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BEST is a Ford Foundation funded community of practice - working towards a vision where all children learn in school buildings that are safe and educationally adequate and that serve as community anchors in vibrant, healthy neighborhoods.

Shared partner concerns:
• Public education
• Neighborhood vitality

Why School Buildings Matter

School building condition affects:
• Achievement
• Attendance
• Teacher retention
• Health and safety
• Technology
• Community vitality

BEST researches, advocates, and builds constituencies for policy and practice that:
• Integrates community involvement into educational facilities and community PLANNING
• Provides for the design and operation of SCHOOLS AS CENTERS OF COMMUNITY
• Requires effective and efficient MANAGEMENT and OVERSIGHT of facility planning, design, construction, modernization, and maintenance
• Ensures equitable and adequate FUNDING for capital improvements and maintenance
 BEST and C&S Research

- Impact of facilities on teaching and learning
- School Construction Spending
- School Facilities and Neighborhoods
  - Housing in the Nations Capital 2006
  - Research in DC and LA
- State policies
  - Model Policies
  - NTHP reports
  - Website
  - Building Schools, Building Communities: CA
- Local Practice
  - School district survey
  - PLUS Initiative – Bay Area


 School Construction Investment Research: Growth & Disparity Report

- Data
  - U.S. Census of Governments
  - McGraw-Hill Construction
  - Census 2000
  - National Center for Education Statistics
- Analyzed school construction spending by public school districts nationwide, by:
  - State
  - Family income at school district level
  - Racial composition of school districts
  - Household income by zip code

 Growth & Disparity Findings

- $504 billion in total K-12 capital outlay
- $304 billion in “hard” construction costs

 Growth
- Per student $ increased dramatically

 Disparity
- Low income districts left behind
- Minority districts left behind
- Disparity increased with HH income

“BEST has illustrated the disparities,...and provided valuable policy suggestions that should receive serious attention.”
- Sen. Barack Obama

 Linking School Construction Investment to Equity, Smart Growth, and Healthy Communities

- School construction decisions have been linked to smart growth, regional equity, and healthy communities
- We link the Growth & Disparity findings to these issues
- We examine the scale, scope, and distribution in California and Florida

 Linking School Construction Investment to Equity, Smart Growth, and Healthy Communities

- Patterns of inequitable spending
- Disinvestment in existing schools and neighborhoods
- Investment patterns have important impacts on neighborhoods, cities, and regions because they affect residential choices, segregation, economic. development, and land use
- Disinvestment is yet another factor driving families out

 Scale of Public School Construction Growth, 1995-2004

- U.S. Census of Governments Public School Capital Outlay (2005 dollars)
Data: Comparing US Census of Governments and McGraw-Hill Construction

Total Capital Outlay $504 billion (in 2005 dollars)


Public School Construction Growth: CA and FL

School Construction Starts in CA and FL, 1995-2004 (2005 dollars)

National Average = $6,519 per student

Construction Expenditure per Student

1. Enrollment growth
2. Aging buildings
   - Average age = 40 yrs
   - GAO and ASCE findings
3. Federal and State mandates
   - Asbestos and lead
   - ADA, IDEA, Title IX, Pre-K/K
4. Changes in Education
   - Small, technology, voc edu, community use
5. Infrastructure equity
   - Court challenges – Abbott in NJ, Williams in CA

Spending on New Construction

CA: 43%
FL: 54%
Analyzing the Distribution in Public School Construction, 1995-2004: CA and FL

1. Investment by Neighborhood Income (zip code level)
2. Investment by Project Type (zip code level)
3. Investment by Neighborhood Racial Composition (zip code level)
4. Investment by Locale (school district level)

Investment by Neighborhood Income, 1995-2004

We analyze the McGraw-Hill data by project zip code and Census 2000 median household income at the zip code level.

- CA: 1052 school districts; 2,490 five-digit zip codes.
- FL: 67 county school districts; 1,832 five-digit zip codes.

Zip code areas were divided into five categories according to 2000 Census median household income:
- Very Low Income (Less than $20,000)
- Low Income ($20,000 to $34,999)
- Moderate Income ($35,000 to $59,999)
- Middle Income ($60,000 to $99,999)
- High Income ($100,000 and more)

Distribution in Students attending Schools in Neighborhood Income Types

Why does the disparity in investment by neighborhood income matter?

1. Body of empirical evidence linking school facilities condition to performance
2. School construction spending impacts neighborhoods, cities, regions
   - Condition and quality of buildings contribute to neighborhood vitality or decline (Weiss 2004)
   - School quality has a push-pull affect on residential choice
   - School quality reflected in housing prices (Bogart and Cromwell 2000, others)
Investment by Project Type, 1995-2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>New Constructions</th>
<th>Additions or Improvements to Existing Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>$3,325</td>
<td>$6,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$2,344</td>
<td>$3,048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Investment by Neighborhood Racial Composition

1. Spending disproportionately benefited newer, wealthier neighborhoods.
2. Disinvestment in existing schools – many in neighborhoods that engender smart growth and healthy communities design principles.

Why does the disparity in investment by project type matter?

Investment by Project Type...In Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Replacement Value</th>
<th>Industry Standard</th>
<th>$/yr/student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Average: $6,519

Distribution in Students attending Schools in Neighborhood Racial Types

- Predominantly minority (< 10% non-Hispanic white)
- Majority minority (10% to 50% non-Hispanic white)
- Majority white (50% to 90% non-Hispanic white)
- Predominantly white (> 90% non-Hispanic white)
California Expenditures (in 2005 dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Exp. Per Student</th>
<th>% of Exp.</th>
<th>Enrollment (Census 2000)</th>
<th>% of student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$2,278,172,956</td>
<td>$11,568,747,115</td>
<td>$9,121,460,587</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution in Students attending Schools in Neighborhood Racial Types

- Predominantly Majority
- Predominantly Minority
- Predominantly White
- Predominantly More than 90% White

Investment by Locale
(Nationally at School District Level)

We analyze the McGraw-Hill data by the NCES "locale code" assigned to every school district.

School districts were divided into four categories:
- City (Inside a principal city and inside an urbanized area)
- Suburb (Outside a principal city, inside an urbanized area)
- Town (Inside an urban cluster, outside an urbanized area)
- Rural (Outside both urbanized area and cluster)

Investment in Public School Construction Nationally by Locale, 1995-2004

Why does the disparity in investment by locale matter?

1. Families force and follow investments
2. Higher investments in suburbs are another incentive for families to there, not cities
3. Disinvestment works to erode both school and neighborhood quality, triggering flight
4. Historically, schools and communities more connected

Linking School Construction to Equity, Smart Growth, and Healthy Communities

- Need appropriate spending to upgrade and maintain older schools in existing neighborhoods to advance goals of smart growth, regional equity, and healthy communities
- Major barrier - data on conditions and spending
- School construction is one important and strategic investment