

**SBI-Plus
Merged High School Campus Selection Analysis**

Peoria High School

Woodruff High School

All high school students on "campus"	<p>Pro's:</p> <p>a) (See below "geographical," "accessibility," and "expansion" comparative "pluses")</p> <p>b) Building square footage, comparatively</p> <p>c) Acreage plus that for expansion</p> <p>d) Student capacity, comparatively</p> <p>e) 40-year operating costs</p> <p>f) The intangible "history" and quantifiable "alumni" affiliation</p> <p>g) Centered in merged Woodruff-Peoria high attendance area</p> <p>h) Centered in technology triangle of Ag Lab, Bradley University, and Hospitals</p> <p>i) Comparatively, accessible from three directions: Knoxville to East, Sheridan to West, North street to North; visible from I-74 to South</p> <p>j) Centered between Manual and Richwoods high schools along major thoroughfares</p> <p>k) Prominently located: top of ridge line along I-74</p> <p>l) Expansion opportunities: relocation of maintenance operations to another site frees up already owned district property; houses North of building along North street and Nebraska cost ~\$40,000; Land locked only to South by I-74.</p> <p>Con's:</p> <p>a) Pool rented from Peoria park district</p> <p>b) Football/track teams compete at Peoria stadium</p> <p>c) Age of building and additions</p> <p>d) Major renovation costs, comparatively</p>	<p>Pro's:</p> <p>a) Has own pool</p> <p>b) Age of building and additions</p> <p>c) Major renovation costs, comparatively</p> <p>d) Adjacent to Glen Oak Park, Zoo, and Botanical Garden</p> <p>Con's:</p> <p>a) Football/track teams compete at Peoria stadium</p> <p>b) (See below "geographical," "accessibility," and "expansion" comparative "negatives")</p> <p>c) Building square footage, comparatively</p> <p>d) Acreage plus that for expansion</p> <p>e) Student capacity, comparatively</p> <p>f) 40-year operating costs</p> <p>g) Eastern most edge of merged Woodruff-Peoria high attendance area</p> <p>i) Comparatively, accessible from only two directions: Monroe to East, Abington to North</p> <p>j) Relative prominence of campus: below and facing 'bluff'</p> <p>k) Expansion opportunities: would require acquisition of land; houses South of building along Monroe would cost ~\$55,000; Land locked to West by bluff and North by commercial property</p>																																								
	Accommodating today's Kingman-Lincoln consolidation and saving \$20M for re-allocation for other construction/renovation/retrofitting/updating needs	<p>Pro's:</p> <p>a) (none)</p> <p>Con's:</p> <p>a) Psychologically "above the 'bluff'"</p> <p>b) All students would require bussing, adding up to 1.0-hours per day on bus and/or lost time to recreation, family, homework, and the like</p> <p>c) Proximity decreases likelihood of parental involvement shown as a factor influencing student achievement</p>	<p>Pro's:</p> <p>a) Woodruff originally designed to be junior high school</p> <p>b) Air conditioned Lincoln school</p> <p>c) Within walking distance of most children</p> <p>d) Closest to "neighborhood" school</p> <p>e) Psychologically, "below the 'bluff'"</p> <p>f) Creates B-B center below "bluff" to complement B-B center "above"</p> <p>g) Doubles year-round opportunities for age group most impacted by summer layoff</p> <p>h) Fewest number of students requiring bussing; adding up to less than 0.5 hours on bus</p> <p>i) Proximity increases likelihood of parental involvement</p> <p>j) adjacent to Glen Oak Park, Zoo, Botanical Garden</p> <p>k) adjacent to planned Children's Museum</p> <p>Con's:</p> <p>a) Requires closure and merging of two high school campuses</p>																																							
Planning Advocates, Statistics	<table><tr><td>Original Build</td><td>1918</td></tr><tr><td>Addition 1</td><td>1930</td></tr><tr><td>Addition 2</td><td>1961</td></tr><tr><td>Addition 3</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Building Age</td><td>92</td></tr><tr><td>Total sq.ft.</td><td>248,900</td></tr><tr><td>Site Size</td><td>21.3 acres</td></tr><tr><td>Designed¹ / Calculated²</td><td>1920 / 1111</td></tr><tr><td>40 Year Operating Costs³</td><td>\$34,643,440</td></tr><tr><td>Major renovation costs⁴</td><td>\$3,281,988</td></tr></table> <p><small>¹Note: Davis, MacConnell, Nelson, Inc., 1989</small></p> <p><small>²Note: Planning Advocates, Inc., 2000</small></p> <p><small>³Note: District 150 10-Year Facility Plan, annualized cost over 40 years; includes gas, electrical, water, supplies, custodial and</small></p> <p><small>⁴Note: as measured by cost to upgrade HVAC systems: District 150 10-Year Facility Plan</small></p>	Original Build	1918	Addition 1	1930	Addition 2	1961	Addition 3		Building Age	92	Total sq.ft.	248,900	Site Size	21.3 acres	Designed ¹ / Calculated ²	1920 / 1111	40 Year Operating Costs ³	\$34,643,440	Major renovation costs ⁴	\$3,281,988	<table><tr><td>Original Build</td><td>1938</td></tr><tr><td>Addition 1</td><td>1961</td></tr><tr><td>Addition 2</td><td>1978</td></tr><tr><td>Addition 3</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Building Age</td><td>72</td></tr><tr><td>Total sq.ft.</td><td>282,000</td></tr><tr><td>Site Size</td><td>17.1 acres</td></tr><tr><td>Designed¹ / Calculated²</td><td>1908 / 1089</td></tr><tr><td>40 Year Operating Costs³</td><td>\$35,592,000</td></tr><tr><td>Major renovation costs⁴</td><td>\$4,303,600</td></tr></table>	Original Build	1938	Addition 1	1961	Addition 2	1978	Addition 3		Building Age	72	Total sq.ft.	282,000	Site Size	17.1 acres	Designed ¹ / Calculated ²	1908 / 1089	40 Year Operating Costs ³	\$35,592,000	Major renovation costs ⁴	\$4,303,600
