools

LEADERSHIP SUBCOMMITTEE
Vickie Bailey
Fairhope, Leadership Subcommittee Chair
Retired Educator
Soon to have grandchildren in Fairhope Schools

Jason Kozon
Elberta
Financial Advisor, Edward Jones investments
Two children, Elberta Middle & Foley High

Liana Barnett
Bay Minette
Mobile County Personnel Board, Human Resources
One child, Baldwin County High School

Kathy Sternenberg
Fairhope
President, Sternenberg Marketing & Consulting, Inc.
One child, Fairhope High

Roger Few
Spanish Fort
Fire Chief, City of Spanish Fort
Two children, Spanish Fort Elementary

COMMUNICATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE
Jennifer Graham Jenkins, APR
Daphne, Communications Subcommittee Chair
President, JJPR
Three children, Daphne East Elementary School, Daphne
Middle School and Daphne High School

Sharee Broussard, Ph.D., APR
Spanish Fort
Associate Professor & Chair, Division of Communication,
Fine & Performing Arts, Spring Hill College
One child, Spanish Fort High School
FACILITIES SUBCOMMITTEE

Cody Phillips  
Fairhope, Facilities Subcommittee Chair  
Phillips Consultants

Jennifer Archuletta  
Elberta  
Municipal employee, Town of Elberta  
Three children in Elberta Schools

Jimmy Davis  
Summerdale  
Police Chief, Town of Summerdale  
Two children, Summerdale School

Eartha Martin  
Daphne  
Retired  
Grandchildren in Daphne schools

Todd Stewart  
Bay Minette  
Principal Architect, Adams Stewart Architects  
Two children, Bay Minette Intermediate School

FUNDING SUBCOMMITTEE

David Vosloh  
Foley, Funding Subcommittee Chair  
Retired  
No children in the school

Tommy Faust, Jr.  
Fairhope  
Commercial Relationship Manager, Trustmark National Bank  
One child in Fairhope Schools

Chris Hadley  
Robertsdale  
Small business owner, Consultant, Information Technology  
Two children in Robertsdale Schools

Susan Hamby  
Elberta  
One grandchild, Elberta Elementary

Starke Irvine  
Daphne  
Realtor/Developer  
No children in school

Michael Robson  
Spanish Fort  
Owner, Mattress Depot  
No children in school
Subcommittee Reports of the Community Advisory Task Force

1. CURRICULUM: Academics first

2. LEADERSHIP: Crucial to effectiveness and efficiency

3. COMMUNICATION: Central; Challenges and greatness must be understood

4. FACILITIES: Exist to support learning

5. FUNDING: We can and must fund what we need
Curriculum

CHARGE: Three to four recommendations from appointed engaged citizens to the BCBE regarding curriculum

RELEVANT DEFINITIONS:

State Standards: Expectations of competency for each grade level, known as Alabama College and Career Ready Standards (ACCRS).

Curriculum: All school related experiences designed to prepare students to become responsible citizens capable of making rational decisions.

Academics: For the purpose of this report, the term academics encompasses all activities related to student learning (curriculum, course offering, athletics, etc).

Instructional Coach: A teacher who is a curriculum or subject-based specialist, who may also be involved in a leadership pathway to become a principal or district level supervisor. Instructional coaches work with other teachers to provide best teaching practices within vertical or horizontal teams.

Vertical Teaming: Teachers working collaboratively and aligning instruction across multiple grade levels.

Horizontal Teaming: Teachers working collaboratively and focusing on student achievement data across one grade level.

In terms of priority on our children’s education, academics should be first.

IB Program: A rigorous international education program currently offered at Daphne and Fairhope High Schools to any high school student in Baldwin County who meets the qualifications. The Distinction Diploma is the highest diploma that can be earned.
1. Over the past several years, technology and funding have been the district’s priorities and were driving decision making, leaving the key purpose of our public schools, academics, as secondary.

2. Academics must lead, not follow. Providing a world-class education for our children must be the primary goal of the Baldwin County Board of Education.

3. The district is currently operating without a Director of Instruction. The position remains vacant after the previous Director retired.

4. The Board of Education holds standing committees for Funding and Facilities, but does not hold a standing committee for Academics.

5. Due to the divisors used by the state to determine how many teacher units a school “earns” through the Foundation Program, Intermediate Schools across the district have overcrowded classrooms and fewer services, such as a Reading Coach. Essentially, the divisor is the teacher/student ratio:
   - K-3: 13.8
   - 4-6: 21.4
   - 7-8: 20.0
   - 9-12: 18.0

6. Many times, student/teacher ratios are not accurately reported. Including Special Ed Teachers in the county skews the overall ratio as those classes tend to be very small.

7. Based on the current student achievement data compared to the resources available for academics, every school is doing a tremendous job with instruction and providing a quality education for our children.

RECOMMENDATION 1:
Provide the necessary leadership to ensure academics is the number one priority of the district.

EXPLANATION:
• Appoint a district level Academic Leader or Academic Dean whose tenure is staggered to overlap elected officials terms.
• Provide sufficient personnel for the Academic Leader/Dean to implement system-wide rigorous academics and support thereafter.
• Create an Academic Standing Committee at the Board level, of equal importance as the Finance & Facilities Standing Committees. The Academic Committee should report on student achievement and performance at every board meeting.
• Create a standing Citizen’s Committee to meet quarterly, and to monitor and report progress.
• Use student achievement data to drive decision-making. The data should be easily accessible by the public with a link on the BCBE website and each schools website.

RATIONALE:
The sole purpose of our public schools is to educate our children and therefore should be the first priority. Everything else is secondary.

RECOMMENDATION 2:
Provide teachers and schools with the resources they need to deliver quality and equitable instruction.

EXPLANATION:
• Provide Instructional Coaches in all schools to support teachers. Coaches should be 12-month employees to analyze data and be ready to mentor and provide Professional Development as soon as school begins. Coaches should have experience teaching more than one grade level, hold strong classroom management and organizational skills, and a clear understanding of the standards and teaching strategies.
• Additional funding for teacher Professional Development for quality programs and best practices that have been identified to replicate across the district.
• Additional funding to pay substitute teachers that would allow teachers to visit their colleagues’ classrooms for vertical and horizontal teaming.
• Provide each High School with a Career Tech Resource or Lead Teacher to promote career academies and work collaboratively with community business leaders to assist students who have chosen this path to move towards job acquisition.
• Additional funding to hire more teachers and reduce class sizes for a lower teacher/student ratio
• Expand the IB Program to the lower grades and, if feasible, offer the expanded IB Program in other geographic locations in the county to facilitate greater participation and ease travel burdens for students.

• To encourage greater participation in the IB Program, the subcommittee recommends allowing students to participate in extracurricular activities and sports at their home schools but understands this under the discretion of an alternate governing body, the Alabama High School Athletic Association.

RATIONALE:
Our teachers must have all the resources available to them necessary to equip our students to move forward in their academic career and workaday lives.

RECOMMENDATION 3:
Reduce class sizes.

EXPLANATION:
• Realign elementary grades to the K-6 model eliminating the Intermediate configuration.
• Provide additional funding to hire more teachers and reduce class sizes for a lower/teacher student ratio.

RATIONALE:
Class sizes are fundamental to the teacher’s ability to provide quality instruction and to give students the feedback and attention they need to be successful.

Hopes for the Future
Providing a quality education to our youth is a sacred trust. The Baldwin County Board of Education exists for only one purpose: to provide the youth of Baldwin County with a world class education necessary to prepare students for college or a career. To achieve that goal, no effort or expense is too great. Excellence will be demanded from the Board Members, administration, teachers, staff and students, because excellence is the standard, not the goal.
Leadership

CHARGE: Three to four recommendations from appointed engaged citizens to the BCBE regarding district and local school leadership

Leadership is crucial for effectiveness and efficiency.

KEY FINDINGS

1. Strong leadership at the district level is apparent.

2. Leadership in place has been established utilizing a district organizational plan. (see appendix)

3. Board President (Shannon Cauley) and Interim Superintendent (Hope Zeana) have an excellent working relationship and greatly assisted this committee by providing information such as district strategic plan, organizational charts, and other necessary information.

RELEVANT DEFINITIONS:

ADMINISTRATION: Personnel assigned to leadership duties to include superintendent, district level supervisors and other central office personnel, local school principals and assistant principals and teachers in leadership positions such as dept. chairs.

LEAD ALABAMA: State of Alabama mandated administrator professional development and evaluation plan.
LEADERSHIP RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION 1:
Implement a recruitment, training and succession plan for the development of Baldwin County aspiring administrators and current administrators.

EXPLANATION:
• Define key requirements of an administrator’s job description. (i.e.: create a road map showing the administrative pathway).
• Design an after-hours leadership course for teachers who strive for leadership training.
• Initiate or reinstate activities such as Principal Academies, Leadership Academies, Leadership Baldwin County, during summer or after school hours.
• Develop a committee to help identify, encourage, and mentor high potential teachers (within the district) to assist them in becoming teacher leaders or administrators.
• Provide for the timely recruitment of external high potential teachers/administrators.

RATIONALE:
To the best of our knowledge, the district does not currently have a formal recruitment, training and succession plan in place for administrators.

RECOMMENDATION 2:
Assure that an effective evaluation plan is in place for current district and local school administrators that not only follows state guidelines through self-assessment, but also provides for an effective professional development model based on individual strengths and weaknesses.

EXPLANATION:
• Provide additional professional development activities based on parent and teacher survey results. Surveys should be consistent throughout the district.
• Develop an effective process to review administrative files annually to determine that an adequate number of professional development hours are completed by each administrator.
• Based on LEAD Alabama professional indicators, the superintendent or designee shall meet individually with administrators to review areas of strengths and weaknesses. An individual professional learning plan should then be developed jointly.

RATIONALE:
Stronger expectations for administrators at the local school level will lead to improved instruction within each school.
RECOMMENDATION 3:

Build a collaborative and cohesive Board Team that includes a culture of concern for ALL students in Baldwin County—not specific only to a board member’s district.

EXPLANATION:

- Create a district-specific toolkit for the purpose of orienting new and existing board members.
- Provide opportunities for Winter/Summer retreats for the purpose of providing training (i.e., 7 Habits etc.) and sharing district needs.
- Provide refresher training through the Alabama State School Board Association to review and explain state guidelines and ethics standards to newly elected members or existing members as needed. (i.e., decision making strategies, building consensus... “All for one and one for all...”)
- Each individual board member should continually strive to proactively seek input from constituents (i.e., parents, community, staff) in advance of work sessions, meetings, and other important educational decisions.

RATIONALE:
An educated and united Board Team leads to stronger decision-making ability.

