



REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE

K–3 Class-Size Reduction Construction Grant Program

2016

Authorizing legislation: RCW 28A.525.058

(<http://app.leg.wa.gov/rcw/default.aspx?cite=28A.525.058>)

Ken Kanikeberg
Chief of Staff

Prepared by:

- **Lorrell Noahr**, Interim Director School Facilities and Organization
Lorrell.Noahr@k12.wa.us | 360-725-6177
- **Randy Newman**, Business Manager
Randy.Newman@k12.wa.us | 360-725-6267
- **Tom Carver**, Program Administrator
Tom.Carver@k12.wa.us | 360-725-6269



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	1
Introduction	2
K–3 Class Size Reduction Construction Grant Pilot Program (2ESSB 6080 Section 201[2])	4
Grant Funding, Prioritization, and Award Details.....	6
Recommendations for Development of K–3 Class Size Reduction Construction Grant Program..	7

Appendices

Appendix A: Prioritization	12
Appendix B: Final Awards Summary	17
Appendix C: Remaining K-3 Class Size Reduction Classrooms to be Funded	18
Appendix D: Examples of Modular and Portable Classroom Construction Classifications	20



Executive Summary

Recently, the Washington State Legislature enacted two pieces of legislation that redefined the program of basic education. In 2009, ESHB 2261 expanded the definition of basic education to include all-day kindergarten (ADK) as an entitlement. The following year, SHB 2776 created a phased-in timeline for ADK and a reduction of class size from 25.23 to 17 students per teacher by the 2017–18 school year.

The Legislature has made a clear commitment to enhancing the program of basic education for our state’s youngest learners. However, these enhancements have created challenges for districts that do not have additional classroom space to dedicate for this effort. Prior to the change to ADK, the state’s basic education funding formulas only provided state funding for a half-day program. A school district could provide two sessions of half-day kindergarten in one classroom. Allowing students to attend a full day requires a dedicated classroom for each session. Reducing class size also requires more classrooms.

The funding formulas for the school construction assistance program (SCAP), the state’s primary K–12 capital grant program, have not increased to address the educational space needs of K–3 class size reduction. Additionally, school districts must obtain local matching funds by passing a capital levy or debt–service levy (bond approval). Debt–service levies require voters in a school district to approve the measure with a super–majority of 60 percent of the vote.

To address the lack of needed classrooms, the Legislature passed two bills in 2015. The 2015–17 capital budget (2EHB 1115) provides \$200 million for new K–3 Class Size Reduction Grants. In conjunction, 2ESSB 6080 establishes rules for a pilot program to offer the grants to districts. The 2016 supplemental capital budget (SHB 2380) provides an additional \$34.5 million to help fund additional classrooms.

The following report summarizes the work done to date on the pilot program.

Introduction

In 2009, the Legislature passed ESHB 2261, which redefined the program of basic education to allow state funding for all-day kindergarten (ADK). In 2010, the Legislature passed SHB 2776, which provided a phased-in schedule to reduce K-3 class sizes to a 17-to-1 student-to-teacher ratio by the 2017-18 school year. The passage of these educational reforms challenged school districts statewide to meet the newly created need for additional facility space.

In the 2015-17 biennium, the omnibus appropriation act provided funding for school districts to offer ADK for approximately 72 percent of kindergarten students for the 2015-16 school year and for all kindergarten students in 2016-17. This act also provided funding for additional certificated staffing to reduce K-3 class sizes to make progress towards the ratios identified in SHB 2776.

The funding for the increased instructional hours for ADK and reduction in class sizes will require school districts to hire additional teachers. For many years—well before the passage of ESHB 2261 and SHB 2776—school districts have struggled to provide the facilities necessary for learning, at all grade levels, through locally funded efforts due to the need to house the additional staff and smaller class sizes. The educational reforms directed by the Legislature to provide additional classrooms for ADK and to reduce K-3 class sizes have compounded the need. Local school districts must raise local funds for the construction or purchase of new space. The two most common funding sources for this effort are capital levies and debt-service levies, also known as capital bond elections. Capital levies can be authorized with a simple majority (one voter more than 50 percent) approval of voters. Capital bonds require a supermajority (one vote more than 60 person) approval of voters, which is more difficult to achieve.

In addition to local funding, the state has provided funding assistance to school districts to construct and modernize school facilities through the School Construction Assistance Program (SCAP). The SCAP funding formula drivers have not kept up with the space needs of districts and the cost of construction and modernization of schools. The current SCAP student space allocations for K-6 are at the same levels that were funded in 1979 (90 square feet per student), and the current construction cost allocation (\$213.23 per square foot) continues to be funded far below actual construction costs currently averaging around \$280 per square foot, depending on the type of project and type of construction. The average amount of square feet being constructed for a new elementary school facility is around 70,000 square feet.

OSPI has requested increased funding drivers for SCAP for every biennium since the mid-1990s, after timber revenues declined and other funding sources were dedicated. The construction cost allocation has received an inflationary-level increase with each biennial capital budget and each subsequent fiscal year. However, the student space allocation has remained unchanged.

Legislative funding was provided in 2015 and 2016 to provide a potential solution to these combined challenges. The 2015–17 capital budget (2EHB 1115, Section 5028) appropriated \$200 million to create a new K–3 Class Size Reduction Grant program (K–3 CSR). 2ESSB 6080 calls for the commencement of a pilot capital funding program that “intends to provide additional state financial assistance to help school districts in funding public school facilities necessary to support state–funded all–day kindergarten and class size reduction in kindergarten through third grade.” In doing so, the Legislature recognizes that some school districts may benefit from additional financial assistance to provide school facilities beyond that provided through SCAP. Further, the 2016 supplemental capital budget (ESHB 2380, section 5006) provided another \$34.5 million to the funding.

The new K–3 CSR grant program intends to create new school capacity to accommodate enrollment growth and to modernize and replace existing schools, while respecting local decisions and control by locally elected school boards. The funding formula provided by this program is substantially similar to the SCAP, but uses enhanced funding drivers such as the cost per square foot, the funding assistance percentage, and the square feet per student.

