7.1.1 Facility Evaluation Tool Approval

Facility Evaluation Tool
Operational Factors

All Campuses
All Campuses and Buildings
All Campuses, Buildings and Property

Factor List	Data Needed	Rating Metric
Building Age and Condition: - Assessment of the age, condition of buildings, years since last renovation - Evaluation of underlying mechanical, electrical, plumbing, and HVAC systems.	• Facility Assessment Score - Corgan 2020 by campus or building • Number of Work Orders (3-5 year review) by campus or building • Cost to Complete Work Orders by campus or building • Number of repeat work orders by campus or building • Upcoming and Ongoing bond projects including costs by campus or building	Assigned Value: 1-5 (5 being excellent condition, 1 being poor condition) 5: Excellent condition, buildings are well-maintained with modern facilities 4: Good condition, minor maintenance issues but overall functional facilities. 3: Fair condition, noticeable maintenance needs and aging infrastructure. 2: Poor condition, significant maintenance issues impacting functionality. 1: Critical condition, buildings require extensive repairs and pose safety concerns.
Building Capacity and Utilization: - Evaluation of the current capacity compared to enrollment and need - Assessment of used or underutilized space. - Analysis of space utilization for educational purposes meeting the needs of the learners and educators - Projection of future space needs based on enrollment trends or space needs - Consideration of available space to expand facility for efficiencies - Evaluation of square footage of building, lot size	• Comfortable Capacity by campus • Campus enrollment (22, 23, 24, 25) • Extracurricular programs that use that space (rentals) by campus • Floor area ratio by campus, building, lot • Possible future use of facility, land, expansion • Maps of campuses examining space utilization	Assigned Value: 1-5 (5 being minimal excess capacity, 1 being significant excess capacity) 5: Minimal excess capacity, campus/building are well-utilized at 85%-90%. 4: Some excess capacity, occasional space in building at 80%. 3: Moderate excess capacity at 70% 2: Significant excess capacity at 60% 1: Excessive excess capacity, numerous rooms consistently vacant at 50%

Factor List	Data Needed	Rating Metric
Building Capacity and Utilization: - Evaluation of the current capacity compared to enrollment and need - Assessment of used or underutilized space. - Analysis of space utilization for educational purposes meeting the needs of the learners and educators - Projection of future space needs based on enrollment trends or space needs - Consideration of available space to expand facility for efficiencies - Evaluation of square footage of building, lot size	• Comfortable Capacity by campus • Campus enrollment (22, 23, 24, 25) • Extracurricular programs that use that space (rentals) by campus • Floor area ratio by campus, building, lot • Possible future use of facility, land, expansion	Assigned Value: 1-5 (5 being maximum expansion opportunities, 1 being minimal expansion opportunities) 5: Floor Area Ratio is less than 0.5 with maximum expansion opportunities 4: Floor Area Ratio is 0.5 - 0.6 with significant expansion opportunities 3: Floor Area Ratio is 0.6 - 0.7 with moderate expansion opportunities 2: Floor Area Ratio is 0.7-0.8 with some expansion opportunities 1: Floor Area Ratio is greater than 0.8 with minimal expansion opportunities
Utility and Operational Costs: - Evaluation of utility, maintenance and operational costs associated with each campus/building - Evaluation of staff FTEs - Evaluation of technology, insurance costs - Evaluation of revenue opportunities vs. operational/maintenance costs (how much do rentals off set costs)	• Utility costs by campus, per student on a campus, building and land per square foot • Operational and maintenance costs by campus or building including per student costs • Rental revenue by campus or building • Full Time Employees (FTEs) by campus or building	Assigned Value: 1-5 (5 being minimal operational costs, 1 being significant excess operational costs) 5: 90th percentile and above of efficiency relative to like buildings, property 4: 80th percentile of efficiency relative to like buildings, property 3: 70th percentile of efficiency relative to like buildings, property 2: 60th percentile of efficiency relative to like buildings, property 1: 50th percentile and below of efficiency relative to like buildings, property

Factor List	Data Needed	Rating Metric
Bus Routes and Transportation Costs: - Analysis of existing bus routes and associated transportation costs. - Consideration of efficiency and cost-effectiveness. - Consideration of cost to travel between buildings	• Number of Bus Routes - overall and by campus • Number of Bus Shuttles by campus and by program • Cost of Bus Routes by campus excluding costs for required transportation (special education, Pre-K, McKinney Vento and EB learners) - consider current and future costs by changes • Cost of travel between admin buildings (stipend, gas, etc)	Analysis of existing bus routes and associated transportation costs as well as admin travel costs - Consideration of efficiency and cost-effectiveness. - Assigned Value: 1-5 (5 being efficient routes and low costs, 1 being inefficient routes and high costs) 5: Efficient routes and low relative costs, optimized bus routes and expenses. 4: Reasonable routes and costs, some room for improvement in route efficiency and cost-effectiveness. 3: Moderate routes and costs, noticeable opportunities for optimization to reduce transportation expenses. 2: Inefficient routes and high costs, significant inefficiencies in bus routes leading to elevated transportation expenses. 1: Highly inefficient routes and exorbitant costs, extensive restructuring needed to improve route efficiency and reduce costs.

