

School APFO:

The criteria that defines adequacy For example:

- -Is the threshold for moratorium set at the appropriate level?

Methodology of the school test For example:

-Is the threshold for requirement of a school facility payment set at the appropriate level?

-Is program capacity the appropriate measure of existing capacity? -Should the queue of project approvals by cluster area be followed on an ongoing basis? -Should the test for adequacy be conducted by school level?

			Cluster Outcomes by Level		
School Test Level	Description	Elementary Inadequate	Middle Inadequate	Hig	
Clusters over 105% utilization School facility payment required in inadequate clusters to proceed.	5-year test Effective July 1, 2015 Test year 2020-21	Clarksburg (113.8%) Gaithersburg (109.4%) Northwood (105.5%) Quince Orchard (115.3%)	Blair (117.1%) Damascus (109.3%) Gaithersburg (106.0%) Kennedy (115.6%) Northwood (110.5%) Rockville (109.6%) Wheaton (114.2%) Whitman (111.9%)	B Chu Clark Ein Walter Ken Ken Ken Kort Nort Nort Nort Nort Nort Nort Whe Whe	
Clusters over 120% utilization **	5-year test				
Moratorium requred in clusters that are inadequate.	Effective July 1, 2015 Test year 2020-21				
Capacities in clusters include the following placeholder capital projects:					

Ten elementary school classrooms in the Gaithersburg Cluster. Six middle school classrooms in the Northwood Cluster. Four middle school classrooms in the Wheaton Cluster. Six high school classrooms in the Einstein Cluster. Eight high school classrooms in the Walter Johnson Clustser. Ten high school classrooms in the Northwood Cluster.

In addition to placeholder capacity projects, the Clarksburg Cluster high school capacity includes eight classrooms associated with the Seneca Valley HS revitalization/expansion that will be utilized through boundary changes between Clarksburg and Seneca Valley high schools in the future.

Rules for Adequacy

Subdivision Staging Policy Results of School Test for FY 2016

Reflects County Council Adopted FY 2016 Capital Budget and Amendments to the FY 2015-2020 Capital Improvements Program (CIP) Effective July 1, 2015, Updated August 25, 2015



igh Inadequate

Blair (110.0%) hurchill (106.4%) rksburg (113.8%) instein (113.7%) r Johnson (111.3%) ennedy (107.7%) Montgomery (110.8%) rthwest (113.3%) rthwood (112.6%) nt Branch (106.1% ce Orchard (108.7%) heaton (108.8%) hitman (114.0%)

- Support for the idea of individual school service area testing instead of (or in addition to) cluster level testing. - Especially a problem at the elementary level, where cluster level testing can mask problems that exist at individual schools

 - Geography of each individual school

- Cluster level test isn't very effective because students don't usually move around within each cluster.
- School facility payments for <u>school</u> level overcrowding in addition to the school cluster test.
- School facility payment thresholds will need to be adjusted if school facility test boundaries change.
- Moratorium should stay in place until Board or Education approves and the County Council appropriates CIP funds.
- Create moratorium if a school hits a maximum enrollment (set a maximum for each individual school) unless funding is in place to handle the students above the maximum threshold elsewhere.
- Consider setting a maximum school enrollment for each level and using this as an alternative trigger for moratoria, rather than the percentage of capacity.
- Yield rate by area or (if data exists) by cluster (not countywide or regionally, southwest/north/east).

Rules for Adequacy Public Comments