Hopes for the Future
It is the hope of the leadership subcommittee that these proposed recommendations may be implemented as part of the district’s strategic plan.
Communication

CHARGE: Three to four recommendations from appointed engaged citizens to the BCBE regarding communication

RELEVANT DEFINITIONS:

COMMUNICATION: The process of understanding and sharing meaning;

COMMUNICATION: Definition provided by District Communications Director Terry Wilhite: Communication happens when understanding takes place. Understanding takes place when there is a relationship. Relationships take place when there is common ground – OR – When there is common ground relationships can be formed that lead to understanding. Communication can fail at any point in the graphical model at right.

BARRIERS TO EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION: The use/overuse of jargon; lack of attention, interest, distractions or perceived irrelevance; differences in perception and viewpoint; contradictory or absence of non-verbal communication; expectations and prejudices (false assumptions or stereotyping); cultural differences

ATTENTION SPAN: The average person’s attention span is EIGHT SECONDS, according to a recent Microsoft study.

Communication is central. Challenges and greatness should be understood.

Source: O’Hair, Rubenstein, Stewart, 2014
KEY FINDINGS

1. BCBE, the District and the individual schools are forthcoming with information.

2. Meetings are open and announced in advance in accordance with Open Meetings requirements.

3. Budgets, minutes, schedules, announcements, notices and etc. are available online – through either the District’s or the individual schools’ sites or both.

4. Information is distributed regularly by the BCBE, by the District, by the schools.

   DEFINED COMMUNICATORS
   • The district’s communication office (one director, one secretary)
   • Key communicators at each of the 45 schools who assist in matters related to websites and communication outputs
   • The Board president and individual board members
   • The District’s Superintendent
   • Principals

   OTHER COMMUNICATORS
   • Teachers
   • PTO leadership
   • Parent volunteers
   • Coaches/booster clubs
   • Fundraiser participants/ Sponsor-ship solicitors

5. Parents, teachers and community leaders are communicated with regularly through multiple media depending upon which constituency they belong – for example: recorded telephone messages, email, videos, text messages, social media and even an app providing easy access to www.bcbe.org via smartphones.

6. Surveys are conducted on occasion about matters of system-wide importance to seek feedback from citizens and constituent groups.

7. Meetings are held to educate the citizenry about hard-to-understand information (such as budgets), but these are generally poorly attended as documented by this recent news report, http://wkrg.com/2015/08/13/poor-turnout-at-baldwin-schools-budget-meeting/

8. Through CATF activity, Communication subcommittee members were surprised that some District employees at high levels seemed to be unfamiliar with the 2011 Co-owned Strategic Plan (BCBE/District/Community).

9. It appears that board of education members react to constituency-driven communication more than they are proactively communicating with the voters in their districts.

10. Communication efforts seem focused on outputs and appear to be one-way, rather than two-way, and seem to fall between Grunig & Hunt’s Public Information and Two-Way Asymmetric models. Especially with current digital methods of communication, the goal is the Two-Way Symmetric model (more equal/more like conversations).

11. When “lack of transparency” or “weak communication” is claimed, we believe that these are perceptual statements stemming from the overabundance of communication outputs, which are frequently in raw form – in other words – communication packaged in ways that are hard to find and/or take much effort to decipher.
COMMUNICATION RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION 1:
Communication packaging (by the District and BCBE) needs attention

EXPLANATION:
- Simplify information and organization of information on the district website, BCBE.org. Even in its current (better-than-previous) form, the website is incredibly hard to navigate and overwhelming for constituents.
- Provide easy-to-find, short summaries of complex items with links to the raw data for those who want more information.
- Communicate in ways people can understand
  - See the Chalkboard Chat video examples regarding complex items.
- Provide labeling so people understand what they’re seeing and who it’s from
  - From very simple (name the school, class, teacher for each piece of paper sent home) to more complex (identify WHY an email is being sent and TO WHOM it’s being sent [parent, VIP, community] and FOR WHAT PURPOSE it’s being sent)
  - Having one person representing multiple entities makes it hard to identify the SOURCE without effort.
  - Is Mr. Wilhite the District’s spokesperson, the Board’s spokesperson, or the superintendent’s spokesperson?
  - Perhaps the Board president should speak for BCBE, the superintendent should speak for himself/herself and the Communication Director should speak for the District.
- If citizens will be engaged through face-to-face outreach, communication needs to be two-way. Otherwise, choose another vehicle for disseminating information: news conference, video, email, text, voice message, direct mail piece, etc.
  - Those initiating the engagement, whether BCBE, district employees or volunteers, should be prepared to take questions and to answer them and this may involve rather extensive advanced preparation.
  - Citizens who exert effort to engage via face-to-face outreach should have their voices heard.

RATIONALE:
Meet people where they are – with language, with imagery, etc. Communication should be understandable, clear, brief, accurate, error-free and easy to digest.

RECOMMENDATION 2:
BCBE should adopt best practices for communication and perspective taking.

EXPLANATION:
- Implement training for the District’s board of education members by experts (board training experts, District subject matter experts, etc.) on regular intervals, if board members do not currently receive regular boardsmanship and media relations training.
• Implement standard, creative problem-solving and perspective taking among the board of education members. In addition to the standing committees of funding and facilities, in an effort to be more considerate of areas of importance to the citizenry, each board member should be asked to wear a “hat” (for perspective taking) and be tasked with approaching decision making through their assigned lens (communication, funding, curriculum, facilities, leadership, etc.).
• If citizenry will be engaged or asked to provide counsel/volunteer (such as with the 2011 Co-owned Strategic Plan) their efforts should prove fruitful.
• Seek common ground when possible and build from those points.
• Acknowledge alternate positions. Be prepared to offer comparative advantages of positions adopted by BCBE.

RATIONALE:
While we understand that elected officials must represent the constituencies that elect them, we believe that the entire enterprise would benefit from holistic perspective taking. By adopting best practices for communication and perspective taking, BCBE members should be better able to explore issues from all perspectives in order to make the best decisions for the District.

RECOMMENDATION 3:
Providing adequate resources to support communication efforts

EXPLANATION:
• Additional resources/bandwidth/personnel are needed in order to support increased focused communication at all levels – at the school level, at the District level at the board level
• Currently, school level communications are fed up to the Director by school liaisons – perhaps the “key communicator” role should be an expected responsibility rather than an add-on or volunteer role for a staff member at the school level – more “Good News” from our schools can be shared if this is an expectation, rather than an after-thought
• Communication tools are needed for District communications to be able to receive feedback and act upon issues more responsively
• Massive amounts of information are being pushed out in terms of communication, however more resources/tools are needed to be able to engage in two-way communication, and act quickly and responsively.
• Communication training is needed at every level of the District where communication is happening.

RATIONALE:
A 20th century staffing model is not adequate in the 21st century. The proliferation of online communication channels and decline of traditional mass media necessitates more (more targeted) communication efforts.

Hopes for the Future
All communication efforts by and for BCBE, the District and the Community should be centered around Student Learning (see graphic) with a focus on two-way communication and best practices to allow for understanding and relationships that create forward progress for the Baldwin County Public Schools.

The three-way engagement model (BCBE, District and Community) used to create 2011’s Co-owned Strategic Plan may be a model for future activity that allows for long-term forward progress independent of any particular individuals.
Facilities

CHARGE: Examining and evaluating the current use and condition of existing permanent and portable school facilities within Baldwin County; Researching alternative methods of construction that could reduce future school expansion costs; Evaluating existing school safety and security systems and recommend changes; Determining which school facilities are in immediate need of repairs, alterations or expansion; Personally surveying various school facilities, including vacant facilities and property, to determine future needs and use; Submitting reasonable recommendations based on available data, research, and evaluation of existing facilities.

Facilities exist to support learning.

RELEVANT DEFINITIONS:

ALTERNATIVE TYPES OF CONSTRUCTION: Structures mainly comprised of construction materials other than wood framing, concrete masonry units (CMU’s), brick veneer or poured-in-place concrete.

BLOCK, BRICK AND MORTAR STRUCTURES: Permanent structures constructed primarily of re-enforced concrete masonry units on a concrete slab, with or without exterior siding of brick, with interior walls framed with either steel or wood stud framed walls. Interior finishes and associated components will consist of those for a permanent structure.

COST PER SF: The gross cost to construct a permanent building per square foot, including costs for materials and labor to build or install foundations, framing, exterior and interior finishes, plumbing, electrical, HVAC, security systems, insulation and the cost of special inspections (as required by applicable local codes). Cost Per Square Foot may not include civil engineered site work and non-permanently attached equipment, material and furnishings.

COTTAGE CLASSROOM STRUCTURES: Temporary structures constructed off-site consisting of wood framing with insulation and interior finish. Includes electrical wiring but generally no plumbing system. Wall, window or separate HVAC systems are installed to serve the space.
PERMANENT FACILITIES: Buildings or structures built on a permanent foundation and constructed to be permanent in nature as opposed to temporary. Permanent facilities may contain additional spaces such as restrooms; accessory rooms incidental to the primary use of the facility; plumbing systems and fixtures, electrical systems and components; heating, ventilation and air-conditioning (HVAC) systems; safety and security systems and components; and internal and external communications systems and related components.

PORTABLE CLASSROOM STRUCTURES (also referred to as a Modular Units): Self contained pre-manufactured structures, single or double wide in size, usually mounted on a chassis with or without wheels, not permanent in nature, electrically prewired, with or without restroom facilities and containing interior finished floors, walls, ceilings and insulation. Modular portable buildings are generally served by HVAC systems mounted permanently to the exterior of the modular building.

PRE-ENGINEEREED STEEL METAL STRUCTURES: Permanent structures constructed upon a concrete slab foundation whose main support and load-bearing components consists of pre-engineered steel beams, girders, purlins and bracing designed to withstand specific wind and earthquake loads. Pre-engineered steel metal buildings may contain the same interior finish and components as a permanent structure.

TILT-UP CONCRETE STRUCTURES: Permanent structures constructed of pre-formed concrete panels of various thicknesses, heights and configurations. Concrete panels are lifted in place using a crane and then permanently connected to one another to form the building. Exterior and interior finishes may be of any material approved by local adopted building codes.

KEY FINDINGS

1. Safety and security equipment, systems and alert notification procedures:
   • Acquisition, placement and monitoring of security equipment and security alert systems and procedures are left to the responsibility of each school principal.
   • Safety, security and related hardware such as cameras and first responder alert systems are not uniform among schools and non-existent in some.
   • Very little, if any, security monitoring is conducted.
   • There are no system wide set standards or policies nor specifications for active and passive security equipment and systems.

2. Portable classrooms and “cottages”:
   • The large majority of portable classrooms and “cottages” currently in use are in good to fair condition.
   • Student academic achievement does not appear to be hampered by where the student learns such as a permanent classroom versus a portable classroom.
   • The location of some portable does pose safety concerns to include exposing students to inclement weather conditions.
   • Some portables are not connected to permanent buildings by covers or enclosures over walkways. Some do not have hard surface walkways between portables and permanent facilities.

