## INTRODUCTION

In the fall of 2005, the Boards of School Trustees of three Tippecanoe County, Indiana school corporations authorized a comprehensive study of the advantages and disadvantages of school reorganization. Those corporations are: Lafayette School Corporation, Tippecanoe School Corporation, and the West Lafayette Community School Corporation. The study was designed to include the following:

1. An analysis of community and student populations to set the cultural and demographic context of the study,
2. An analysis of the current delivery systems of current curricular and extra-curricular programs that are grounded in "best practices" within the three corporations,
3. An analysis of space available for student population changes along with program expansion considerations, and
4. An analysis of a variety of financial, governance, staffing and technological considerations. The study was divided into five subsections, each with specific questions to be addressed as follows:

### Subsection A

Are there curricular advantages that could be realized by consolidation? Specifically, could instructional programs and course offerings for students be enhanced or preserved through consolidation? Would any curricular programs or offerings be harmed?

How would consolidation impact the Greater Lafayette Special Services Co-operative?

How would consolidation impact the schedules and school calendars for the districts?

How would extra-curricular programs including athletics be impacted?

### Subsection B

What would be the impact of school consolidation on the need to construct or remodel school facilities?

### Subsection C

How would the administrative and support services of the school districts be impacted? Specifically, how would consolidation impact transportation, food service, maintenance of facilities including grounds, custodial, and administrative costs? The corporations would expect an analysis of the present costs compared with school corporations that would compare in size after consolidation.

How would consolidation impact distribution of poverty and eligibility for, and the receipt of, grant money?

How would consolidation impact governance? Specifically, what options would exist for a Board of School Trustees?

How would tax rates be impacted for taxpayers in each school district?

How would labor contracts be handled?

**Subsection D**

How would staffing of schools and class sizes of schools be impacted by consolidation? This analysis should include instructional support, guidance, media, and other non-classroom professionals as well as paraprofessionals.

**Subsection E**

How would consolidation impact the technology infrastructure, and the software being used in the respective school corporations?

Subsections A and B were assigned to a team from Indiana State University, Subsections C and D were assigned to a team from Educational Services Company, and subsection E was assigned to Steve Haire from Purdue University. This report contains materials concerning subsections A, B, C, and D. Subsection E will be submitted under separate title.

The intent of the reports contained herein is to provide a baseline of data and conceptual considerations for the respective Boards of School Trustees as they continue their dialogue on ways the three school corporations can cooperate, collaborate, and consolidate the delivery of educational programs in the county in the most effective and efficient manner for the students of Tippecanoe County, Indiana now and in the future.

The data collection and analysis relied on the support of the central office administrative and clerical staffs of the three school corporations. In addition, a wealth of document sources was utilized to provide a comprehensive view of the advantages of further cooperation, collaboration, and consolidation efforts among the three school corporations. The data provided, along with the perceptions of the administrative staffs consulted during the study, are demonstrative of a strong commitment to quality education for the students of the three Tippecanoe County School Corporations.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

## SUBSECTION A

Are there curricular advantages that could be realized by consolidation? Specifically, could instructional programs and course offerings for students be enhanced or preserved through consolidation? Would any curricular programs or offerings be harmed?

How would consolidation impact the Greater Lafayette Special Services Co-operative?

How would consolidation impact the schedules and school calendars for the districts?

How would extra-curricular programs including athletics be impacted?

**PREPARED BY:**

Dr. Robert L. Boyd
Dr. Gregory R. Ulm

# Tippecanoe County Consolidation Report

**Research Summary**

**Curriculum and Instruction**

**Extracurricular Programs**

**Special Services**

**Schedule and Calendar**

**Considerations**

**Prepared for the School Corporations of Tippecanoe County, Indiana**

**Boards of Education**

**August 3, 2006**

**Tippecanoe County Study**

**Gregory R. Ulm**

## Purpose of Study

Four specific questions make up the curriculum study to examine the advantages and disadvantages of school reorganization involving the three Tippecanoe County school corporations.