New Policy Directions

In addition to creating a new pilot program, 2ESSB 6080 introduces the following new policy directions related to school district facilities:

- Classroom use: Spaces are categorized for SCAP as either direct–instructional, indirect–instruction, or support space for purposes of project prioritization (WAC 392-343-505), but otherwise this is not a factor in funding assistance. For 2ESSB 6080, classrooms with various types as well as their regular uses (art, music, labs, special education, highly capable, community use, etc.) are required to be reported by districts, collected by OSPI, and verified by Washington State University’s Extension Energy Program (WSU EP).
- Classroom need: For 2ESSB 6080, various factors are used in calculating classroom need:
 - Using current enrollments, not projected enrollments as required by SCAP.
 - Alternative Learning Experience (ALE) enrollments are adjusted for students not using classrooms on a regular basis for a reasonable duration, while SCAP adjusts out the ALE students who do not reside in–district.
 - How far along a school district is in the process of requesting or receiving a SCAP grant; the project status (D6 is the threshold) will be considered for classroom counting.
- Two–tiered funding level: A minimum need of twelve K–3 classrooms must be determined for 2ESSB 6080 to assume a district is need of a new school. Less than twelve classrooms, the district is assumed to construct modular buildings. Portable

buildings are not included as an option for grant funds. SCAP does not fund at different levels which are dependent on extent of district need.

- Local share of costs: The program uses a SCAP funding assistance percentage prescribed in RCW 28A.525.166, enhanced by adding twenty percent of students eligible and enrolled in the free and reduced school meal program (FRPM), to determine the state assistance level.
- Prioritization: Funding priority is given to districts that show greatest need based on four criteria outlined in 2ESSB 6080, some of which are related to classroom need.

SCAP on the other hand, utilizes the type of spaces, local priority determination, joint funding, student scheduling, growth factors, and building condition assessment scores to prioritize projects.

- Funding is potentially granted before a school is designed, a site is secured for development, or permits are approved. SCAP does not secure funding until after bids have been opened and a recommendation to award contract is made by the district's board of directors.
- Portable or modular spaces: OSPI takes into account the instructional facility inventory when determining if a district has SCAP eligibility for additional space. Portable and some modular spaces are not included on the district's instructional facility inventory and are not counted when determining eligible space. 2ESSB 6080 counts the portable and modular classroom spaces as instructional inventory for the calculation of the K-3 CSR grants, but does not provide funding for new portable buildings.

K-3 CLASS SIZE REDUCTION CONSTRUCTION GRANT PILOT PROGRAM (2ESSB 6080 SECTION 201[2])

The 2015-17 capital budget (2EHB 1115, Section 5028) appropriated \$200 million for K-3 Class Size Reduction Grants, and the 2016 supplemental capital budget (SHB 2380, Section 5006) appropriated an additional \$34.5 million. Of the total combined appropriation, \$10 million was provided solely for Seattle Public Schools and as much as \$750,000 for OSPI administration of the program.

Calculation Methods Required

Specific steps for district qualification are summarized as follows:

Step 1: Districts were required to provide a count of "necessary added" classrooms, which were then verified by on-site visits from WSU EP. A series of calculations was charted resulting in "needed classrooms" minus "available classrooms" as defined in the bill. The resulting number was defined by the pilot program guidance as "necessary added," or simply known as the district's need for K-3 classrooms.

Step 2: Based on the “necessary added” classrooms for each district, a determination was made to justify constructing a new school, modernizing a previously closed school, or simply adding classrooms to an existing active school. A number of 12 or more presumed a new school is required, which would qualify the district for a higher level of funding. School districts with a need of fewer than 12 classrooms were presumed to construct modular classrooms to address their classroom needs.

Step 3: OSPI calculated the grant for each “necessary added” classroom based on a district’s 2015 funding assistance percentage, plus 20 percent of a district’s FRPM percentage, multiplied by the per-classroom base dollar amounts authorized in 2ESSB 6080 (all numbers were later escalated by current inflation per the bill).

- \$615,083 for each permanent K–3 classroom determined to be needed, if a district’s need is 12 classrooms or more (inflated to \$654,662).
- \$210,000 for each modular K–3 classroom determined to be needed, or permanent K–3 classroom if a district’s need is less than 12 classrooms (inflated to \$223,513).

Step 4: Grants were prioritized according to four criteria in the following order of importance:

1. Applicants with high “necessary added” classrooms to available classrooms ratio in K–3.
2. Applicants with high student–to–teacher ratio in K–3.
3. Applicants with high percentage of students eligible and enrolled in FRPM.
4. Applicants that had not raised capital funds through bond or levy elections in the prior ten years.

Step 5: School districts were required to provide the following assurances to OSPI:

- Local matching funds were secured and authorized by July 1, 2016;
- Available sites had been secured; and
- Progress towards reducing class sizes and providing ADK would be achieved for the 2017–18 school year, as intended by the basic education funding formulas.

Section 201(3) of 2ESSB 6080 requires OSPI to report on the status of the K–3 CSR grant program. The application process requires school districts to certify their existing classroom counts and complete a formal application to OSPI. The deadline for completion of classroom counts and the application was December 1, 2015. As of that date, 93 districts completed a certification of classroom counts. Ninety of those districts also completed the required grant application and was considered in the prioritization effort.

GRANT FUNDING, PRIORITIZATION, AND AWARD DETAILS

Determination of Grant Funding Per Classroom

2ESSB 6080 stipulated specific amounts per classroom depending on total count of classrooms needed. Section 201(1)(c)(iii) required an inflationary increase for the fiscal year of the grant award by the same percentage increase as SCAP's construction cost allocation, beginning with fiscal year 2014.

Prioritization

Appendix A provides a list of the 90 districts that completed an application, arranged from highest prioritization score to lowest, with the twenty top-scoring districts that received funding separated on top.