Learning Environmental and Programmatic Factors

Factor List	Data Needed	Rating Metric
Current Enrollment Trends and Projected Enrollment: - Analysis of current, historical back 5 years and future projections for 5 years of enrollment data. - Projections for future enrollment based on demographic trends. - Utilization trend since rezoning	● Students zoned to campus versus attending campus by campus ● Number of students at a campus in special programs (Special Education, DLI, IB, Open Enrollment, Transfers) ● Enrollment trends and yields by campus ● Student yields from neighborhoods and developments by campus *Enrollment numbers should include current and projected	Assigned Value: 1-5 (5 being increasing enrollment, 1 being decreasing enrollment) 5: Based on historical, current, and future enrollment data, the campus has an increasing enrollment trend. 3: Based on historical, current, and future enrollment data, the campus has stable enrollment. 1: Based on historical, current, and future enrollment data, the campus has a decreasing enrollment trend.
Natural Combinations of Attendance Zones: - Assessment of geographic and demographic factors influencing attendance zone boundaries. - Consideration of logical combinations of attendance zones. - Consideration of keeping students together during changes	● Attendance Zones by campus ● Enrollment Numbers by campus ● Student yields from neighborhoods and developments	Assigned Value: 1-5 (5 being logical combinations, 1 being illogical combinations) 5: Logical combinations, attendance zones reflect geographic and demographic coherence. 4: Somewhat logical combinations, minor inconsistencies in attendance zone configurations. 3: Moderate inconsistencies, noticeable disparities or irregularities in attendance zones. 2: Significant inconsistencies, substantial discrepancies or illogical configurations in attendance zones. 1: Illogical combinations, attendance zones lack coherence and are poorly structured.

Factor List	Data Needed	Rating Metric
Neighborhood School: - Examination of the feasibility of walking or biking to school for students including safety and distance	• Map of CISD • Hazardous Route information by campus or building • Traffic patterns by campus or building	Assigned Value: 1-5 (5 being high feasibility, 1 being low feasibility) 5: High feasibility, safe sidewalks and bike lanes provide convenient access for students with 75-80% living within 0.25 miles 4: Moderate feasibility, some infrastructure in place for walking or biking but with safety concerns with 75-80% living within 0.25-0.75 miles 3: Fair feasibility, limited infrastructure for walking or biking, requiring caution with 75-80% living within 0.75-1.25 miles 2: Low feasibility, inadequate infrastructure for walking or biking, posing safety risks with 75-80% living within 1.25-1.5 miles 1: Very low feasibility, lack of sidewalks or bike lanes, making walking or biking impractical with 75-80% living within more than 1.5 miles
Geographic Proximity to Other Campuses/Buildings: - Evaluation of the proximity of buildings to each other with schools/buildings strategically located to maximize accessibility and minimize travel distance - Consideration of transportation logistics, community accessibility, traffic patterns and ease of rezoning/moving occupants to another building - Consideration of the need for a campus or building in a specific location based on need	• Maps of campuses • Travel time between campuses/buildings and within attendance zones (and adjacent attendance zones) using Google Maps in minutes especially during peak times	Assigned Value: 1-5 (5 being optimal proximity, 1 being poor proximity) 5: Optimal proximity, schools/buildings are strategically located to maximize accessibility and minimize travel distance. 4: Good proximity, schools/buildings are reasonably located with adequate access to neighboring buildings. 3: Fair proximity, some schools/buildings are located further from other campuses, impacting accessibility, enrollment balancing and travel. 2: Poor proximity, significant distance between buildings, resulting in less accessibility, enrollment balancing issues and longer travel times. 1: Inadequate proximity, buildings are isolated or distant from one another, posing logistical challenges.

Impact Decision Matrix

All Campuses
All Campuses and Buildings
All Campuses, Buildings and Property

	Impact Decision Matrix
	Impact on Students: - Evaluation of the impact of the decision on the quality of educational experience for students - Consideration of the movement of students and maintaining a cohort to the degree possible
	Impact on Staff: - Evaluation of the impact of the decision on the staff (number of staff impacted, time, travel, workload, etc)
	Core Values/Community Engagement Alignment: - Alignment with district's core values, vision, and mission statement - Alignment with surveys and Visioning work sharing parent, staff and community input
	Special Programs: - Identification of special programs like special education, IB, and DLI and the population served - Assessment of the impact of decision on these programs including cost, revenue, accessibility to the program, operational and facility investments and gaps in service
	Disruptive Nature of Change: - Evaluation of the possible disruption that the change may cause to stakeholders (students, staff, parents, etc) - Consideration of outside factors and impact of disruption including impact on current programs
	Potential Value of the Facility or Property: - Evaluation of value of the property, future opportunity of asset - Consideration for revenue or future use (revenue, renovation, expansion)
	Future Planning: - Alignment with long-term strategic goals and vision for the district - Sustainability of proposed initiative over time - Adaptability to changing educational landscape and district needs

	Impact Decision Matrix
	Solution Focused: - Consideration of the desired outcomes and objectives - Practicality and feasibility of proposed solutions - Consideration of the intended or unintended consequences of proposed solutions - Consideration of how one decision could or would impact other areas of the district and the subsequent solutions/plans, if needed
	Retention and Recruitment of Families: - Consideration if the decision created a potential void causing loss of enrollment or staff - Anticipated impact on retention of families within CISD - Consideration of potential for creating a void in services or programs - Consideration of maintaining competitive programs and choice offerings - Mitigation strategies to address concerns and retain families within the district
	Operational Implications - Transportation or hazardous route implications related to a change - Traffic patterns - drop off and pick up implications - Cost implications for any recommended change - Personnel implications and related costs for any change - Proximity to emergency response teams/response time to a certain location based on recommended changes