3. Several schools such as Bay Minette and Perdido are among the older built schools in the County:
   • Many of the older school buildings should be listed on the Alabama Historic Register.
   • Due to its age, Perdido Elementary possesses several issues to include rotting wood and termite infestation.
   • Portables at Perdido Elementary have large pieces of floor covering missing.
   • The boy’s restroom at Perdido Elementary is located on the outside of conditioned spaces of the school.
   • The Perdido Elementary School Gym flooring is in disrepair and hazardous.
   • Perdido Elementary buses must share one exit with parents picking up their children.
   • The absence of covered walkways at Bay Minette Elementary School exposes students to inclement weather.
   • The location of the farthest classrooms on the Bay Minette campus exacerbates the problem outlined above with children having to travel a far distance to other portions of the school campus to include the Cafeteria, Gym and Library during inclement weather.

4. Use of existing facilities and the planning and placement of portables appear to be reactive rather than proactive:
   • Some school classrooms visited appear to have a minimal number of students (between 18 to 22) while other classrooms had much more.
   • Some schools were utilizing spaces within permanent facilities for teacher lounges, storage and other non-curricula uses thereby reducing available permanent classroom space.
   • Some schools had opened up existing single classrooms to make larger classrooms thus reducing available classroom space. The opposite appeared to be happening at Gulf Shores Elementary where administrative areas had been subdivided to create smaller administrative areas without sacrificing classroom space.
   • Formal space utilization studies were not performed before placement of portables at schools nor
has any formal space utilization and optimization study been performed.

- Historical enrollment data of each school does not appear to have been used to determine the actual number of portables needed. It is apparent that at the current rate of student increases each year coupled with the current tax climate, some portables may always be needed at certain schools whether it be for classrooms or other non-curricula purposes.

- No priority list exists for expansion of schools based upon the number of portables utilized at each school.

- There is no BCBE policy on how each portable should be used such as classroom space versus storage, art, band, athletics, etc.

- A visit to Gulf Shores Elementary revealed the lack of usable land for future expansion. The school is contiguous with BCBE property consisting of dense woods and wetlands (according to the Principal and Mr. Boatwright) making it almost impossible to expand the existing facilities without mitigation of adjacent wetlands. Additionally, open space previously used for playgrounds are now occupied by portable classrooms thereby restricting the amount of space available for outdoor student activity.

5. There is no set written policy concerning standardizing acceptable types of construction, elevation details or floor plans of proposed new schools or expansion of existing schools:

- Many schools in Baldwin County are constructed of block, brick and mortar except much older schools, which are wood framed.

- Block, brick and mortar-constructed schools can be the most expensive type to build as opposed to newer and more modern methods of construction.

- There does not appear to be any set policy concerning the aesthetic look or layout of proposed schools or additions. Existing schools are diametrically different across the various feeder patterns in construction, aesthetics and floor plans.

6. New construction specifications, bids and bid award process:

- The BCBE does have a policy to accept only pre-qualified contractors for all new construction related bids.

- Except for some newly constructed Gyms, proposed construction related specifications and bid packages, especially for additions and new schools, have primarily consisted of Block, Mortar and Brick type of construction. Alternative construction types such as Pre-engineered Metal Buildings and Tilt-up wall construction have not been considered.

- Request for Proposals, bid packages and awarded bid information have not been readily or openly available online for public review and input.

- The BCBE has given priority to local contractors for new construction and additions to existing facilities. While it may be a good practice to award contracts to local businesses to support and help boost those local contractors and businesses economy the BCBE should equally consider all contractors based on the lowest Cost/SF and responsible bid regardless of the contractor’s primary business location.

7. Cost of construction:

- There is no set policy or procedures to accept or reject bids or contracts based on a range of acceptable Cost/SF for new construction or additions.

- Cost/SF of proposed new construction and existing facilities are not compared with costs of similar regional projects to determine if the proposed project and bid is reasonable and within budget constraints.

- The use of alternative types of construction such as Pre-engineered Metal Buildings and Tilt-up construction versus Block, Brick and Mortar construction for new schools and additions can reduce the Cost/SF of future projects by as much as 50% for Pre-engineered Steel Metal Buildings and 20% to 30% for Tilt-up concrete construction. In addition, Pre-engineered Steel Metal Buildings and Tilt-up concrete constructed buildings use materials that can be easily recycled. Both construction types are more energy efficient, durable and resistant to severe weather as opposed to Block, Brick and Mortar buildings.

8. Vacant and unused BCBE property:

- Several vacant and unused BCBE properties exist.

- There is no known publically published plan detailing the future utilization of vacant and unused properties.

- Each of the vacant and unused properties is an asset to the school system and could be liquidated with realized income applied to new capital projects.

- Older vacant school buildings possess the potential to be renovated and placed back into service as a school at a cost less than that for new construction.

- Older vacant school buildings and the property on which they are located also possess the potential for commercial development that could bring income to the school district for new capital projects. One example is the vacant Fairhope Intermediate School at the corner of Fairhope Avenue and Bishop Road.
FACILITIES RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION 1:

Develop and adopt a countywide school district safety and security policy and plan to include written safety and security procedures, establishing security equipment specifications and installation of security equipment and installation of covers over walkways between classrooms and other areas of the school campus where applicable. Compare cost of using resource officers and a combination of scaled down security equipment as an option.

EXPLANATION:

• Safety and security policies, procedures and especially security equipment specifications and installation should not be a decision left solely to each school principal as currently permitted. To save on costs, security equipment such as cameras, monitoring equipment and alarm systems (separate from fire alarm systems) can be purchased “off the shelf” from box stores rather than through a contractor thereby reducing the overall cost of such equipment. Internal labor can be used to install the equipment to save in labor and installation costs. The location and monitoring of security equipment should be coordinated jointly between the BCBE and the law enforcement agency having jurisdiction.

• Schools that do not have hard surface walkways and covers between various elements of the campus should receive priority for installation of the same to protect students from exposure to adverse weather elements.

RATIONALE:

A district wide safety and security plan will establish standards for all schools thereby enhancing safety and security at each school and reducing overall costs through the purchase and installation of readily available equipment.

RECOMMENDATION 2:

Perform formal, detailed school wide space utilization and optimization studies and implement findings to better manage classroom spaces. Develop a priority schedule to begin elimination of portables in conjunction with the studies. Include reviewing current feeder patterns to determine if redrawing the feeder patterns would be beneficial in alleviating over-crowding and reducing the number of portables currently in use. Review current teacher unit formulas to determine if additional space may be realized from changes made to the criteria.

EXPLANATION:

• Permanent classrooms should be used for teaching curriculum and not for storage, incidental or occasional uses or as teacher lounges or break areas, especially at schools where portables are being used for teaching. A formal space utilization and optimization study will provide vital information concerning current use of existing spaces and identify the best use of those spaces. The results of the study may lead to consolidation of classes, identifying space for permanent classrooms and elimination of some portables.
• While portables may not be totally eliminated in the near future, a priority system should be developed and used to identify schools in need of new permanent classrooms based on the number of portables currently in use at a particular school. For example, after a space utilization and optimization study is completed and classroom spaces are consolidated, schools with 8 or more portables should be placed on a Priority 1 list for construction of additional classrooms or a new school as appropriate whose records indicate, based on the previous five years, an annual net average increase of new students. Any new permanent classrooms created should accommodate projected student population increases for the next five years based on the historical data. Schools with 4-7 portables with expected growth less than Priority 1 schools for the same period of time would be listed as Priority 2. Schools with 3 portables or less would be placed in Priority 3 status. Overcrowded schools with no land spaces suitable for permanent expansion and the oldest schools experiencing frequent costly repairs or rapid deterioration should be placed in the Priority 1 category.

• As part of the study, a review of methods for assigning teacher units should also be considered as well as consideration given to the redrawing of district feeder patterns, classroom management and organizational skills, and a clear understanding of the standards and teaching strategies.

RATIONALITY:
Identification of the best use of available space, smart space management, review of teacher/student ratios and reconfiguration of existing feeder patterns will help decide where consolidation or relocation of students would be beneficial in reducing existing portables and/or identifying schools that need immediate attention.

RECOMMENDATION 3:
Include alternative types of construction such as Pre-engineered Steel Metal buildings or Tilt-up Concrete wall construction in future Requests for Proposals (RFP's) and bid packages for new school construction and additions. Establish a wider distribution of RFP’s to contractors within and without the County and State.

EXPLANATION:
• The BCBE should be including alternative construction types, other than Block, Brick and Mortar constructed school buildings, as part of all Request for Proposals for new construction and additions. Alternative construction types will potentially lower overall costs of new school construction and additions. Every Request for Proposal for new construction and additions should include alternate types of construction such as Pre-engineered steel metal buildings and Tilt-up concrete wall construction.

RATIONALITY:
Alternative types of construction such as Pre-engineered Steel Metal Buildings and Tilt-up Concrete wall construction both possess positive benefits over Block, Brick and Mortar construction currently used in Baldwin County Schools. The benefits of alternative types of construction include lower Cost/SF, higher insulation values offering improved energy efficiency resulting in reduced energy costs, faster construction completion times, high resistance to wind
loads, flexibility in space configurations and construction materials which are durable, low maintenance and can be easily recycled. Pre-engineered steel metal building Costs/SF can be as much as 50% less than conventional Block, Brick and Mortar constructed school buildings. Tilt-up concrete wall construction can cost as much as 30% less than Block, Brick and Mortar constructed school buildings and are considered safer than conventional construction. Wider distribution of RFP’s that include alternative types of construction will stimulate competition across the board and help reduce overall construction costs.

**RECOMMENDATION 4:**

*Use available BCBE capital funds $25M (based on Funding Committee recommendations) to immediately begin a pay-as-you-go construction program for school projects evaluated as Priority 1 projects under the criteria outlined in Recommendation 2 above. Include alternative types of construction to lessen the impact on the capital improvement budget. Critical capital projects whose total costs exceed available capital funds should be supported from available reserve funds only in the amount necessary to accomplish capital projects. Seek historic designation of older schools so each school might be eligible for any Historic Preservation Grants."

**EXPLANATION:**

- Sales tax revenues for FY15 is up approximately $10M over FY14. The Capital Improvement portion of the school budget should be augmented by this increase in sales tax.
- Based on the overcrowding of Gulf Shores Elementary School, the BCBE should consider using capital funds to pay for a new High School at Gulf Shores using alternative types of construction at a reduced cost. Relocate the Middle School after construction of the new high school is complete thereby providing needed space for all the schools.
- Perdido Elementary School has serious structural, safety and health issues and is among the oldest in the County still in use. This school should be placed on the Priority 1 construction list due to those issues.
- Bay Minette Elementary is another older school that needs enclosed walkways to protect students from inclement weather. The existing main building needs to be evaluated for near future replacement or renovations and additions. It should be noted that Bay Minette Elementary saw a net increase of 50 students while the Intermediate School saw an increase of 39 students.
- Bay Minette Elementary, Perdido Elementary and other similar older schools or buildings owned by the BCBE should be considered for placement on the Alabama Historical Record. School buildings formally declared as historic sites may be eligible for special funding or historical grants that can be applied to maintaining their continued usefulness.