The first three priority elements each have a quantifiable value for each district, creating a ranking system, with the top district receiving 100 points. An equation was developed to give the top district 100 points.

Priority points, weighted by the hierarchy of the four priority categories, were calculated by OSPI. The first priority's points are worth 50% of the total score, so the top district's 100 points becomes 50. The second priority's points are worth 25% of the total score. The third priority's points are worth 15%. The fourth priority's point are worth 10%.

The first priority element looked at the ratio of "necessary added" classrooms to available classrooms in K-3, as determined by WSU EP's validations. Most districts had a positive number for the ratio, reflecting a need for more classrooms. Districts that had a negative number were given zero points and did not move on to the next phase. The top district received 100 points. Points were then multiplied by 50%.

The second priority element looked at student-to-teacher ratio in K-3, as provided by OSPI School Apportionment. Most districts were above 17, reflecting a need for more classrooms. Districts that were at 17 or below were given zero points and did not move on to the next phase. The top district received 100 points. Points were then multiplied by 25%.

The third priority element looked at an indication of poverty, the percentage of students eligible and enrolled in FRPM, as determined by the OSPI Child Nutrition Services. School districts were ranked by their participation rate. The top district received 100 points. Points were then multiplied by 15%.

The fourth priority element awarded 10 points to school districts that had not raised capital funds through levies or bonds in the prior ten-year period. Those that have passed a bond or capital levy received zero points. 2ESSB 6080 did not provide consideration for districts that "tried and failed" versus districts that did not (or could not) try at all.

Awarding of Grant Funds

The top-scoring districts were awarded a grant based on the WSU EP-validated need, or the district's request, whichever was lower. This determined twenty top-scoring districts plus Seattle's block grant before exhausting the available funding of \$234.5 million.

Appendix B lists the awarded districts. Appendix C lists the remaining classrooms to be funded.

Although the awarded districts were fairly representative for urban vs. rural, large vs. small, and east vs. west, high-growth districts, such as Kennewick School District, a large, fast-growing, and high-need district, received over one-fifth of the entire appropriation. The six top-scoring districts received nearly three-quarters of the appropriation. Seattle Public School's relatively low enhanced funding assistance percentage would have equated funding of 59 classrooms, but due to the nature of the block grant, the district chose to use funding to create 20 classrooms, 7 of which will be of modular construction.

Yakima School District chose to accept funding for only one classroom due to existing financial constraints, even though that district passed a bond in 2009 for an ambitious capital program. Initially they applied for 4 classrooms, but would have qualified for 61. Federal Way was the beneficiary of these declined funds, as they were not fully funded for their 60 qualifying classrooms. Federal Way received enough funding for nearly 45 classrooms.

Formalizing Grant Awards

The state funds the K-3 CSR grant with general obligation bonds from the State Building Construction Account. This requires OSPI to communicate to OFM and the Office of the State Treasurer the expected cash flow of these projects, so bonds can be sold. The twenty-one awarded districts were asked to provide a reimbursement request schedule and also a list of potential projects. This list of potential projects was necessary for OSPI to continue administering SCAP properly, as any new or replacement square footage built would affect a district's future SCAP funding eligibility.

OSPI is requiring districts to submit documentation at the end of each project that certify not only the number of K-3 classrooms created, but also the amount of affected square footage, associated floor plans, and compliance with the Asset Preservation Program, among other requests to administer SCAP and to ensure best construction practices.

All state public works requirement are being followed, with which districts must be compliant.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF K-3 CLASS SIZE REDUCTION CONSTRUCTION GRANT PROGRAM

OSPI has collected questions and comments from school districts and stakeholders. As stated in 2ESSB 6080, the goals are to ensure that the grant program will meet program objectives for all school districts needing additional classrooms, and to identify changes to SCAP to improve coordination between the two grant programs.

Stakeholders

In addition to consulting with the initial interested parties from fall 2015, OSPI assembled a more formal group of stakeholders to gather direct input for OFM and legislative staff. The group included:

- School districts that applied for and were awarded a grant;
- School districts that applied for, but were not awarded a grant;
- School districts that chose not to apply; and
- WSU EP.

Improved Method for Calculating Needed Classrooms

Portable age, condition, and use should be considered. This is by far the largest concern districts have expressed. School districts should be able to provide cost data from an estimator for needed improvements for portable buildings. In 1992 seismic codes were updated, changing portable manufacturing requirements. Portables manufactured prior to this year should be excluded. Additionally, portables used as storage or staff offices due to condition should not be counted.

Allow for the full inclusion of basic education spaces. 2ESSB 6080 requires reprogramming of art, music, lab, some special education, some highly capable, and some pre-K spaces. Unlike secondary schools, elementary school spaces are typically used full-time for one purpose. For example, when students leave their classroom for P.E., they return to the same room. A classroom used for second grade will not be shared half a day with art class or special education.

Likewise, a gymnasium will generally have a series of P.E. classes all day, every day. Adding more classrooms for class size reduction increases the burden on gymnasium use, likely resulting in a need for a second gymnasium.

Art, music, labs, and spaces for highly capable, learning assistance, and transitional bilingual programs are part of basic education, and should not be reprogrammed.

Create better definitions for classrooms and the categories of space.

Allow for some school districts to determine need by school rather than district-wide. A district-wide analysis assumes attendance boundaries can be adjusted to even out enrollment at each elementary school. Some school districts are unable to adjust their boundaries for reasons beyond a district's control. For example, Clover Park School District serves students of Joint Base Lewis-McChord. They are not able to send non-military students to the base to even out attendance. This is a barrier for this school district when calculating classroom needs on a district-wide basis.

Another example is Seattle Public Schools, which is the largest school district in the state. The large size and geography of the district makes it difficult for the district to equalize

enrollment from the fast-growing areas to the slower-growing schools. OSPI requests the authority to provide a waiver of the district-level calculation in these cases and to instead calculate the eligibility by subareas or schools.

