

Update on the Organization Options Study for the Wheatland Chili Central School District

Stephen Uebbing

Brian Brent

The Original Research Questions (2008)

- 1. Can the Wheatland-Chili Central School District, with a student population of approximately 700, provide a comprehensive K-12 program in Monroe County over the next decade that is fiscally sustainable?
- 2. If a comprehensive program cannot be maintained in its current state, what options could be considered to reach that goal?
- 3. How would each of the possible options impact the District programmatically, fiscally, and (in terms of) community identity?

Update Proposal (Dec. 2009)

- **Enrollment analysis:** We believe it is important to update this information annually. We would enter your yearly updates into the existing formulas, access live birth data from the New York State Department of Health, and provide new five-year projections. We suggest this work be completed every January. The work product would include updates of Tables 1, 2, and 3 in the existing study along with brief narrative.
- **District demographics:** We propose that we update the community demographic section of the report once, specifically in January 2012. By this time all the census data should be available. The work product would include an update to Table 7 in the study along with brief narrative.
- **Program survey:** It seems reasonable to revisit the program analysis by which we looked at the educational program offerings in Wheatland-Chili and compare them with offerings in contiguous districts. We propose that we do this work once in January 2011. This work requires extensive follow-up and interviews with district staff. The work product would include updates to tables 11-17 in the existing study.
- **Economic and housing factors:** In the study, we provided data regarding economic and housing factors in the Wheatland-Chili Central School District. Specifically, we interviewed developers and public officials to gain insight into the economic climate and how it is likely to influence the school district. Additionally, we provided certain district financial comparisons. We propose that we duplicate this analysis in 2011 and again in 2013. The work product would be our report to the board, including updates to tables 26, 27, 33, and 34 in the current report. This work requires additional time for interviews with key individuals.

Issue One: Enrollment

What is the pattern of LBR in the district?

Table 3a - Kindergarten Enrollment Predicted by Live Births

Year of Birth	Total Live Births	Year of Kindergarten	Kindergarten Enrollment	Survival
2002	54	2007	53	.98
2003	45	2008	43	.98
2004	66	2009	41	.62
2005	47	2010	36	.77
Average Survival	(updated)			.84

Actual	G	5-year CSR	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
56	K	0	66	50	45	50	50
38	1	1.069029	38	70	54	48	53
50	2	0.965899	48	37	68	52	47
50	3	1.021954	43	49	38	69	53
60	4	1.051545	65	45	52	40	73
47	5	1.040261	48	68	47	54	42
52	6	1.086669	65	52	74	51	59
47	7	1.01534	53	66	53	75	52
61	8	0.983283	68	52	65	52	74
57	9	0.945781	52	64	49	62	49
58	10	0.950376	55	49	61	47	59
60	11	0.975773	60	54	48	60	46
55	12	1.031219	61	61	55	50	61
24		BOCES	22	22	22	22	22
715		Total Enrollment	744	741	731	731	738

year born		K year apx		
2002	54	2007	53	0.981481
2003	45	2008	43	0.955556
2004	66	2009	41	0.621212
2005	47	2010	36	0.765957
2006	78	2011	56	0.717949
2007	60	2012	49	0.808431
2008	54	2013	44	0.808431
2009	44	2014	36	0.808431
			5 yr avg	0.808431

How did that change this year?

Table 3a - Kindergarten Enrollment Predicted by Live Births

Year of Birth	Total Live Births	Year of Kindergarten	Kindergarten Enrollment	Survival
2002	54	2007	53	.98
2003	45	2008	43	.98
2004	66	2009	41	.62
2005	47	2010	36	.77
2006	78	2011	56	.72
Average Survival	(updated)			.808

G	5-year CSR	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
K	0	49	44	36	43	43
1	1.066	38	52	47	38	46
2	0.972719	49	37	50	46	37
3	1.055658	44	51	39	53	48
4	1.034784	64	46	53	41	55
5	1.036556	48	67	48	55	42
6	1.042668	63	50	69	50	57
7	0.993041	52	62	49	69	49
8	0.963438	66	50	60	48	66
9	0.963898	53	64	48	58	46
10	0.960301	56	51	62	46	55
11	0.97734	60	54	50	60	45
12	1.011416	60	60	55	50	61
BOCES		22	22	22	22	22
TOTAL		722	710	688	678	674

Table 17 – Monroe County True Value Tax Rates – Highest to Lowest
(\$1 per \$1,000 of Full-Value, County Rank)

District	1998-99	2001-02	2004-05	2007-08	2010-11
Brighton	18.38	20.09	23.05	24.59	24.27
Brockport	20.12	23.25	23.83	23.50	23.61
Churchville-Chili	19.66	22.17	24.65	23.88	22.54
East Irondequoit	19.27	23.60	26.03	29.34	26.68
East Rochester	20.00	20.91	24.57	25.78	24.65
Fairport	18.46	20.55	22.06	21.90	21.19
Gates-Chili	20.19	22.57	23.75	23.63	23.85
Greece	17.89	20.77	23.35	23.20	22.54
Hilton	18.92	20.72	23.17	21.53	22.38
HFL	18.09	20.09	23.13	22.97	21.11
Penfield	21.93	23.67	25.35	24.71	24.36
Pittsford	19.08	19.76	21.05	22.48	23.40
Rush- Henrietta	16.95	17.74	19.95	18.96	18.93
Spencerport	21.21	25.57	27.79	25.25	23.14
West Irondequoit	17.48	18.99	21.57	21.25	25.43
Wheatland-Chili	18.28 (12th)	23.11 (5th)	25.4 (3 rd)	24.67 (5th)	22.21 (13 th)

Source: Monroe County School Boards Association "Facts & Figures"

Table 19 - Building Permits in Select Municipalities

Municipality	Year	Single Family Homes	Apartment Units	Townhome Units
Chili	2010	34	0	0
Henrietta	2010	100	0	9
Scottsville	2010	0	0	0
Wheatland	2010	1	0	0
Monroe	2009	583	192	93
	2010	551	104	171
Ontario	2009	227	22	8
	2010	240	8	71
Wayne	2009	78	1	2
	2010	86	3	0
Totals	2009	888	215	103
	2010	877	115	242

Interview with developers

- Rick Herman confirmed that infrastructure improvements are a prerequisite to any significant development. The perception that the village is moving in that direction is a positive development.
- A change in market conditions has resulted in single-family housing in the high \$100K to low \$200K range as more viable development.
- One major developer who did not see potential in the district in 2008 now sees opportunities, primarily due to the change in price points that have developed. He believes that with the appropriate infrastructure and what he perceives as reasonable zoning, that Wheatland-Chili is now an attractive alternative for developers. He suggested that the school and community actively seek the input of developers in creating the right conditions for attractive, middle income development.

Recommendations: to continue the district in its current organization

- Maintain the intimate character of the Wheatland-Chili Central School District. Very small class size, a sense of family and caring, all contribute to making Wheatland-Chili a special place to go to school.
- Improve educational outcomes. Wheatland-Chili is strong in many areas. We advise bolstering opportunities for advanced classes. Given the very small class sizes the district offers, it is reasonable to aim for higher levels of achievement.
- Promote reasonable growth. Ongoing development that adds quality, reasonably priced housing will stabilize both enrollment and the tax base.
- Promote the district. The district should find ways to promote the unique educational opportunities it offers. We especially suggest that the district find a way to communicate and support children from birth to kindergarten, thus helping families to see the benefits the district offers.