Planning for Growth:

- Balancing Shafer and Stanley Enrollment for Fall 2014
- Enrollment, Capacity, and Programs Review Process

*Presented by*
Operations Department

January 13, 2014
ABM Timeline

Oct. 28, 2013: Demographic update ✓

Nov. 2013:
• 18\textsuperscript{th}: Preliminary recommendation at work study ✓
• 19\textsuperscript{th}–Dec. 2\textsuperscript{nd}: ABM public feedback and survey ✓

Dec. 2013:
• 9\textsuperscript{th}: ABM recommendation taken to Board for discussion/action ✓
• 10\textsuperscript{th}–24\textsuperscript{th}: Shafer/Stanley balancing recommendation public feedback and survey ✓

Jan. 13, 2014: Shafer/Stanley balancing recommendation taken to Board for approval ✓
Possibilities for Relief at Stanley

• **Option A** – Do nothing at this time. Assess Shafer and Stanley as part of a comprehensive enrollment, capacity, and programs assessment

• **Option B** – Move 74D and 74M from Stanley to Shafer

• **Option C** – Move 74A to Shafer
Possibilities for Relief at Stanley

• **Option D** – Preferred option: Move all of Westheimer Lakes North to Shafer, Move 74J & 74K to Stanley

• **Option E** – Split Westheimer Lakes North Version I

• **Option F** – Split Westheimer Lakes North Version II

• **Option G** – Split Westheimer Lakes North Version III

• **Option H** – Split Westheimer Lakes North Version IV
Stanley Option D - Move All of Westheimer Lakes North to Shafer, Send 74J & 74K to Stanley
Stanley/Shafer Option D: Move All of Westheimer Lakes North to Shafer, Move 74J & 74K to Stanley

- Enrollment figures are fairly well balanced between the two
- Does not split out Westheimer Lakes North into two pieces
- Puts LUZs that are close to Stanley in Stanley’s zone
- All neighborhoods kept intact
- Eliminates need for walkers to cross Fry
- Does move the NE portion of Westheimer Lakes North that is close enough to walk to Stanley over to Shafer
- Results in moving three LUZs areas to balance the enrollments
- Might be a good long-term solution to Stanley and Shafer
Stanley/Shafer Option E: Split Westheimer Lakes North Version 1

- Enrollments are fairly well balanced
- Leaves a portion of the Westheimer Lakes North “walkers” at Stanley, still need to cross Fry
- Splits Westheimer Lakes North into two pieces, along fencelines in the northeastern portion of the LUZ
- Moves less students than option D
PASA Recommendations

• Moving LUZ 74A and also LUZ 74J & 74K, using option D to provide immediate balance between Shafer and Stanley.
• Conduct a comprehensive enrollment, capacity, and programs assessment within the District.
Communications

December 10, 2013

• Survey on recommended ABM for providing an enrollment balance between Stanley and Shafer (public feedback also available through email, phone and in person via the PPAC)

• News release regarding December 9 Board discussion about balancing enrollment between Stanley and Shafer elementary schools

• Website updated to reflect additional ABM

• eNews to Stanley and Shafer elementary parents informing them about recommended ABM
Communications (cont.)

December 11, 2013
• eNews to Westheimer Lakes North parents confirming transportation eligibility for students residing in LUZ 74A should these students transition from Stanley to Shafer

December 12, 2013
• Reminder eNews sent to Stanley and Shafer parents requesting their feedback

December 17, 2013
• News release regarding December 16 Board approval of the ABM recommendation for elementary schools #36 and #37
Communications (cont.)

FUTURE COMMUNICATIONS

January 14, 2014

• News release on January 13 Board decision regarding the recommended ABM

• The ABM webpage will be updated to reflect the approved ABM

• eNews and backpack letter home to Stanley and Shafer elementary school parents notifying them of the approved ABM

• eNews to staff, community members, and realtors notifying them of ABM impacting Stanley and Shafer elementary schools
ABM Survey Outcomes

2,798  Potential Respondents
662  Total Survey Participants
369  Respondents from Stanley Elementary
249  Respondents from Shafer Elementary
44  Respondents that did not provide school name*

* Respondent did not provide school name, but may have provided LUZ.
# ABM Survey Outcomes

## Do You Support the Recommended ABM?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents’ LUZs</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74A- Westheimer Lakes North</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74J- Oak Forest</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74C- Rosewood; Sedona</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUZ not provided</strong>*</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74K- Oak Forest</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74D- Spring Lake</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74I- Rollingwood</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74P- Pine Hills</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74M-The Reserve at Spring Lake; Lakeside....</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74G- Pine Forest</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74N- Avalon at Cinco Ranch</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74L- Pine Forest</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74O- Oak Bluff, Rollingwood</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>662</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Respondent may have provided school name, but not LUZ.
ABM Survey Outcomes

If no, why do you not support the recommendation*?