Continue partnership with WSU EP to conduct future classroom count validations. WSU EP has been a good partner for this work, working both efficiently and expeditiously. They were able to apply an unbiased consistent method statewide. However, their funding was stretched thin, considering their original appropriation for this work also included several other tasks related to Study & Survey work and data entry. Creating more objective criteria for classroom use and acceptable condition of facilities would allow school districts, WSU EP, and OSPI the ability to better communicate expected classroom counts.

Improved Funding Formula for Calculating Grant Awards

Maintain per-classroom funding. The original base amount of funding per permanent classroom, \$615,083 (adjusted for inflation to \$654,662) and per modular classroom \$210,000 (adjusted for inflation to \$223,513) were provided by 2ESSB 6080. Stakeholders confirmed the funding amounts were adequate.

Eliminate two-tiered funding levels in favor of a graduated system. 2ESSB 6080 assumes a need of 12 or more classrooms will require a new elementary school for the district. Stakeholders expressed concern about the funding cliff that occurred between 11 and 12 needed classrooms. OSPI is recommending a sliding scale to build permanent classrooms and still obtain grant funding.

An alternative recommendation of the stakeholder group is to allow the school district to determine if the classrooms will be added using modular or permanent construction. The school district would receive the funding level for the construction type, not the number of classrooms. OSPI will inspect the projects to ensure the construction method funded was used.

Address the immediate need for K-3 classrooms by allowing OSPI to grant projects that are ready to begin. Districts that have the financial, staffing, and other necessary resources to tackle several large projects upon grant award, are not likely to start construction on their entire need within the biennium. It is recommended to allow for the consideration of the timely use of grant funds. This would also allow for more projects to be spread out over more districts. OSPI would ensure all districts receive their full entitlement.

Provide a separate allocation to comply with the Art in Public Places program. RCW 28A.335.210 mandates one-half of one percent of capital appropriation of original construction be allocated to works of art. SCAP projects receive this allocation separately and on top of calculated state assistance. For current K-3 CSR grantees, this allocation must be carved out of their grant, but prior to knowing how much original construction will ultimately occur. Having the allocation provided separately greatly simplifies the process and assures districts their grants aren't reduced by one-half of one percent.

Recommended Process for Prioritizing Grant Applications

Eliminate the priority element of having or not having raised capital funds through bond or levy in the previous ten years. Districts have stated a disparity between the requirement of having local funds to qualify for the K-3 CSR grant, while being penalized in K-3 CSR grant prioritization for having passed a bond or levy for those funds.

OSPI ran a test scenario without this priority element with current data. The result drew in two new districts for funding: Washougal and Willapa Valley, and 15 additional classrooms for Federal Way. However, three districts would have prioritized lower and been denied any funding: Mount Vernon, Okanogan, and West Valley-Spokane. While this would have hurt some districts and benefitted others, the overall result was not significant.

Recommended Statutory and Rule Changes for Coordination with SCAP

Stakeholders provided competing recommendations for statutory and rule changes for coordination between the K-3 CSR grant program and the SCAP. Current SCAP rules for instructional inventory include state-funded instructional spaces when calculating future program eligibility. New spaces are added to the inventory at board acceptance of a project. The K-3 CSR pilot program funds a higher space allocation than SCAP creating “overhoused” space even when additional space is needed. Because the SCAP and K-3 CSR pilot program space allocations are not aligned, some of the stakeholders recommended keeping the newly funded space outside of the SCAP instructional inventory. However, other members of the group recommended including the space so that the space could be eligible for modernization in thirty years through the SCAP.

Link inclusion of K-3 CSR classroom inventory with future funded SCAP enhancements. OSPI recommends a middle ground between the two recommendations of the stakeholder group. The newly funded space should be added to the SCAP instructional inventory when square footage allocations in the SCAP funding formula meet or exceed the K-3 CSR pilot program’s square foot allocations. The SCAP should provide modernization funds to these spaces thirty years after board acceptance of the project regardless of when the space was added to the instructional inventory. (This second component assumes the SCAP space allocations will eventually be increased to meet or exceed the current K-3 CSR pilot program allocation.)

Recommended Content and Method for Reporting Annually

Use OFM’s major project status report form. This form takes a snapshot of a project’s financial and construction status. Requiring this report every six months would be consistent with other major capital projects OSPI administers that receive at least a \$5 million appropriation.

Recommended Statutory and Rule changes for Building Projects with Expected Life <30 Years

Current SCAP rules do not count buildings with less than a thirty-year life expectancy in the instructional inventory when calculating eligibility. Buildings meeting this definition are portable classrooms that are intended to be sited only for the short-term. OSPI assumes

modular buildings built with permanent foundations and underground utilities are not temporary buildings and have a life expectancy of thirty years or more. Therefore, this recommendation would only encompass pre-fabricated buildings that are intended to be temporary. These structures typically have overhead utilities and may or may not be situated on permanent foundations due to local code requirements. Modular classrooms funded with the K-3 CSR pilot program with underground utilities and permanent foundations will be included in the school districts permanent K-6 instructional inventory at the time of board acceptance. [Appendix D](#) provides photos and descriptions of both permanent modular classrooms and portable classrooms.

Stakeholders expressed security concerns that temporary portable buildings are typically spread out across a campus and cannot be locked down for security purposes quickly. Increasing the number of portables can make addressing student safety more difficult.

Fund Permanent Spaces Regardless of Construction Type. OSPI does not recommend state funding for future temporary spaces with a useful life of less than thirty years, but instead for spaces that are intended to be permanently situated. Modular buildings funded by the state should be required to have a certified service life expectancy of more than thirty years and be permanently sited with consideration for student safety.



APPENDICES

Appendix A: Prioritization

2ESSB 6080 directs the prioritization to reflect four elements in order of importance. Each of the first three priority elements had a maximum of 100 points, which was assigned to the district with the highest value. A weighted averaging process was then applied. The first priority element’s points were multiplied by 50%, the second by 25%, the third by 15%. In the fourth priority element, districts either scored 10 points or none. The resulting total scores were used in overall prioritization.