**RATIONALE:**

The use of alternative types of construction to address issues at the above schools is possible using available capital improvement funds, additional realized sales tax revenue for FY15 and by augmenting those funds with a portion of reserves needed to accomplish the projects. Construction projects should be able to move forward almost immediately using a pay-as-you-go plan. Having older and eligible schools designated as historical sites may provide another funding source for renovations, maintenance and additions.

**Hopes for the Future**

The Facilities Subcommittee is hopeful that the BCBE can begin discussions about and move forward with conducting a space utilization and optimization study; implement changes to secure additional classrooms based on the results of the study thereby reducing the number of portables; formulate, publish and implement a School District wide safety and security plan applicable to all schools; incorporate alternative construction types and methods to save money on capital improvement projects; begin preparing Requests for Proposals based on a priority system of needs; start construction of new facilities as soon as possible using alternative types of construction; and apply for historic designation of older schools.
Funding

**CHARGE:** Three to four recommendations from appointed engaged citizens to the BCBE regarding funding. To complete this task, members of this subcommittee reviewed a multitude of financial data provided by the Baldwin County Board of Education (BCBE) as well as other third-party evaluations and audit summaries. The six members of this subcommittee and other assisting volunteers collectively invested no fewer than 500 hours to complete this charge, from July through October 2015.

**RELEVANT DEFINITIONS:**

ADM (AVERAGE DAILY MEMBER): Average daily attendance of first 20 school days after Labor Day.

SYSTEM: the Baldwin County Public School System

ALSDE: Alabama State Department of Education

ASBE: Alabama State Board of Education

PARCA: Public Affairs Research Council of Alabama

**We can and must fund education in Baldwin County.**

COST PER PUPIL: Total expenditures less capital construction projects, new bond proceeds, debt services, and other unique expenditures.
KEY FINDINGS

1. The financial subcommittee concludes that there are not sufficient revenues to sustain the current growth of the System, and that the recent non-renewal of the existing ad valorem taxes (3 mills/1 mil) and pending expiration of the one-cent sales tax exacerbate the problem, elevating the problem to the level of critical.

2. Baldwin County is growing far faster than mechanisms for funding the public school system can provide for.
   - In 2015, the U.S. Census Bureau lists the Daphne/Fairhope/Foley metropolitan statistical area (Baldwin County) as the 14th fastest growth area in the United States with an annual growth rate of 2.4%.
   - In December 2014, Dr. Semoon Chang of the University of South Alabama reported that Baldwin County was the fastest growing county in the state of Alabama, based upon information supplied by published Census and economic reports data.
   - PARCA found that the System’s enrollment grew by an average of 483 students from 1998-2009. 2010-2015 average annual growth is 517. To put that number in perspective, Baldwin County public schools’ total enrollment is growing – each year – at a rate that equals the number of students it takes to fill an entire elementary school.

3. The financial data provided by the Chief Financial Officer was found to be reliable and accurate.
   - The BCBE is subject to multiple independent audits annually that consistently draw that same conclusion.
   - Through in-depth, regular review, the Alabama State Board of Education has noted nothing of significance that may suggest a possibility of serious errors, omissions or inaccuracies in financial matters.

4. There is a significant and growing gap in funding from the ASBE. According to ASBE’s Report Card, the System’s average annual cost per pupil is about $8,500 per student for 2014. Using the System’s average growth of 517 students from 2014 to 2015, plus half of the expected growth in 2016, the System will absorb the cost of about 775 students over the entire 2016 school year. At $8,500 per student, this gap requires that approximately $6.6 million annually be absorbed by locally generated funds.
   - The Alabama State Board of Education dictates the minimum number of positions that BCBE must staff and fund based on the ADM of the previous fiscal year. This means that the ADM upon which decisions are made is 12 months to 24 months behind actual attendance numbers.
   - Due to Baldwin County’s extraordinary population growth, the System has about 517 students more than the ADM at the beginning of each school year, to which is added more new students, so by the end of the second school year, the System could be educating about 775 more students than it receives state funding for each year.
   - The actual funds provided by ASBE through the Foundation Program cover nearly all of the costs for the directed positions. The majority of the shortfall comes directly from the 10-mill chargeback required from local ad valorem taxes.
   - Additional positions required to accommodate the number of students above the ADM must be absorbed locally.
     - Recognizing this, as well as the downturn in local tax revenues in 2008 and 2009, voters in 2010 voted for a three-year one-cent sales tax to help meet the shortfall. Voters renewed this in 2013.

5. There is a significant gap in the receipt of educational tax funds derived specifically from new home/condo/apartment construction, which results in first-time occupants essentially not contributing via ad valorem taxes to the System for two to three years – depending upon the time it takes for construction, appraisal, Baldwin County’s “pay in arrears” tax collection system and, etc.
   - The pace of Baldwin County’s growth immediately adds to the student population but does not as quickly contribute to revenue.
   - The cost to the system is significant but undefined by current tax authorities.

6. Funds are not available to meet the requirements for new school construction.
   - The school system is growing by the equivalent of one new elementary school worth of attendance each year. No new school has been built since 2009. The System is at a facility deficit.
   - All of the current one-half percent sales tax revenue restricted for capital improvement and maintenance purposes is used each year for repairs, maintenance, major systems repairs like HVAC, roofs, parking lots, etc.

No new school has been built in Baldwin County since 2009.
7. Defunding the System is not a solution. Without the revenue from the 3 mill/1 mill renewals and temporary sales tax, we believe that Baldwin County will not be able to effectively educate its students. Certainly no new schools will be built.

- If each mill equals about $3.7 million, upon expiration of the defeated 3 mill/1 mill ad valorem renewals in May 2017 and March 2018 = a collective loss of about $14.5 million.
- The one-cent temporary sales tax is set to expire May 31, 2018 = another loss of about $32 million in FY2015, an amount estimated to grow to $35 million by 2016 according to System Finance Director John Wilson.

8. The System is far more efficient than public perception of it.

- Citizens expressed a desire for the BCBE to better manage funds and make the system more efficient, but based on an independent evaluation by PARCA of all school systems in Alabama; the subcommittee found that BCBE already is more efficient in statewide comparisons in nearly every expense category. Any possible increase in efficiency would not be sufficient to cover the funding deficiency.
- We found significant effort has been made in the last two years to decrease costs per student.
  - When examined against other counties in Alabama, Baldwin County measures quite well. Per PARCA, the Cost Per Pupil (CPP) data supplied by the Alabama State Department of Education for 2014 indicates that Baldwin County expends the least of these nearby Alabama counties:
    - **MONROE COUNTY**: total expenditures = $8,865 CPP (local tax revenue = $1,192)
    - **MOBILE COUNTY**: total expenditures = $8,848 CPP (local tax revenue = $1,523)
    - **WASHINGTON COUNTY**: total expenditures = $8,744 CPP (local tax revenue = $893)
    - **BALDWIN COUNTY**: total expenditures = $8,512 CPP (local tax revenue = $2,134)
  - By every metric the subcommittee members reviewed (except cost of maintenance and for debt service), the System is performing better than the statewide average.
  - The Public Affairs Research Council of Alabama (Samford University) conducted studies in 2011 (2010 data) and 2014 (2013 data) of the non-instructional staffing for all counties in Alabama. These studies showed by a volume of metrics that the System has become very efficient in nearly everything it does. The updated 2014 study found that in 2013 for:
    - **ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES**: the System spent 4% per ADM (statewide average: 5%)
    - **BUS TRANSPORTATION**: the System spent $473 per student (statewide average: $521)
    - **OPERATIONS & MAINTENANCE**: the System spent $889 (statewide average: $875)
    - **CHILD NUTRITION**: the System spent $481 (statewide average: $661)
    - **GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS**: the System spent $295 per ADM (statewide average $371)
  - Over the last 18 months, management efforts have been made to eliminate more than half of the curriculum and school management hierarchy staff positions at the central office and have demonstrated a will to reduce overhead costs even further. Our review found a decrease of $1,675 in costs per pupil between 2008 ($10,187) and 2014 ($8,512).

9. Debt service is higher than the statewide average.

- The PARCA study found that BCBE in FY 2013 spent $688 per student for debt service compared to the statewide average of $618.
- Debt service can only be funded with local tax revenue.
- Current bonds and warrants outstanding will require about $19,735,000 of the 2016 budget.
- The largest bond issue goes through 2037 with principal and interest in FY 2016 of about $4,390,000 and growing to about $9,854,000 in 2037.

10. There is not a single county-wide data-driven priority list regarding new construction planning – each of the proposed new schools aligns with a school member’s voting district.

11. There are indications that funding seemed to be sufficient six to eight years ago (2007-2009). With the understanding that actual impactful events like the economic recession and BP Oil Spill would have been unimaginable, perhaps more systemic contingency thinking in decision making then may have better positioned the System for its current situation.

- Superintendents change. Board members change. Interpersonal dynamics impact decision making. Systemic or holistic thinking should benefit the System more than individualistic thinking.
- The BCBE itself is not subject to any external review other than its individual members’ elections (voter sentiment).

---

**The System is performing better than the statewide average.**
RECOMMENDATION 1:
Provide understandable information to the public on system finances.

EXPLANATION:
The BCBE should prepare summary releases for citizens of Baldwin County. Electronic links to detailed accounting data should be made available from the summary data.

Based on the efficiency measures found, we believe a series of charts and financial information tables, showing comparisons of BCBE to the statewide averages, should be created and placed on the BCBE website for the public to review with sources of data identified.

RATIONALE:
Information is available, but it is difficult to find and even more difficult to digest. Those who want more detail should be able to access data, reports and etc.

RECOMMENDATION 2:
Use private funds for future tax campaigns.

EXPLANATION:
• While an opinion was sought in advance and the campaign proved legal in subsequent defense, using tax funds to campaign for more taxes is a contentious practice in the minds of many voters.
• Allow community groups, professional affiliations, and various industry sectors to champion causes that they feel will benefit the educational system.

RATIONALE:
Perceptually, relationship-building, education, outreach and conversations are very different than a professional campaign. Perhaps using district funds for those types of ongoing, proactive activities and private funds for campaign actions, ads and materials, may be less contentious.

RECOMMENDATION 3:
Address the capital construction deficiency by adopting a pay-as-you-go construction philosophy, funded by a new one-half cent sales tax that foregoes the use of long-term bonds.

EXPLANATION:
• Create a single county-wide priority list that focuses on the total needs of the county, publicize the list on the website, develop a plan (including public comment) and tackle the system’s biggest needs first.
• Historical preference for bonding versus pay-as-you-go stems from a statewide concern that if a particular area within a system were to break
into a standalone system, the applicable facilities would transfer free/without any associated debt obligations. This concern must be overcome contractually between each municipality receiving a new school facility and BCBE, so that the municipality will still be responsible for the undepreciated total project cost associated with any facilities transferred in the event of a split. The BCBE leadership must think of pay-as-you-go funding rather than more bonding.  