Original Build	1918																																									
Addition 1	1930																																									
Addition 2	1961																																									
Addition 3																																										
Building Age	92																																									
Total sq.ft.	248,900																																									
Site Size	21.3 acres																																									
Designed ¹ / Calculated ²	1920 / 1111																																									
40 Year Operating Costs ³	\$34,643,440																																									
Major renovation costs ⁴	\$3,281,988																																									
Original Build	1938																																									
Addition 1	1961																																									
Addition 2	1978																																									
Addition 3																																										
Building Age	72																																									
Total sq.ft.	282,000																																									
Site Size	17.1 acres																																									
Designed ¹ / Calculated ²	1908 / 1089																																									
40 Year Operating Costs ³	\$35,592,000																																									
Major renovation costs ⁴	\$4,303,600																																									
Overall Evaluation	<table><tr><td>Safety</td><td>66.5</td></tr><tr><td>Healthfulness</td><td>73</td></tr><tr><td>Accessibility</td><td>75</td></tr><tr><td>Flexibility</td><td>70</td></tr><tr><td>Efficiency</td><td>58</td></tr><tr><td>Expansibility</td><td>70</td></tr><tr><td>Appearance</td><td>46</td></tr></table>	Safety	66.5	Healthfulness	73	Accessibility	75	Flexibility	70	Efficiency	58	Expansibility	70	Appearance	46	<table><tr><td>Safety</td><td>68.7</td></tr><tr><td>Healthfulness</td><td>74</td></tr><tr><td>Accessibility</td><td>70</td></tr><tr><td>Flexibility</td><td>73</td></tr><tr><td>Efficiency</td><td>60</td></tr><tr><td>Expansibility</td><td>75</td></tr><tr><td>Appearance</td><td>47</td></tr></table>	Safety	68.7	Healthfulness	74	Accessibility	70	Flexibility	73	Efficiency	60	Expansibility	75	Appearance	47												
Safety	66.5																																									
Healthfulness	73																																									
Accessibility	75																																									
Flexibility	70																																									
Efficiency	58																																									
Expansibility	70																																									
Appearance	46																																									
Safety	68.7																																									
Healthfulness	74																																									
Accessibility	70																																									
Flexibility	73																																									
Efficiency	60																																									
Expansibility	75																																									
Appearance	47																																									
PSAE Results (2008)	<table><tr><td>Reading</td><td>30.9 All / 24.1 Low Income / 23.1 African-American</td></tr><tr><td>Math</td><td>24.0 All / 15.6 Low Income / 14.7 African-American</td></tr><tr><td>ACT</td><td>16.5</td></tr><tr><td>Overall</td><td>23.4</td></tr><tr><td>Performance-all state tests</td><td></td></tr></table>	Reading	30.9 All / 24.1 Low Income / 23.1 African-American	Math	24.0 All / 15.6 Low Income / 14.7 African-American	ACT	16.5	Overall	23.4	Performance-all state tests		<table><tr><td>Reading</td><td>21.1 All / 17.0 Low Income / 9.6 African-American</td></tr><tr><td>Math</td><td>14.8 All / 12.5 Low Income / 5.7 African-American</td></tr><tr><td>ACT</td><td>16.8</td></tr><tr><td>Overall</td><td>16.8</td></tr><tr><td>Performance-all state tests</td><td></td></tr></table>	Reading	21.1 All / 17.0 Low Income / 9.6 African-American	Math	14.8 All / 12.5 Low Income / 5.7 African-American	ACT	16.8	Overall	16.8	Performance-all state tests																					
Reading	30.9 All / 24.1 Low Income / 23.1 African-American																																									
Math	24.0 All / 15.6 Low Income / 14.7 African-American																																									
ACT	16.5																																									
Overall	23.4																																									
Performance-all state tests																																										
Reading	21.1 All / 17.0 Low Income / 9.6 African-American																																									
Math	14.8 All / 12.5 Low Income / 5.7 African-American																																									
ACT	16.8																																									
Overall	16.8																																									
Performance-all state tests																																										