School Districts	Priority 1				Priority 2				Priority 3				Priority 4		Total
	Calculated Necessary Added to Available Classrooms Ratio	Rank	Proportional Points	Points x50%	Student to Teacher Ratio	Rank	Proportional Points	Points x25%	FRLP	Rank	Proportional Points	Points x15%	Raised Capital Funds in 10 Years	Points 10%	
LAKE STEVENS	0.326940	3	96.39	48.19	25.01	5	82.95	20.74	29.70%	80	33.26	4.99	No	10	83.92
WAPATO	0.337588	2	99.53	49.76	21.20	63	70.32	17.58	84.70%	4	94.85	14.23	Yes	0	81.57
PULLMAN	0.339197	1	100.00	50.00	30.15	1	100.00	25.00	32.40%	71	36.28	5.44	Yes	0	80.44
WHITE RIVER	0.275048	4	81.09	40.54	24.16	11	80.13	20.03	30.90%	77	34.60	5.19	No	10	75.77
KENNEWICK	0.263800	5	77.77	38.89	24.47	7	81.16	20.29	58.50%	24	65.51	9.83	Yes	0	69.00
PORT TOWNSEND	0.201927	7	59.53	29.77	22.92	23	76.02	19.00	49.90%	43	55.88	8.38	No	10	67.15
VANCOUVER	0.184162	8	54.29	27.15	21.55	53	71.48	17.87	52.00%	40	58.23	8.73	No	10	63.75
PIONEER	0.213517	6	62.95	31.47	21.65	51	71.81	17.95	70.10%	13	78.50	11.77	Yes	0	61.20
YAKIMA	0.179894	10	53.04	26.52	23.10	21	76.62	19.15	84.20%	6	94.29	14.14	Yes	0	59.82
MOUNT VERNON	0.108249	25	31.91	15.96	21.10	65	69.98	17.50	64.90%	19	72.68	10.90	No	10	54.35

School Districts	Priority 1				Priority 2				Priority 3				Priority 4		Total
	Calculated Necessary Added to Available Classrooms Ratio	Rank	Proportional Points	Points x50%	Student to Teacher Ratio	Rank	Proportional Points	Points x25%	FRLP	Rank	Proportional Points	Points x15%	Raised Capital Funds in 10 Years	Points 10%	
HIGHLINE	0.152956	15	45.09	22.55	23.69	16	78.57	19.64	69.60%	14	77.94	11.69	Yes	0	53.88
CHEHALIS	0.182390	9	53.77	26.89	22.13	37	73.40	18.35	49.40%	44	55.32	8.30	Yes	0	53.53
EASTMONT	0.165575	13	48.81	24.41	22.72	27	75.36	18.84	55.50%	29	62.15	9.32	Yes	0	52.57
OKANOGAN	0.078626	33	23.18	11.59	23.40	17	77.61	19.40	56.80%	27	63.61	9.54	No	10	50.53
CENTRAL VALLEY	0.157173	14	46.34	23.17	25.32	3	83.98	21.00	35.90%	68	40.20	6.03	Yes	0	50.19
RIDGEFIELD	0.170636	11	50.31	25.15	23.77	15	78.84	19.71	29.20%	82	32.70	4.90	Yes	0	49.77
WEST VALLEY (SPOKANE)	0.078290	34	23.08	11.54	22.18	35	73.57	18.39	53.80%	35	60.25	9.04	No	10	48.97
TOPPENISH	0.117216	22	34.56	17.28	20.87	69	69.22	17.31	81.40%	7	91.15	13.67	Yes	0	48.26
OTHELLO	0.089610	30	26.42	13.21	24.22	10	80.33	20.08	81.00%	8	90.71	13.61	Yes	0	46.90
FEDERAL WAY	0.127915	18	37.71	18.86	21.31	59	70.68	17.67	59.90%	23	67.08	10.06	Yes	0	46.59
Preliminary funding line: 468 classrooms for above classrooms + 20 Seattle classrooms = 488															
WILLAPA VALLEY	0.112299	24	33.11	16.55	26.25	2	87.06	21.77	49.10%	49	54.98	8.25	Yes	0	46.57
WASHOUGAL	0.135052	17	39.82	19.91	23.95	13	79.44	19.86	40.10%	62	44.90	6.74	Yes	0	46.50
TUKWILA	0.028438	48	8.38	4.19	22.23	34	73.73	18.43	77.80%	11	87.12	13.07	No	10	45.69
RENTON	0.118666	20	34.98	17.49	22.32	32	74.03	18.51	54.00%	34	60.47	9.07	Yes	0	45.07
UNIVERSITY PLACE	0.137144	16	40.43	20.22	21.54	54	71.44	17.86	39.00%	64	43.67	6.55	Yes	0	44.63
EVERGREEN (CLARK)	0.045729	43	13.48	6.74	22.09	39	73.27	18.32	49.10%	49	54.98	8.25	No	10	43.30
MUKILTEO	0.100318	28	29.58	14.79	24.16	11	80.13	20.03	50.50%	42	56.55	8.48	Yes	0	43.30
PASCO	0.084698	32	24.97	12.49	23.25	19	77.11	19.28	67.10%	18	75.14	11.27	Yes	0	43.03
QUINCY	(0.145408)	86	0.00	0.00	21.43	56	71.08	17.77	84.50%	5	94.62	14.19	No	10	41.96
WELLPINIT	(0.044118)	74	0.00	0.00	20.88	67	69.25	17.31	85.40%	3	95.63	14.34	No	10	41.66
PUYALLUP	0.113314	23	33.41	16.70	22.75	26	75.46	18.86	35.80%	69	40.09	6.01	Yes	0	41.58
SEQUIM	0.029663	47	8.75	4.37	22.89	25	75.92	18.98	46.20%	54	51.74	7.76	No	10	41.11