• Establish and fund a budgeted line item exclusively for new construction of at least $25 million (not to include major repair or replacement of existing systems or facilities).

• The subcommittee proposes a new one-half cent sales tax be requested from the County Commission and placed on the November 2016 general election ballot for voter consideration. This new tax will generate about $18 million dollars of the line item annually and should be designated solely for construction of new schools. The balance of funding for this line item (approx. $7 million) should come from efficiency gains within the system, reduced debt service costs and growth in the existing tax base.

• The subcommittee recommends using up-to-five-year, low interest rate, short-term bank loans to enable BCBE to fund/build a more expensive high school in one budget year rather than waiting two or three years for sufficient funds to accumulate; to be paid from the $25 million line item. Normally, the cost of a new high school is $35-$40 million dollars. This proposal needs further vetting by BCBE, but the up-front costs and interest expenses seem low compared to bonds. EXAMPLE: assuming 4% interest, the cost of a $100 million bond issue would be $72 million (30-year payout) while the cost of $100 million alternative debt would be $10.5 million (five-year payout) and shorter term loan may also be at a lower interest rate.

• Because some residents within the county might wish to raise their community’s priority on the list for new construction, BCBE should be open to proposals whereby self-generated funds from within a municipality could lower the project cost to BCBE for a specific new school. If this process of leverage is adopted, we recommend that such municipalities be required to offer at least 50% of the project cost (in cash, land, and/or utility services) upfront.

• Local investment could escalate the rate of construction in all areas of the county because if municipalities are investing half the cost of their new schools, construction line-item funds should then be available for the other priority list of new construction needs.

RATIONALE:
Past usage of bonds has overextended current budget funds. Debt service consumes funds that could be used for new construction going forward. Current funding for new construction is unavailable.

RECOMMENDATION 4:
Provide sufficient operating funds to meet the expenses of the System.

EXPLANATION:
• We strongly recommend that the renewal of the 3 mill/1 mill ad valorem taxes be presented to voters at the next scheduled election.
• Enlist help of all commissioners and mayors and citizens in county to push for renewal of 1 & 3 mil tax ASAP.
• Ask local legislative delegation to sponsor a local bill to remove the sunset provision on the one cent temporary sales tax and make it permanent, based on twice voter approval.

• The existing one-cent sales tax should be converted to a 30-year permanent tax program by either the local legislative delegation, or the voters at the November 2016 general election.
  • Proceeds should be used only for local budget requirements not funded by ASBE or federal programs – such as:

• Funding the gap created by extraordinary numbers of new students not counted/accommodated through the Foundation Program or ad valorem revenue.

• Extending the life of current assets and facilities through additional maintenance and repair funds above those received from the existing one-half percent sales tax, which are currently dedicated to major repairs and upgrades.

• Continuing technology in academics with the most cost effective usage of digital and printed learning tools.

• Continuing debt service on existing bonds until paid off in 2037 and once retired, this annually budgeted amount should be used for new construction.

• Providing salary and fringe benefit costs over the minimum statewide levels used by the Foundation Program (about 2%) so that Baldwin County can retain and keep talented, qualified teachers.

• Dedicating at least a portion of any unspent or residual funds to new construction in the next fiscal year.

• Removal of the uncertainty of these revenue sources continuing will allow expanded funding of operational needs in the areas of curriculum and teacher/student ratios.

• Recommend public panel of experts in technology, facilities, curriculum, etc. be appointed, on an ongoing basis, to review all major capital expenditure recommendations before funds are committed.
  • Process would serve to make best long-term financial decisions for public funds by considering all possible alternatives from both an initial cost AND ongoing cost basis.

**Hopes for the Future**

The funding subcommittee of the Community Advisory Task Force requests that BCBE consider and act on these recommendations.

References:
Alabama State Board of Education - “Educational Report Card”
BCBE FY 2016 Proposed Budget - www.bcbe.org - business & financial tab
Census Bureau: https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/newsroom/releases/2015/cb15-56_graphic.pdf
November 2014 Public Affairs Research Council of Alabama - “Analysis of Non-Instructional Expenses”
Conclusion

Task force members appreciate the opportunity to participate in this historic community initiative. Excellent Public Schools should be a partnership between the school system, its Board of Education, and the citizens in the communities served. Members of the CATF thank BCBE for seeking third-party advice and hope the recommendations will be considered and incorporated into future planning which will have life beyond any individual person: employee, board member, or citizen. In addition, CATF members recommend that the 2011 Co-Owned Strategic Plan be revisited and revised moving forward on regular intervals, so that long-term planning is always top-of-mind.

The task force was unanimous in its belief in public education and that an area’s public education system is the cornerstone upon which quality of life and economic development rest. We believe young people need to graduate from high school and be either college or career ready. Our hope for this process is that the outcome will positively impact public education in Baldwin County for our children’s future.
The following graphic is an attempt to provide a visual depiction of these statements:

- Student learning is central and must be driven by strong leadership and holistic thinking
- All parts and pieces of the enterprise should effectively and efficiently support learning
- Effective two-way communication between BCBE, District employees and the citizens is a necessity
Appendix
Curriculum
A Primer on
The Foundation Program
and School Funding in Alabama

An overview and resource guide provided by
SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS of Alabama
What is the Foundation Program?

In the early 1990’s Alabama’s previous funding formulas (commonly known as the Minimum Foundation Program) for public schools was challenged in court in what became known as the “Equity-Funding suit.” In response to this suit the Legislature adopted a new funding formula in 1995 known as the Foundation Program to begin operation in FY 1995-96.

The intent of the Foundation Program was to provide an equitable, basic funding stream for public K-12 schools throughout the state. The equity came through a mandated 10-mill equivalence in local property tax which the local school system had to commit to the Foundation Program. In theory, a poorer school system operating only with funds provided through the Foundation Program would have the essential elements to offer a solid foundation program.

The legislation also established a framework for the K-12 funding budget. The Foundation Program provides to each school system the following:

- A minimum number of teachers (called units)
- A principal, assistant principals, librarians, and counselors according to school population (also called instructional support units)
- Operations money known as Other Current Expense (OCE – see below for detail)
- Basic financial support for classrooms: textbooks, technology, professional development, library enhancement, and classroom materials and supplies

What is OCE?

OCE was created to provide state financial support for non-certified personnel (school secretaries, custodians, cafeteria workers, and teacher aides). In theory, it also includes funds to pay for utilities and substitute teachers, but OCE has never been fully funded at this level. It is funding for costs other than teacher units and for current operations (not debt and not capital outlay).

From its creation, OCE has been one of the most difficult concepts to validate in the K-12 education budget. Though it has specific, intended funding purposes, its annual calculation is not governed by a set formula, nor does it appear as a line item in the budget. OCE allotments are annually calculated based on an allocation “per earned unit.” The allocation itself changes annually based on funds available as determined by the Legislature. In recent years, the OCE appropriated from the Education Trust Fund (ETF) has varied:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount per earned unit:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2007</td>
<td>$15,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2008</td>
<td>$16,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009</td>
<td>$16,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010</td>
<td>$11,502 (supplemented by ARRA Budget Stabilization Funds)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since 2007, OCE has decreased by more than 25% even though expenses supposedly covered by OCE have risen.
What is the State-Required Match?

It is important to note that the Foundation Program is not a “state” program. Rather, it is a state-local partnership that should provide the funds needed for schools to operate. The total Foundation Program allocation for any school system is determined through formulas and is based solely on the number of students enrolled in the previous year. (See ADM below)

The state and local percentages of funding for the Foundation Program vary from system to system. In order to provide equity, the state share is higher in poorer systems. Conversely, more affluent systems contribute a higher percentage of local funds to the Foundation Program. The local percentage is known as the “state-required match” or “10-mill match,” but is also commonly referred to as the “charge-back.” This term is really a misnomer because no system is actually “charged” nor does it have to send money “back to Montgomery.”

The charts below show that the match does not require any system to “send money to Montgomery” or to send money from wealthier to poorer areas of the state. The Foundation Program has occasionally been labeled a “Robin Hood” program. To the contrary, the Foundation Program formula determines funding for each system based solely on student enrollment. The state-local percentages are then adjusted according to community affluence.

State-Local Partnership in a MORE affluent system
- State share is the balance to 100%
- Local Match determined by property values

State-Local Partnership in a LESS affluent system
- State share is the balance to 100%
- Local Match determined by property values

How is affluence determined?

For purposes of the Foundation Program, affluence is determined solely by the value of property in a given school system’s boundaries. Regardless of the number of mills of property tax a system raises, the value of a single mill is contingent upon the value of the property in general. For instance, property in downtown Birmingham or on the waterfront is considerably more valuable than property in a rural area.
farming area. Therefore, a mill of property tax in Birmingham or on the waterfront raises more money than a mill in the rural areas.

Applying a standard formula to information gathered from county revenue offices, the value of 1.0 mill is determined for each system and then multiplied by 10 to determine the local system’s contribution to the Foundation Program. This amount is then subtracted from the amount budgeted in the Foundation Program total each year for that system. The balance is the state’s share from the ETF.

**Match for Recent Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$520,887,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$504,379,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$458,661,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$428,348,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$389,069,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$375,348,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$351,529,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$334,006,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What funds the Foundation Program?**

State and local dollars fund the Foundation Program. The local share comes from local property taxes (10 mills). Prior to 2006 there were 30 school systems that did not collect 10 mills of property tax. These systems had to make up the difference in sales, alcohol, or other taxes. Constitutional Amendment 778, approved Nov. 7, 2006, requires that each school district in the state levy and collect at least 10 mills from taxpayers. But, it is more complicated.¹

¹ The dollar amount of the 10-mill match is based upon the yield of a mill of the school district tax. Many of the 10 mills derived from a countywide tax (which may have several types of exemptions) are less than a mill of school district tax. Furthermore, if there is a city school system(s) in the county, the amount of countywide ad valorem tax distributed to each local board of education is based primarily upon the number of students in ADM and not the tax capacity of the school system. As a further complication, the 10-mill match is based upon the yield per mill actually collected two years earlier, which was actually assessed three years earlier, and which was based upon fair market value four years earlier. When property values are rising, this is a benefit to local boards. When property values are in decline, this is a financial burden to local boards.
The state share comes from the Education Trust Fund.

**What funds the Education Trust Fund?**

The Education Trust Fund (ETF) is funded through a variety of state taxes. Unfortunately, most of them are very volatile and follow the fluctuations in economic cycles. The ETF was originally referred to as the “Special” Education Trust Fund but in 1995 the Legislature passed a law that removed the word “special” effective for FY97.