- Concerned that future boundary changes will cause us to move again (182 responses) - 22.7%
- Proximity to the school (124) - 16.1%
- Doesn't stabilize enrollment at the schools for a long enough period of time (129) - 15.4%
- Transportation is an issue (90) - 11.5%
- Concerned about my child adjusting to new school (186) - 11.2%
- Other (please specify) (92) - 23.2%

* Respondents were allowed to select more than one reason. A total of 803 selections were made.
# ABM Survey Outcomes

555 Survey Comments  
12 Emails  
36 Phone calls received by the PPAC  
(603 Total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Themes</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am supportive of the recommendation</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep Westheimer Lakes North at Stanley, Oak Forest at Shafer, and move Spring Lake to Wilson Elementary</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep Oak Forest (74J and K) at Shafer, move 74M and 74D to Shafer, and 74G to Stanley</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not move students closest to Shafer</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandfather 4th/5th graders at Shafer</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move newer neighborhoods to new schools</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split Westheimer Lakes North Version I (<a href="#">Option E</a> from first ABM presented on elementary schools #36 and #37)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other comments (i.e. questions, informational comments)</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>603</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PASA Recommendations

- Moving LUZ 74A and also LUZ 74J & 74K, using option D to provide immediate balance between Shafer and Stanley.
- Conduct a comprehensive enrollment, capacity, and programs assessment within the District.
Three Scenarios of Growth

High Growth
2018: 82,018
2023: 98,657

Moderate Growth
2018: 80,710
2023: 94,886

Low Growth
2018: 78,364
2023: 89,269
Projected New Housing Occupancies
October 2013 to October 2018
Projected New Housing Occupancies
October 2018 to October 2023
Projected New Housing Occupancies
October 2013 to October 2023
Projected New Housing Occupancies 2013 – 2023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Ending in October:</th>
<th>Single Family</th>
<th>Multi-Family</th>
<th>Total New Housing Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2,825</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>4,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2,714</td>
<td>1,711</td>
<td>4,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2,533</td>
<td>1,623</td>
<td>4,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2,436</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>3,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2,576</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>3,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2,740</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td>4,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2,849</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>3,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2,704</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>3,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2,812</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>3,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>3,080</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>3,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2018</td>
<td>13,084</td>
<td>7,075</td>
<td>20,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2023</td>
<td>14,185</td>
<td>4,578</td>
<td>18,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2023</td>
<td>27,269</td>
<td>11,653</td>
<td>38,922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Housing Units in Katy ISD
Current and Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single-Family</th>
<th></th>
<th>Multi-Family</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current (2012)</td>
<td>77,583</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>16,554</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Growth</td>
<td>2,355</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2012-2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Growth</td>
<td>27,269</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>11,653</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2013-2023)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Total</td>
<td>107,207</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>28,634</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2023)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SY 2015-16 ABM Possible Timeline

DRAFT WORKING PAPER

2014

• Jan: Capacity and program study
• Feb/March: Small group meeting with principals
• March/Apr: Board presentation on capacity study
• May: Scope discussion with Board
  Staff and PASA planning commences on ABM
  Modify LUZ sizes to allow easier ABM
• July/Aug: PASA Board workshops
• Aug/Sep: PASA public workshops
• Oct: Demographic update
• Nov: Initial recommendation to Board
  Public feedback
• Dec: Board discussion/action
Possible Timeline for LRFP & Potential 2015 November Bond

- **February – June 2014**
  - Issue LRFP Survey to campuses, departments, programs
  - M&O physical plant assessment of all facilities
  - Commence design for next generation of schools

- **June – September 2014**
  - Review surveys, visit facilities and validate requests

- **September – November 2014**
  - Merge survey data with physical plant assessments & prioritize LRFP items
  - Pricing of LRFP items to commence
  - Input for buses, portables and technology

- **October 2014**
  - Annual demographic update
  - Confirmation of new school/school addition requirements
  - Property acquisition requirements

- **December 2014**
  - Board discussion and direction related to a November 2015 bond referendum

- **January – July 2015**
  - Bond planning with School Facilities Referendum Planning Task Force

- **August 2015**
  - Board calls for bond election

- **November 2015**
  - Bond Election
New School Projected Openings

- Aug 2014: ES #36 and #37
- Aug 2017: 2 Elementary, 2 Junior High
- Aug 2018: 1 Elementary, 1 High School
- Aug 2019: 3 Elementary
- Aug 2020: 1 Junior High
- Aug 2021: 1 Elementary, 1 Junior High, 1 High School
New School Projected Openings

- Aug 2014: ES #36 and #37
- Aug 2017: 2 Elementary, 2 Junior High
- Aug 2018: 1 Elementary, 1 High School
- Aug 2019: 3 Elementary
- Aug 2020: 1 Junior High
- Aug 2021: 1 Elementary, 1 Junior High, 1 High School

PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS:
CONSTRUCTION DEPENDENT ON BOND FUNDING.

NEXT BOND IN NOVEMBER 2015.