IMMEDIATE CHALLENGES

• Need for Buses
  • We are growing and our fleet of buses is aging, and this impacts maintenance.

• Need for Classrooms/Seats
  • 180 portable classrooms in use
  • Full Day Pre K: It appears that full day pre-k will need to be phased in which will require roughly 45 additional classrooms just using current enrollment.
    • The number may increase when we introduce the full day option (1468 Pre-K and 322 EC students projected for 19-20).

• Need to Be Prepared to Build Next Schools (Land and Design)

• Need to Sustain Technology Infrastructure and Device Replacement Cycle

• Need to Continue Safety and Security Projects

• Need to Address Large Replacement/Capital Projects that may arise. The projects that were to make up the summer of 2020 project are not currently funded (avg. age of campuses is 28 years).
WHAT HAPPENS IF WE WAIT OR ARE NOT SUCCESSFUL ON THE NEXT REFERENDUM?

• We will need to do some rezoning…a lot of rezoning.

• We may need to purchase additional portable classrooms. Some for growth and some to replace aging fleet.

• According to last year’s PEIMS Financial Data, CISD spent $1342.00 less per child than the state average. The Instructional Expenditure Ratio for CISD was 67.5% compared to 62.7% for the state.

• We will need to find ways to fund large capital projects. Because of our efficiencies, shifting more of our budget to fund a greater percentage of plant maintenance/operation (9.24% or $785.58 per student in 17-18 vs Texas 10.47% or $1030.66 per student) will likely involve some difficult decisions. Since nearly 90% of our budget is payroll-related, this will require us to look at areas where we can reduce staffing/payroll. We may consider:
  • Freeze programs (i.e. dual language)
  • Look at raising class size ratios
  • Hiring Freeze
  • We will need to consider reducing the number of bus riders (increasing distance to be eligible from current 1 mile).
# ELEMENTARY CLASS SIZE AVG.
## (2017-18 PEIMS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>CISD</th>
<th>Texas</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>CISD</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Language Arts</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Languages</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRANSPORTATION

• The District continues to add 10-12 routes each year to respond to growth.
• Last year we were the 3\textsuperscript{rd} largest transporter of students in Texas with 36,021 students registered to ride the bus.
• We drove the 4\textsuperscript{th} highest number of miles at 7,302,992 miles.
• In terms of total expenditures, we were the 7\textsuperscript{th} highest in Texas while transporting the third largest number of daily riders.
• Of our riders, 24.39\% live within 2 miles of school compared to our peer group average of 26\%.
• We transport fewer students per miles (avg. 177.4 students per sq. mile) than our benchmark districts (avg. 540.2) while transporting the highest percentage of students (roughly 58\%) within our peer group.
• Although 17-18 PEIMS showed we spent $432.00 per student on Transportation-Related costs compared to the state average of $292.00 per student, our cost per mile is the 2\textsuperscript{nd} lowest of our benchmark group at $3.40 per mile. In other words, our transportation services are very efficient when we consider the number of riders, the age of our fleet, and the number of miles we drive.
• The average age of our buses is 11.4 years. 261 Buses are 10 years or younger (2009-19). 289 of our buses are 11 years or older (1994-2008) of which 201 are 15 years or older. 131 buses do not have a/c. Of our total 550 buses, we average about 90 buses out for both routine and long term maintenance at any given time, leaving the remainder to run 384 total routes and roughly 45 field trips out of four locations.
FACILITY CONSIDERATIONS BASED ON PROJECTIONS

- Projected at 1100 for next year, the Conroe High School 9th Grade Campus will be at capacity. 4180 projected for both campuses.

- TWCPHS is projected at 3135 and is over capacity (2850) with 12 portables.

- Projected at 4283, TWHS is over capacity (3000 at 10-12 campus) with 15 portables.

- In 6 years, CCHS is projected to be over capacity. Grangerland Intermediate (7) is expected to be 113 students over capacity next year. Creighton (10 portables) and Austin (6 portables) are both currently over capacity.

- With next year's projections, McCullough (6), Knox (2), York (14), Peet (3), Washington (9), and Moorhead (7) Jr. Highs are projected to be over capacity. We will address Peet and Washington enrollments with the opening of Stockton Jr. High.

- In 6 years, Stewart is projected to be 800 students over capacity and Giesinger (5 portables) is projected to be nearly 400 students over capacity. In two years, Runyan will be over capacity.

- Next year, Broadway, Birnham Woods, and Snyder will be over capacity in the Grand Oaks feeder. In 5 years, Grand Oaks HS is projected to be at 117% of capacity and York will be at 126% of capacity.

- Ride (12), Hailey (9), Lamar (5), Powell (3), and Wilkerson are projected to be over capacity next year. This can be addressed with rezoning within the Woodlands.