**Sample ETF Funding**

![Sample ETF Funding](image)

**What is Average Daily Membership (ADM)?**

ADM is an average of the number of students enrolled in a school or school system for the 20 days following Labor Day. The “count period” has not always been the first 20 days after Labor Day. Prior to ACT 05-339, it was the first 40 days of school. This legislation changed the count period in order to more accurately reflect regular student enrollment.

**What are Divisors and how do they work?**

In order to determine how many teacher units a school “earns” the following formula is used:

\[
\frac{ADM \text{ (for each grade)}}{Divisor} = \text{Derived Units}
\]

For example, the divisor for Kindergarten is 13.8. If an elementary school has 138 Kindergarteners in fall 2009, that school would earn 10 teacher units for the 2010-11 school year. However, those earned units may not all be used for Kindergarten teachers. Some will be used to fund support teachers like PE, music, art, and Special Education. Unfortunately, the divisor system is often misunderstood because the actual class size and the divisor number do not match. Likewise, raising the divisor by “one” does not simply add “one” student to each classroom.
Middle schools and high schools are especially difficult to staff under the current divisors because of the many requirements for graduation beginning in middle grades. Most school systems have supplemented earned units in middle and upper grades in order to offer all the courses needed to offer multiple diploma tracks for both career and college readiness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT DIVISORS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the idea of divisors was conceived, students could graduate from high school with 11 core courses. As the Legislature increased the graduation requirements to 16 core courses and additional electives, the burden of meeting the graduation requirements fell on local school systems. The State Board of Education recently adopted the First Choice Diploma requiring more advanced courses and electives but no additional funding has been allocated to assist local school systems in achieving this goal.

**What are local units?**

“Local unit” is the term to describe any teachers employed by a school system above the allocation determined through the divisor system. Most of these local units are assigned in middle school and high school because the divisors are much higher in these upper grades. This makes for larger classes and fewer specialty teachers.

Ironically, middle and high schools are where most specialty (i.e. electives) teachers work. Administrators feel the pressure of increased course requirements and community demands for varied courses to place local units in upper grades. Whenever school systems do hire local units, all salaries and benefits must come from additional local funds. Very few systems can afford local units in the current economic climate.

**What are the programs not included in the Foundation Program?**

The Foundation Program does not include all the state funds sent to K-12 schools. Additional line items include transportation, school nurses and technology coordinators. In the FY11 school year, transportation is currently funded at 70%. In FY11, school systems are receiving $59,823 for the first nurse and $31 per student for additional nurses and $28,060 for the technology coordinator. These funds are subject to proration and local funds must be used to cover the actual salary paid and the benefits of the employee.

Also, funds for the Alabama Reading Initiative (ARI), the Alabama Mathematics, Science and Technology Initiative (AMSTI), and Distance Learning come to the local school systems through the State Department of Education. Funds for these programs do not cover the full costs of salaries and benefits of these employees.
What is the Public School fund?

The oldest and most stable source of school funds in Alabama, the PSF has its origin in the Constitution of 1901 and dates back to the earliest years of state-sponsored schooling. The PSF is funded from the 3.0 mill statewide property tax. By statute, the proceeds must be spent on capital outlay. As a practical matter, PSF is funded to the schools through the Capital Outlay Program. These funds are used for major renovations like roof repairs and structural changes. They are also used for building additions. Theoretically, they can be used to construct new schools, but rarely are these funds sufficient to launch such massive projects.

What is the split?

“The Split” is the common term for referring to the way ETF funds are divided between Higher Education and K-12. The Higher Education portion includes 2-year and 4-year institutions and workforce development funding. The K-12 portion includes the Foundation Program and non-Foundation funds as well.

Each year there is also a percentage that goes to “other” related agencies that are neither truly Higher Education nor K-12. Historical data for the “split” show that the K-12 to Higher Education funding ratio has varied from 85/11 to 57/28 through the years.

The data table below shows a sample of how the split has varied from decade to decade. Complete information is available by contacting the School Superintendents of Alabama or the office of the Deputy State Superintendent of Education for Administration and Finance.

What is the “Other” Category?
Just as the size of the “other” category has varied through the years, so have the agencies and programs receiving funding from the Education Trust Fund. In recent years expenditures for “other” have included the Alabama Institute for Deaf and Blind; the Department of Youth Services (excluding the school district); Rehabilitation Services; Public Health; the Department of Human Resources; Community Service Grants; Educational Television; and, the Public Library Service. These agencies constitute over 80% of the total of the “other” category for FY11.

The SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS of Alabama appreciates the resources provided for this document from Decision Resources, Inc., and the Alabama State Department of Education.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daphne East Elem</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta Elem</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foley Elem</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf Shores Elem</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loxley Elem</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia School</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton School</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Beach Elem</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Grove Elem</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertsdale Elem</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverhill Elem</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Fort Elem</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stapleton Elem</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerdale Elem</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Average                | 1537 | 87 | 18 |
| 1st Average           | 1647 | 86 | 18 |
| 2nd Average           | 1722 | 82 | 24 |
| 3rd Average           | 1855 | 80 | 21 |
| 4th Average           | 1884 | 72 | 23 |
| 5th Average           | 1305 | 87 | 24 |
| Overall Average       | 15755 | 524 | 21 |
## Baldwin County Public Schools - K-3 Schools Class Count by Grade 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bay Minette Elem</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daphne Elem</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elberta Elem</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairhope Elem</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **K Average**: 583 (18)
- **1st Average**: 672 (20)
- **2nd Average**: 692 (20)
- **3rd Average**: 630 (19)
- **Overall Average**: 2577 (19)
### Baldwin County Public Schools - Intermediate Schools Class Count by Grade 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bay Minette Inter</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elberta Middle</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairhope Inter</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foley Inter</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.J. Carrol Inter</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4th Average | 656 24 27 |
| 5th Average | 956 33 29 |
| 6th Average | 867 31 28 |
| Overall Average | 2479 88 28 |
Facilities
## TYPES OF CONSTRUCTION COST COMPARISONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL SQUARE FOOTAGE</th>
<th>BLOCK, BRICK &amp; MORTAR BUILDING</th>
<th>PRE-ENGINEERED METAL BUILDING</th>
<th>TILIT-UP CONCRETE WALL BUILDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COST/SF</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
<td>COST/SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>$185.00</td>
<td>$9,250,000.00</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>$185.00</td>
<td>$13,875,000.00</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>$185.00</td>
<td>$18,500,000.00</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>$185.00</td>
<td>$23,125,000.00</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>$185.00</td>
<td>$27,750,000.00</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>$185.00</td>
<td>$32,375,000.00</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>$185.00</td>
<td>$37,000,000.00</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>$185.00</td>
<td>$41,625,000.00</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>$185.00</td>
<td>$46,250,000.00</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Construction Cost Estimates for High School in National, US

The following analysis estimates the cost to build a high school using US National Average costs from 2013 RSMeans cost data. Costs are derived from a building model that assumes basic components, using union labor for a 130000 square foot building.

Scope differences and market conditions can cause costs to vary significantly. To see an estimate of the costs to build a high school in a specific city or metropolitan area, go to our index of high school models by state.

NOTE: This cost estimate uses 2013 RSMeans data. A more accurate estimate using current RSMeans cost data is available on RSMeans Online - our online cost estimating tool.

### High School Construction Cost Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location:</th>
<th>US National Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stories:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story Height (L.F.):</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area (S.F.):</td>
<td>130000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basement Included:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Release:</td>
<td>Year 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## HIGH SCHOOL SQUARE FOOT COST ASSUMING DECORATIVE CONCRETE BLOCK / R/CONC. FRAME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Estimate (Union Labor)</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Cost Per SF</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$118.43</td>
<td>$15,396,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Fees</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$29.61</td>
<td>$3,849,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Fees</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>$10.36</td>
<td>$1,347,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Building Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$158.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,592,200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Estimate (Open Shop)</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Cost Per SF</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$108.20</td>
<td>$14,066,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Fees</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$27.05</td>
<td>$3,516,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Fees</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>$9.47</td>
<td>$1,230,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Building Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$144.72</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18,813,300</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Construction Cost Estimates for Jr High School in National, US

The following analysis estimates the cost to build a jr high school using US National Average costs from 2013 RSMeans cost data. Costs are derived from a building model that assumes basic components, using union labor for a 110000 square foot building.

Scope differences and market conditions can cause costs to vary significantly. To see an estimate of the costs to build a jr high school in a specific city or metropolitan area, go to our index of jr high school models by state.

NOTE: This cost estimate uses 2013 RSMeans data. A more accurate estimate using current RSMeans cost data is available on RSMeans Online - our online cost estimating tool.

**Jr High School Construction Cost Assumptions**

- **Location:** US National Average
- **Stories:** 2
- **Story Height (L.F.):** 15.00
- **Floor Area (S.F.):** 110000
- **Basement Included:** No
- **Data Release:** Year 2013
**JR HIGH SCHOOL SQUARE FOOT COST ASSUMING CONCRETE BLOCK STUCCO FACE / BEARING WALLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Estimate (Union Labor)</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Cost Per SF</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$115.93</td>
<td>$12,752,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Fees</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$28.98</td>
<td>$3,188,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Fees</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>$10.14</td>
<td>$1,115,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Building Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$155.05</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,055,800</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Estimate (Open Shop)</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Cost Per SF</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$106.97</td>
<td>$11,767,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Fees</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$26.74</td>
<td>$2,941,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Fees</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>$9.36</td>
<td>$1,029,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Building Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$143.08</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,738,400</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Construction Cost Estimates for Elementary School in National, US

The following analysis estimates the cost to build an elementary school using US National Average costs from 2013 RSMeans cost data. Costs are derived from a building model that assumes basic components, using union labor for a 45000 square foot building. Scope differences and market conditions can cause costs to vary significantly. To see an estimate of the costs to build an elementary school in a specific city or metropolitan area, go to our index of elementary school models by state. NOTE: This cost estimate uses 2013 RSMeans data. A more accurate estimate using current RSMeans cost data is available on RSMeans Online - our online cost estimating tool.

### Elementary School Construction Cost Assumptions

- **Location:** US National Average
- **Stories:** 1
- **Story Height (L.F.):** 15.00
- **Floor Area (S.F.):** 5000
- **Basement Included:** No
- **Data Release:** Year 2013
### ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SQUARE FOOT COST ASSUMING DECORATIVE CONCRETE BLOCK / BEARING WALLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Estimate (Union Labor)</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Cost Per SF</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$122.83</td>
<td>$5,527,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Fees (GC,Overhead,Profit)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$30.71</td>
<td>$1,381,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Fees</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>$10.75</td>
<td>$483,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Building Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$164.29</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,393,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Estimate (Open Shop)</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Cost Per SF</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$112.29</td>
<td>$5,053,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Fees (GC,Overhead,Profit)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$28.07</td>
<td>$1,263,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Fees</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>$9.83</td>
<td>$442,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Building Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$150.19</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,758,400</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Custom Built School Buildings

Offering Strong, Attractive & Modern Design Options

When it comes to the safety of the children in your school, there is no stronger or more durable construction material than steel. Promising the best value for your dollar, a steel building is the best option for school divisions on a limited budget. Using steel for your new school building can result in savings of up to 50 per cent on the cost of construction compared to other building materials. Steel is also one of the most durable materials available, guaranteeing your prefab school building to last for many years. As steel requires minimal upkeep compared to wood, your maintenance costs will also be comparatively lower than other construction materials, leading to future cost-savings for many decades to come.