School Districts	Priority 1				Priority 2				Priority 3				Priority 4		Total
	Calculated Necessary Added to Available Classrooms Ratio	Rank	Proportional Points	Points x50%	Student to Teacher Ratio	Rank	Proportional Points	Points x25%	FRLP	Rank	Proportional Points	Points x15%	Raised Capital Funds in 10 Years	Points 10%	
BURLINGTON-EDISON	0.078110	35	23.03	11.51	24.29	9	80.56	20.14	52.00%	40	58.23	8.73	Yes	0	40.39
GRAND COULEE DAM	0.001508	58	0.44	0.22	21.21	62	70.35	17.59	69.10%	17	77.38	11.61	No	10	39.42
MEAD	0.089160	31	26.29	13.14	25.31	4	83.95	20.99	30.50%	78	34.15	5.12	Yes	0	39.25
NORTHSHORE	0.118463	21	34.92	17.46	22.48	29	74.56	18.64	16.00%	86	17.92	2.69	Yes	0	38.79
ADNA	0.123649	19	36.45	18.23	18.71	84	62.06	15.51	29.90%	79	33.48	5.02	Yes	0	38.76
ROYAL	0.061023	39	17.99	9.00	21.49	55	71.28	17.82	70.50%	12	78.95	11.84	Yes	0	38.66
SEATTLE	0.104877	27	30.92	15.46	21.27	61	70.55	17.64	32.30%	72	36.17	5.43	Yes	0	38.52
WENATCHEE	0.064105	37	18.90	9.45	22.18	35	73.57	18.39	62.10%	22	69.54	10.43	Yes	0	38.27
MOUNT BAKER	(0.107071)	82	0.00	0.00	21.71	50	72.01	18.00	57.10%	26	63.94	9.59	No	10	37.59
SULTAN	(0.132207)	85	0.00	0.00	22.69	28	75.26	18.81	49.20%	47	55.10	8.26	No	10	37.08
NORTH MASON	0.056731	41	16.73	8.36	23.39	18	77.58	19.39	55.00%	32	61.59	9.24	Yes	0	37.00
EPHRATA	0.004001	57	1.18	0.59	20.34	74	67.46	16.87	55.30%	30	61.93	9.29	No	10	36.74
OAK HARBOR	0.077741	36	22.92	11.46	22.05	40	73.13	18.28	41.20%	61	46.14	6.92	Yes	0	36.66
NASELLE-GRAYS RIVER VALLEY	(0.227124)	87	0.00	0.00	21.58	52	71.58	17.89	51.30%	41	57.45	8.62	No	10	36.51
EAST VALLEY (SPOKANE)	(0.108915)	83	0.00	0.00	21.02	66	69.72	17.43	53.50%	36	59.91	8.99	No	10	36.42
CLE ELUM-ROSLYN	(0.003305)	61	0.00	0.00	22.92	23	76.02	19.00	43.50%	59	48.71	7.31	No	10	36.31
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND	0.104906	26	30.93	15.46	23.22	20	77.01	19.25	7.70%	90	8.62	1.29	Yes	0	36.01
LAKE CHELAN	0.169182	12	49.88	24.94	12.45	90	0.00	0.00	64.30%	20	72.00	10.80	Yes	0	35.74
UNION GAP	(0.023965)	67	0.00	0.00	24.58	6	81.53	20.38	89.30%	1	100.00	15.00	Yes	0	35.38
SOUTH BEND	0.052326	42	15.43	7.71	19.17	82	63.58	15.90	69.50%	15	77.83	11.67	Yes	0	35.28
TENINO	(0.025490)	70	0.00	0.00	20.71	71	68.69	17.17	47.90%	50	53.64	8.05	No	10	35.22
RAYMOND	(0.102262)	81	0.00	0.00	18.63	85	61.79	15.45	55.10%	31	61.70	9.26	No	10	34.70
SAN JUAN ISLAND	0.009362	54	2.76	1.38	19.08	83	63.28	15.82	44.40%	57	49.72	7.46	No	10	34.66
LAKE WASHINGTON	0.094881	29	27.97	13.99	22.10	38	73.30	18.33	12.70%	87	14.22	2.13	Yes	0	34.44