When it comes to putting children’s safety first, steel is one of the strongest and sturdiest construction materials on the market. Safe against earthquakes, strong winds, hurricanes, and even fires, your students’ safety and security will be guaranteed in a pre-engineered steel school building.

Whether you are choosing a pre-engineered steel building to add on to your school’s existing space, as an entirely new replacement building, or as a new charter school, its exterior can be customized to suit any surroundings. From stone to brick, slate, stucco and siding, your finishing options are limitless with a steel building.
Why Choose a Metal School Building?

**Flexibility and Adaptability:** Easily adaptable to your school’s needs, pre-engineered steel buildings are designed for hassle-free expansion to allow for more classrooms to be added at any time without disrupting school operations. Just remove one end-wall, extend the walls to the desired size, and replace the end-wall -- it’s that simple. A pre-engineered steel building also provides the possibility of a column-free interior space of up to 300 feet across, perfect for large gymnasiums or meeting rooms.

**Cost Savings:** As most school boards have a limited budget, ensuring funds go as far as possible is key in building a top quality new building. Construction is quick with pre-engineered components and requires less manpower to assemble, resulting in low labour costs. A steel school building is also highly resistant to decay, mildew and rust due to its zinc and aluminum alloy coating, and will result in lower maintenance costs over time. Steel will not only help you stay within budget but will allow you to acquire everything on your school’s wish list as well.

**Speed of Construction:** Traditional construction can be a slow, drawn-out process that affects children’s daily school routines. Pre-engineered steel school buildings, however, can be assembled quickly and efficiently with components that are pre-cut and pre-drilled in the factory. Due to its lightweight nature, steel is a user-friendly material to work with and assemble. As a result, your school can be assembled hassle-free in a matter of weeks or months, as opposed to years, getting your community’s children back into the classroom in no time at all.

**Heavy Duty:** Compared to other construction materials like wood, steel school buildings are highly impervious to water, mold, mildew, termites and other wood-destroying insects. As a result, your school will continue to save on maintenance costs down the line.

**Climate Control:** The components of our pre-engineered steel school buildings are cut with laser-like precision in the factory. That provides tight connections between walls and will result in significantly less heat and cooling loss than a building made from inferior building materials. Watch your students enjoy learning while in the optimal climate-controlled environment without any cool drafts
in winter. As a school board, you will see continue to see lower heating bills as a result of choosing a pre-engineered steel building for your new school.

**Environmentally Responsible:** Steel is a recyclable material, and most manufactured steel today contains an average of 25 per cent recycled content. At the end of its life, a steel building is 100 per cent recyclable. Choosing steel saves landfill space and valuable resources like forests, protecting our natural environment and helping to achieve a more livable habitat for future generations. Send the right message to your students by choosing a pre-engineered steel school building.

**Low Premiums:** Steel has many qualities that insurance companies like to see in a home, and will reward you for that. In fact, you can expect to save up to 40 per cent on insurance premiums if you choose to build your school with steel. Reasons for that include steel being incredibly resilient against termite infestations, and the fact that steel cannot rot, mold or crack. Steel is also non-combustible and resistant to fire.

**Fire Resistant:** Steel has an incredibly high melting point and continues to maintain its structural integrity when faced with fire. Steel will melt at about 1,380 degrees Celsius, or 2,500 degrees Fahrenheit, whereas the temperature at the base, or continuous flame region, of a fire can reach about 900 degrees Celsius, or 1,652 degrees Fahrenheit. As a result, steel buildings are incredibly resistant to structural damage even during a fire. Steel framed homes also help to contain fire and prevent it from spreading to other parts of the building.

**Strength:** Steel has an incredibly high strength to weight ratio. Strong enough to withstand hurricanes and even tornadoes, a steel building provides supreme protection against extreme weather conditions, promising your community’s children a safe and secure learning environment.
(Ottawa, Canada – November 17, 2011) Mention overcrowded schools these days and you’re bound to hit an emotional button – in new communities and older ones. Whether you’re building a new school, adding a school addition or moving in portables, you can’t seem to please everyone. But, when it comes to the actual construction of the building, a technique that has been around since the early 1900s is gaining popularity across Ontario and Canada. It’s called concrete tilt-up panels and its list of benefits reads like it was discovered just for schools:

Speed – Classroom walls can be erected in a few hours; an eight-classroom structure with washrooms and air conditioning can be completed in mere weeks. A school can be built in as little as six months.

Energy Efficiency – The natural thermal mass properties of concrete reduce energy costs. Tilt-up buildings offer an overall energy and life cycle
performance that is typically 20-60 percent more efficient. This translates into a comfortable learning environment.

Cost and Value – Tilt-Up construction is the most cost effective solution for durable wall construction, and why the use of tilt-up has exceeds a billion square feet of wall area annually, globally.

Durability: The natural properties of a concrete insulated core help to protect against vandalism and maintenance abuse. The inherent fire resistance of concrete allows classrooms to be located closer to an existing school (attached in most cases) without sacrificing valuable playgrounds or forcing students and staff to walk outside during inclement weather.

Versatility – The fluid properties of concrete allows for any size, design and finish. Every school addition can be designed and constructed to suit the architecture and requirements of the existing school.

“Concrete tilt-up is a construction technique whose name says what it is — concrete panels are cast on-slab,然后 tilted to install,” says Shawn Hickey, president of SiteCast Construction, Canada’s leading concrete tilt-up specialist.

“When school or classroom structures are built with tilt-up concrete panels, students and staff study and work in a healthy, sound, safe, comfortable environment, suitable for a productive work day.”

In 1999, SiteCast built its first school in Cumberland Ontario using insulated concrete tilt-up panels. The school was built three times faster than its sister school that was built using conventional brick/masonry construction. Within a few years, the school had saved 38% on its energy costs. Since then SiteCast has worked with general contractors and construction managers throughout Ontario to build schools additions.

To view a time-lapse video on the construction of Louis Riel School and a video on tilt-up construction, visit the SiteCast school resource centre: www.sitecast.ca/schools

About SiteCast Construction
SiteCast Construction specializes in tilt-up panels to create custom, superior building envelope solutions for retail, industrial, commercial and institutional customers. For the past two decades, SiteCast has been pushing the boundaries in what designers can do with tilt-up and as such creates panels of any size, shape or texture. SiteCast has produced more tilt-up structures than any other contractor in Ontario. Projects in Ottawa include: Kanata Montessori School (gymnasium and classroom additions), Louis Riel School (addition), Canadian Bank Note (addition), Waste Services Inc. (waste transfer facility) and the Coca Cola’s distribution facility, and many retail centres, including LCBO, Staples, Starbucks, Subway and Blockbuster. International projects include the Military Housing Project in Amman Jordan and Eritrea Orphanage in Africa.

www.sitecast.ca
SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION PROVIDES GROWTH MARKET FOR TILT-UP

While commercial construction is suffering through today’s economic difficulties, school construction remains strong – at least for now. According to the 2009 School Construction Report, published by School Planning & Management, school districts in the United States spent just over $19.5 billion on construction projects during the 2008 calendar year. More than 65% of that money went into new building construction – the highest percentage since 1978.

And, because today’s construction money has been in the pipeline for a number of years, school construction remains high. Future construction planning may be in jeopardy, but the hope of federal stimulus funds still exists for school districts that have projects ready to go.

But, even if money is available, school construction can still be highly complex for school districts. They must be fiscally responsible, while still delivering for safety, sustainability and technology needs. With these continually growing demands on school construction, districts have faced an overall increase in school construction costs. The cost to build a new school today is more than 50% higher than in 2000, according to School Planning & Management.

With increased financial demands in the midst of a recession, school districts are looking for ways to achieve their construction goals in the most economical way possible. Many schools are finding concrete tilt-up construction to be the solution to achieve the best of both worlds. For decades, tilt-up construction has proven to be an effective solution for growing educational needs. Some of the primary characteristics of tilt-up that benefit schools are:

- Fast – tilt-up has delivered schools in as little as four to six months
- Cost-Effective – utilizing readily available labor and materials, tilt-up provides a cost-effective design and construction solution
- Durable – vandalism and maintenance are minimized with concrete walls
- Attractive – virtually any architectural finish can be applied with tilt-up, including a real masonry finish
- Safe and Quiet – concrete is naturally fire- and weather-resistant and absorbs sound
• Spacious – load-bearing walls provide unobstructed space for gyms and classrooms
• Sustainable – the natural heat sink properties of concrete reduce energy usage and cost

CON/STEEL Alliance members have proven the value of tilt-up on dozens of school projects in the last 10 years.

Back in 2001—when tilt-up schools were exclusively built in warm weather climates—SiteCast Construction Corp. (Ottawa, Canada) delivered a new elementary school to a growing school district in only six months. The cast-in brick used on the project saved months off traditional masonry schedules, while delivering the same architectural appeal.

Today, school districts all over the country are benefiting from the characteristics of tilt-up schools. By employing a tilt-up concrete alternative, Summit Concrete (a subsidiary of Alliance member Meyer Bros. Building Co. of Kansas City, Mo.) saved $500,000 on a new middle school in Olathe, Kansas. The project team recognized that using tilt-up construction would allow them to bid the concrete and tilt-up elements of the project earlier. Bidding these portions early saved time and money since wall design and coordination could overlap with other elements of the project.

Even when a project isn't originally designed with tilt-up, the method can still provide schedule and budget benefits. Early last year, the Brevard County school district in Florida, was in need of a new two-story academic building. Although they had an original contract for a precast concrete structure, their entire campus upgrade project was falling behind schedule. Plus, the district had safety concerns due to the precast panels being trucked in and transported into position across an active campus.

Working with CON/STEEL Alliance member Sunshine Structures (LeHigh Acres, Fla.), the building team realized they could change the design to tilt-up and set the panels in place before school started. The 32,000-square-foot project broke ground in early July, and all panels were erected before classes resumed in late August. The tilt-up solution also delivered a cost of $27.50 per square foot, compared to $32 per square foot for the original precast design. This cost savings was realized even though additional panel-to-panel connections were added for increased hurricane resistance.