School Districts	Priority 1				Priority 2				Priority 3				Priority 4		Total
	Calculated Necessary Added to Available Classrooms Ratio	Rank	Proportional Points	Points x50%	Student to Teacher Ratio	Rank	Proportional Points	Points x25%	FRLP	Rank	Proportional Points	Points x15%	Raised Capital Funds in 10 Years	Points 10%	
SUNNYSIDE	0.004719	56	1.39	0.70	22.42	30	74.36	18.59	85.90%	2	96.19	14.43	Yes	0	33.71
WOODLAND	0.037431	45	11.04	5.52	23.78	14	78.87	19.72	46.70%	53	52.30	7.84	Yes	0	33.08
ANACORTES	0.063547	38	18.73	9.37	22.01	46	73.00	18.25	30.90%	77	34.60	5.19	Yes	0	32.81
OMAK	(0.790698)	90	0.00	0.00	19.34	79	64.15	16.04	39.90%	63	44.68	6.70	No	10	32.74
BATTLE GROUND	(0.007662)	62	0.00	0.00	19.96	77	66.20	16.55	36.40%	67	40.76	6.11	No	10	32.66
SUMNER	0.059941	40	17.67	8.84	22.03	43	73.07	18.27	33.10%	70	37.07	5.56	Yes	0	32.66
REARDAN-EDWALL	(0.047252)	75	0.00	0.00	18.13	86	60.13	15.03	42.20%	60	47.26	7.09	No	10	32.12
CARBONADO	(0.036053)	72	0.00	0.00	19.25	81	63.85	15.96	29.60%	81	33.15	4.97	No	10	30.93
SPOKANE	0.015229	53	4.49	2.24	22.00	47	72.97	18.24	57.80%	25	64.73	9.71	Yes	0	30.20
MERIDIAN	0.033752	46	9.95	4.98	22.04	41	73.10	18.28	38.10%	65	42.67	6.40	Yes	0	29.65
MONROE	0.038078	44	11.23	5.61	22.97	22	76.19	19.05	27.10%	83	30.35	4.55	Yes	0	29.21
SELAH	0.021411	50	6.31	3.16	20.69	72	68.62	17.16	49.30%	45	55.21	8.28	Yes	0	28.59
MOSES LAKE	(0.016718)	65	0.00	0.00	21.40	57	70.98	17.74	63.20%	21	70.77	10.62	Yes	0	28.36
SEDRO-WOLLEY	0.007928	55	2.34	1.17	21.91	48	72.67	18.17	52.60%	37	58.90	8.84	Yes	0	28.17
LYNDEN	0.028068	49	8.27	4.14	21.11	64	70.02	17.50	36.40%	67	40.76	6.11	Yes	0	27.76
KIONA-BENTON CITY	(0.016043)	64	0.00	0.00	22.29	33	73.93	18.48	47.70%	51	53.42	8.01	Yes	0	26.49
NOOKSACK VALLEY	(0.000509)	59	0.00	0.00	20.65	73	68.49	17.12	54.80%	33	61.37	9.20	Yes	0	26.33
CHENEY	(0.025032)	69	0.00	0.00	21.40	57	70.98	17.74	49.20%	47	55.10	8.26	Yes	0	26.01
DAVENPORT	(0.021686)	66	0.00	0.00	19.29	80	63.98	16.00	56.00%	28	62.71	9.41	Yes	0	25.40
CASCADE	(0.036235)	73	0.00	0.00	21.29	60	70.61	17.65	45.60%	55	51.06	7.66	Yes	0	25.31
KENT	(0.003303)	60	0.00	0.00	19.93	78	66.10	16.53	52.00%	40	58.23	8.73	Yes	0	25.26
ENUMCLAW	0.016132	52	4.76	2.38	20.88	67	69.25	17.31	32.20%	74	36.06	5.41	Yes	0	25.10
NORTH THURSTON	(0.076966)	80	0.00	0.00	20.81	70	69.02	17.26	44.20%	58	49.50	7.42	Yes	0	24.68
WHITE SALMON VALLEY	(0.024330)	68	0.00	0.00	20.00	76	66.34	16.58	47.40%	52	53.08	7.96	Yes	0	24.55

School Districts	Priority 1				Priority 2				Priority 3				Priority 4		Total
	Calculated Necessary Added to Available Classrooms Ratio	Rank	Proportional Points	Points x50%	Student to Teacher Ratio	Rank	Proportional Points	Points x25%	FRLP	Rank	Proportional Points	Points x15%	Raised Capital Funds in 10 Years	Points 10%	
WEST VALLEY (YAKIMA)	(0.071542)	78	0.00	0.00	20.10	75	66.67	16.67	44.70%	56	50.06	7.51	Yes	0	24.18
SNOHOMISH	(0.049587)	76	0.00	0.00	24.36	8	80.80	20.20	21.00%	84	23.52	3.53	Yes	0	23.73
TUMWATER	(0.026496)	71	0.00	0.00	22.03	43	73.07	18.27	32.20%	74	36.06	5.41	Yes	0	23.68
INCHELIUM	(0.327160)	89	0.00	0.00	16.75	88	0.00	0.00	80.70%	9	90.37	13.56	No	10	23.56
OLYMPIA	(0.013440)	63	0.00	0.00	22.04	41	73.10	18.28	31.30%	75	35.05	5.26	Yes	0	23.53
MANSON	(0.126067)	84	0.00	0.00	16.85	87	0.00	0.00	78.70%	10	88.13	13.22	No	10	23.22
ISSAQUAH	0.016574	51	4.89	2.44	22.41	31	74.33	18.58	8.70%	89	9.74	1.46	Yes	0	22.49
HOCKINSON	(0.072998)	79	0.00	0.00	22.03	43	73.07	18.27	20.50%	85	22.96	3.44	Yes	0	21.71
LYLE	(0.301248)	88	0.00	0.00	16.25	89	0.00	0.00	69.30%	16	77.60	11.64	No	10	21.64
SNOQUALMIE VALLEY	(0.067777)	77	0.00	0.00	21.77	49	72.21	18.05	12.40%	88	13.89	2.08	Yes	0	20.13



Appendix B: Final Awards Summary

Twenty districts had the highest prioritization scores to receive funding for their full amount of validated K–3 classroom need. Yakima chose to take fewer classes due to existing financial constraints. Seattle did not score high enough to receive additional funds beyond its block grant.

School District	Enhanced Funding Assistance Percentage	Classrooms			Funding		Grant award amounts			
		District-Requested MODULAR K–3 Classrooms	District-Requested PERMANENT K–3 Classrooms	WSU-Validated K–3 Classroom Need	Need of MODULAR or <12 PERMANENT Per Classroom	Need of 12+ PERMANENT Per Classroom	Total MODULAR Classrooms Accepted by District	Total <12 PERMANENT Classrooms Accepted by District	Total 12+ PERMANENT Classrooms Accepted by District	Total Grant Amount Awarded
LAKE STEVENS	75.02%	0	50	50		\$491,127	0	0	50	\$24,556,372
WAPATO	103.57%	0	21	21		\$654,662	0	0	21	\$13,747,902
PULLMAN	62.84%	0	18	18		\$411,390	0	0	18	\$7,405,013
WHITE RIVER	65.34%	0	18	18		\$427,756	0	0	18	\$7,699,611
KENNEWICK	87.78%	0	97	89		\$574,662	0	0	89	\$51,144,945
PORT TOWNSEND	29.98%	0	3	3	\$67,009		0	3	0	\$201,028
VANCOUVER	74.43%	0	89	88		\$487,265	0	0	88	\$42,879,314
PIONEER	51.30%	0	3	3	\$114,662		0	3	0	\$343,987
YAKIMA	98.63%	4	0	61	\$220,451		1	0	0	\$220,451
MOUNT VERNON	82.18%	0	22	15		\$538,001	0	0	15	\$8,070,018
HIGHLINE	73.71%	0	13	71		\$482,551	0	0	13	\$6,273,168
CHEHALIS	73.04%	0	7	7	\$163,254		0	7	0	\$1,142,777
EASTMONT	76.51%	0	20	20		\$500,882	0	0	20	\$10,017,638
OKANOGAN	89.79%	0	2	2	\$200,692		0	2	0	\$401,385
CENTRAL VALLEY	75.84%	0	42	42		\$496,496	0	0	42	\$20,852,818
RIDGEFIELD	55.65%	10	0	10	\$124,385		10	0	0	\$1,243,850
WEST VALLEY (SPOKANE)	78.06%	3	0	5	\$174,474		0	3	0	\$523,423
TOPPENISH	107.14%	0	11	10	\$223,513		0	10	0	\$2,235,130
OTHELLO	98.97%	0	10	10	\$221,211		10	0	0	\$2,212,108
FEDERAL WAY	76.71%	0	67	60		\$502,191	0	0	45	\$22,579,064
SEATTLE	26.46%	0	310	139	n/a	n/a	7	0	13	\$10,000,000