To provide for the needs of students – both today’s and tomorrow’s – school districts can’t afford to compromise anything when it comes to school construction. Tilt-up concrete construction has proven to be the solution for delivering beautiful, functional and sustainable projects despite condensed schedules and limited budgets.
Funding
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Date Levied</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Renewal</th>
<th>Levying Authority</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>FY 2016 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 mills County Wide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Note below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mill</td>
<td>March 8, 1988</td>
<td>30 yrs</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>Baldwin County Commission</td>
<td>Failed</td>
<td>3,968,677.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 mills</td>
<td>May 12, 1987</td>
<td>30 yrs</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>Baldwin County Commission</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>11,906,031.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 mills</td>
<td>December 5, 1961</td>
<td>No renewal</td>
<td>Amendment No. 879/Local Act</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,843,386.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 mills District Wide</td>
<td>May 12, 1987</td>
<td>30 yrs</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>Baldwin County Commission</td>
<td>Failed</td>
<td>11,884,149.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47,602,244.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 mills Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>See Note Below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Date Levied</td>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>Levying Authority</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% Sales Taxes</td>
<td>12/20/88 &amp; 6/6/91</td>
<td>No Renewal</td>
<td>Baldwin County Commission</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>32,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% Sales Taxes</td>
<td>June 1, 2013</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>May 31, 2018</td>
<td>Amendment No. 879/Local Act</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>32,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% Sales Taxes to improve general educational expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Can only be used for capital improvement and maintenance purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2% Sales Tax</td>
<td>August 24, 1984</td>
<td>No Renewal</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 % Sales Tax Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note 1:** Ad Valorem revenue includes both property and probate taxes. These figures are provided by the county along with a provision in case of disputes that could reduce the total revenue brought in.

**Note 2:** Sales Tax revenue is always budgeted conservatively. Sales Taxes can be volatile depending on many factors so I always budget conservative and under the notion that hopefully actual will exceed budgeted revenue. We have 2 additional budget amendments allowed where we can adjust figures as necessary.

**Note 3:** The regular 1% sales tax, the state requires an additional matching requirement for state capital funds therefore $3,667,525 is reduced from the $32 million in the general fund and placed into Debt Service Fund per State requirements.

**Note 4:** The 1/2 Sales Tax is restrict for only certain purposes therefore it is included in the Special Revenue account instead of the General Fund.
## Baldwin County School System Comparative Data - Revenue & Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total State Revenue</td>
<td>125,762</td>
<td>136,962</td>
<td>121,881</td>
<td>107,282</td>
<td>103,258</td>
<td>110,483</td>
<td>124,076</td>
<td>134,856</td>
<td>142,902</td>
<td>143,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Federal Revenue</td>
<td>17,475</td>
<td>18,087</td>
<td>19,499</td>
<td>31,588</td>
<td>33,537</td>
<td>26,369</td>
<td>22,965</td>
<td>24,813</td>
<td>22,946</td>
<td>23,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Local Revenue (incl 10 mills)</td>
<td>121,622</td>
<td>130,573</td>
<td>115,756</td>
<td>120,335</td>
<td>142,996</td>
<td>139,547</td>
<td>145,845</td>
<td>141,969</td>
<td>137,369</td>
<td>143,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Other Revenue</td>
<td>1,777</td>
<td>2,021</td>
<td>2,074</td>
<td>2,155</td>
<td>1,905</td>
<td>1,882</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>1,519</td>
<td>4,173</td>
<td>865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>266,636</strong></td>
<td><strong>287,643</strong></td>
<td><strong>259,210</strong></td>
<td><strong>261,360</strong></td>
<td><strong>281,696</strong></td>
<td><strong>278,281</strong></td>
<td><strong>294,426</strong></td>
<td><strong>303,157</strong></td>
<td><strong>307,390</strong></td>
<td><strong>311,775</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Services</td>
<td>138,046</td>
<td>155,902</td>
<td>146,924</td>
<td>133,660</td>
<td>138,070</td>
<td>133,266</td>
<td>137,844</td>
<td>146,378</td>
<td>151,636</td>
<td>154,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Support Services</td>
<td>42,924</td>
<td>48,545</td>
<td>46,908</td>
<td>41,677</td>
<td>39,904</td>
<td>39,958</td>
<td>39,599</td>
<td>41,802</td>
<td>43,302</td>
<td>42,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>26,783</td>
<td>29,682</td>
<td>28,040</td>
<td>24,770</td>
<td>24,733</td>
<td>25,185</td>
<td>25,713</td>
<td>28,767</td>
<td>40,502</td>
<td>37,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Services</td>
<td>28,678</td>
<td>26,349</td>
<td>25,711</td>
<td>21,712</td>
<td>23,452</td>
<td>23,463</td>
<td>27,558</td>
<td>32,062</td>
<td>33,541</td>
<td>31,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administrative Services</td>
<td>8,088</td>
<td>7,663</td>
<td>7,659</td>
<td>6,565</td>
<td>7,310</td>
<td>7,112</td>
<td>8,525</td>
<td>9,957</td>
<td>10,187</td>
<td>8,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay &amp; Renovations</td>
<td>80,953</td>
<td>84,275</td>
<td>49,795</td>
<td>9,701</td>
<td>2,451</td>
<td>2,332</td>
<td>5,133</td>
<td>7,293</td>
<td>15,664</td>
<td>7,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Services</td>
<td>13,360</td>
<td>17,457</td>
<td>17,716</td>
<td>19,501</td>
<td>18,266</td>
<td>19,445</td>
<td>19,893</td>
<td>24,092</td>
<td>26,629</td>
<td>19,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenditures</td>
<td>5,888</td>
<td>6,666</td>
<td>7,028</td>
<td>6,772</td>
<td>7,614</td>
<td>8,105</td>
<td>8,931</td>
<td>8,954</td>
<td>8,763</td>
<td>8,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>344,720</strong></td>
<td><strong>376,539</strong></td>
<td><strong>329,781</strong></td>
<td><strong>264,358</strong></td>
<td><strong>261,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>258,866</strong></td>
<td><strong>273,196</strong></td>
<td><strong>299,305</strong></td>
<td><strong>330,224</strong></td>
<td><strong>311,625</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Fund Sources (Interfund)</td>
<td>186,104</td>
<td>24,432</td>
<td>23,371</td>
<td>26,144</td>
<td>27,424</td>
<td>72,250</td>
<td>60,351</td>
<td>45,289</td>
<td>30,313</td>
<td>24,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Fund Uses (Interfund)</td>
<td>28,553</td>
<td>22,120</td>
<td>19,970</td>
<td>23,095</td>
<td>21,698</td>
<td>71,195</td>
<td>47,607</td>
<td>43,596</td>
<td>28,249</td>
<td>22,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus or Deficit</td>
<td>79,467</td>
<td>(86,584)</td>
<td>(67,170)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25,622</td>
<td>20,470</td>
<td>33,974</td>
<td>5,545</td>
<td>(20,770)</td>
<td>2,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Mil Chargeback</td>
<td>24,664</td>
<td>29,314</td>
<td>37,236</td>
<td>45,431</td>
<td>43,830</td>
<td>43,331</td>
<td>39,891</td>
<td>36,890</td>
<td>35,765</td>
<td>36,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Membership (ADM)</td>
<td>25,825</td>
<td>26,037</td>
<td>26,323</td>
<td>26,736</td>
<td>27,445</td>
<td>27,744</td>
<td>28,319</td>
<td>28,996</td>
<td>29,685</td>
<td>30,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Pupil Expenditures</td>
<td>9,082.33</td>
<td>10,187.00</td>
<td>9,361.00</td>
<td>8,254.31</td>
<td>8,298.00</td>
<td>8,030.53</td>
<td>8,046.00</td>
<td>8,512.00</td>
<td>8,817.70</td>
<td>8,304.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note 1:** ADM represents the total, average daily enrollment during the first 20 days after Labor Day of the previous school year (No Pre-K).

**Notes 2:** Per Pupil Expenditures: These figures were pulled directly off the State Department of Education Report Card or if not available calculated in the same manner. The State method excludes Capital, Debt Services, & Other Expenditures and only includes expenditures in the General and Special Revenue Fund Source.
## Material, Supplies, & Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Supplies</td>
<td>194,540.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Ed Supplies/Equipment</td>
<td>203,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Software</td>
<td>1,091,113.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Equipment</td>
<td>90,850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT/Infrastructure Equipment</td>
<td>1,948,489.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing Supplies</td>
<td>49,725.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Supplies</td>
<td>67,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noninstructional Equipment/Supplies (including time clocks)</td>
<td>111,282.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Supplies (Superintendent, Communication, HR, etc)</td>
<td>28,030.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitorial/Ground Services Supplies</td>
<td>1,119,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Supplies/Tools</td>
<td>819,022.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Supplies</td>
<td>210,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,932,701.41</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Registration Fees for PD conferences etc.</td>
<td>166,175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Funds Transferred to School for Materials &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>135,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band and Choral Funds Transferred to Schools for M &amp; S</td>
<td>154,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>455,175.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Penny Tax Salaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penny Tax Salaries and Benefits</td>
<td>26,116,407.00</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNP Pass-through Benefit Cost</td>
<td>3,970,563.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Supplements and Stipends (Athletic, Band, etc.)</td>
<td>1,658,597.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitute Cost</td>
<td>2,411,677.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34,157,244.38</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Purchase Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>615,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professional Services (Copier, Postage, Printing, other misc items)</td>
<td>281,076.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In District Travel</td>
<td>251,085.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In State Travel</td>
<td>154,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of State Travel</td>
<td>134,996.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>1,400,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities, Phone Bills, Equip Agreements, Portables etc.</td>
<td>11,635,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Repair Services</td>
<td>6,977,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>440,393.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT (Data Procession, Server, Infrastructure Cost)</td>
<td>1,100,506.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noninstru Software Licenses (online registration, parent-link, time clock, accounting system, GIS)</td>
<td>544,384.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Ed Purchase Services</td>
<td>497,200.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 24,031,040.00
**Expenditures from Local Tax Revenue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>34,157,244.38</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Services</td>
<td>24,031,040.00</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material, Supplies &amp; Equipment</td>
<td>5,932,701.41</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Debt Services</td>
<td>16,609,290.21</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Cap Projects</td>
<td>7,000,000.00</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Misc</td>
<td>455,175.00</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 mill match</td>
<td>36,992,420.00</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local Tax Expenditures** 125,177,871.00

*Does not include expenditures related to Non-Tax Revenue*
### Local Tax Revenue

Ad Valorem (including probate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,968,677.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,906,031.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>19,843,386.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,884,149.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Ad Valorem: 47,602,244.11

Sales & Use Tax: 80,300,000.00
County Alcohol Bev Tax: 310,000.00
Business Privilege Tax: 1,090,000.00
Helping School Vehicle Tags: 30,000.00
Manufactured Homes- Reg Fees: 20,000.00

Total Tax Revenue: 129,352,244.11

### Non Tax Local Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest Revenue</td>
<td>144,625.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service Income</td>
<td>3,953,348.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Day Charges for Services</td>
<td>1,253,512.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local School Public Funds</td>
<td>5,875,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local School Non Public Funds</td>
<td>1,964,901.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Reimbursement</td>
<td>850,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Non-Tax Revenue: 14,041,636.37

Total Local Revenue: 143,393,880.48