Subtotal: \$233,749,999

OSPI Administration Allowance: \$750,000

Federal Way \$502,191x44 = \$22,096,414
Remaining funds = \$482,650
Total for Federal Way = \$22,579,064

28	28	432	
----	----	-----	--

Total: \$234,499,999

Appropriation: \$234,500,000



Appendix C: Remaining K-3 Class Size Reduction Classrooms to be Funded

The following is a list of remaining classrooms to be funded using the current funding formula. Changes to the funding formula will result in changes to the remaining classroom need.

District	Total Classrooms Remaining	Estimated remaining state match
YAKIMA	60	\$38,741,588
HIGHLINE	58	\$27,987,979
WEST VALLEY (SPOKANE)	2	\$348,948
FEDERAL WAY	15	\$7,532,868
WILLAPA VALLEY	1	\$140,120
WASHOUGAL	9	\$1,363,474
TUKWILA	2	\$264,148
RENTON	42	\$13,811,142
UNIVERSITY PLACE	12	\$1,984,795
EVERGREEN (CLARK)	26	\$13,516,544
MUKILTEO	24	\$9,351,716
PASCO	39	\$24,344,588
PUYALLUP	40	\$19,024,478
SEQUIM	1	\$89,383
BURLINGTON-EDISON	1	\$143,540
MEAD	18	\$8,737,774
NORTHSHORE	61	\$15,066,910
ADNA	2	\$313,321
ROYAL	2	\$375,368
SEATTLE	119	\$20,613,604

WENATCHEE	11	\$1,944,787
NORTH MASON	3	\$381,738
District	Total Classrooms Remaining	Estimated remaining state match
OAK HARBOR	10	\$1,588,954
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND	6	\$371,747
LAKE CHELAN	4	\$368,707
SOUTH BEND	1	\$197,787
LAKE WASHINGTON	61	\$10,870,139
SUNNYSIDE	1	\$223,513
WOODLAND	2	\$313,812
ANACORTES	4	\$234,063
SUMNER	12	\$1,775,319
SPOKANE	13	\$6,678,273
MERIDIAN	1	\$135,896
MONROE	5	\$706,525
SELAH	2	\$362,538
SEDRO-WOOLLEY	1	\$165,578
LYNDEN	2	\$276,977
ENUMCLAW	1	\$138,489
ISSAQUAH	8	\$738,129
TOTALS	682	\$231,225,258



Appendix D: Examples of Modular and Portable Classroom Construction Classifications

The following provides examples of permanent modular construction and portable classrooms:

PERMANENT MODULAR K-12 CLASSROOMS



STEM School, Lk Washington School District

Two-stories built on a permanent foundation

Intended life 30 continuous years at same location

Partially built on site (utilities hard-lined)

Design-bid-build process

“Appears” to be a site-built structure



South Bay Elem., North Thurston School Dist.

On permanent foundation

Intended life 30 continuous years at same location

Partially built on site (utilities hard-lined)

Ramps are permanent sidewalks to match grade

KCDA bid process, supervised by general contractor

“Appears” to be site-built structure and matches exterior finish of main building

Image courtesy of Google Street View



The Perkins School, Independent

On permanent foundation, not of concrete but still acceptable by local building department (concealed by skirting)

Intended life 30 continuous years at same location

Partially built on site (utilities hard-lined)

KCDA bid process

Photo courtesy of Stacy Smedley, the SEED Collab.

PORTABLE K-12 CLASSROOMS



Lynndale Elementary, Edmonds School Dist.

No foundation

Intended life 30+ years

KCDA bid process

Sustainable features, flexible design, making it easy to disconnect and move elsewhere



Generic example

No foundation

Intended life <30 years

Ramps needed to reach above-ground structure



Spruce Elementary, Edmonds School District

No foundation

Intended life 30+ years

KCDA bid process

Three classrooms

Photo courtesy of Pacific Mobile

OSPI provides equal access to all programs and services without discrimination based on sex, race, creed, religion, color, national origin, age, honorably discharged veteran or military status, sexual orientation including gender expression or identity, the presence of any sensory, mental, or physical disability, or the use of a trained dog guide or service animal by a person with a disability. Questions and complaints of alleged discrimination should be directed to the Equity and Civil Rights Director at 360-725-6162 or P.O. Box 47200 Olympia, WA 98504-7200.

Download this material in PDF at <http://k12.wa.us/LegisGov/Reports.aspx>. This material is available in alternative format upon request. Contact the Resource Center at 888-595-3276, TTY 360-664-3631. Please refer to this document number for quicker service: 16-0057.



Randy I. Dorn • State Superintendent
Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
Old Capitol Building • P.O. Box 47200
Olympia, WA 98504-7200