1. Are there curricular advantages that could be realized by consolidation? Specifically, could instructional programs and course offerings for students be enhanced or preserved through consolidation? Would any curricular programs or offerings be harmed?
2. How would consolidation impact the Greater Lafayette Special Services Cooperative?
3. How would consolidation impact the schedules and school calendars for the districts?
4. How would extra-curricular programs including athletics be impacted?

It is important to recognize that the information and insights provided in this report are based on information derived from several sources. First, this researcher was invited to meet with members of the leadership team of each school corporation, WCCC, and GLASS. At that time, they provided an overview of their curricular and instructional focus and described specific programs, initiatives, and concerns related to the academic program of each school corporation. I appreciate their support and assistance. Second, print materials were used as a source of information. Next, access to electronic documents and reports provided data and information. Finally, this researcher tried to identify articles and research that could be used to interpret and understand considerations related to the academic programs in each school system.

## Perspectives on School Consolidation

In studying elements of curriculum and instruction, it is important to consider the intended framework for school consolidation. The findings and considerations set forth in this study should be understood or interpreted based on certain perspectives. In a report prepared for the National Rural Education Association (NREA), the authors note that policy-makers, education professionals, and even private businesses that have interest in financial gain have encouraged school consolidation. In a 2004 Texas study, the author noted that consolidation "generally occurs along two broad levels: a district merging with another district and a school merging with another school." It was suggested that either of these options can be accomplished through "annexation, reorganization, dissolution, or co-oping." The report indicates that co-oping is the most flexible method and presents opportunities to "pool resources so, for example, participation in sports can increase, bulk prices for office supplies can be made, and specialized teachers can be utilized across a wider area." Reorganization is defined as the process that results in "the formation of a new school district…unification of two or more existing operational districts into one larger district (Sell, Liestritz, and Thompson (Department of Agriculture Economics. Agricultural Economic Report

No. 347. 1996))." In the study prepared for NREA (2005), the researchers provided an overview of the history, current research and issues, economies of scale, student achievement, and conclude with proposed recommendations. This paper, developed by an NREA Consolidation Task Force, provides important and helpful perspectives. The NREA report cites a 1995 study of Oklahoma superintendents, "successful consolidation strategies involved joint student body activities, a consolidation plan, maintaining all school sites, and community meetings." Furthermore, research reported by Howley and Bickel (2000), noted, "the lower socioeconomic status of the students and/or district, then the school enrollment should be small. From reviewing the literature, it appears that there is not an ideal or optimal district or school size that is universally agreed upon (p. 9)." Other studies that provide helpful perspective include, "Consolidation of Michigan's Schools: Results from the 2002 State of the State Survey" (Policy Report No. 14, February 2003) and, "School District Consolidation and Public School Efficiency" (Texas Public Policy Foundation, February 2006). Another study, available for review but not yet published, is "Growing Pains: The School Consolidation Movement and Student Outcome," authored by Christopher Perry and Martin West (2005).

Enrollment patterns and school size have played a role in decisions related to school consolidation. The NREA study cited Lawrence et al. (2002), indicating that a school district should have an enrollment of 4000 to 5000 students as a maximum. Further, they note that Imerman and Otto (2003) recommend school districts not fall below 750. Augenblick and Myers were cited for reporting "that in order to offer a safe and nurturing environment, an appropriate curriculum, and extracurricular activities, a district should have an enrollment between 260 and 2,925 students." Other studies suggest 300-400 students for elementary schools and 400-800 for secondary schools. The NREA study cited Howley and Bickel (2000), suggesting, "The lower the socioeconomic status of the students and/or district, then the school enrollment should be small." All reviews of the literature result in the realization that there is not conclusive evidence of the best or ideal district or school size. It is this researcher's opinion that individual school settings are left then with the task of using key indicators of organizational performance to help them determine the merits of consolidation, however it may be defined.

In a report on consolidation of Michigan schools (2003), the authors confirm, "views on consolidation varied according to how satisfied people are with their local schools—but not by much." They go on to detail a wide range of opinion that suggests that though striking differences in support or opposition appeared among community types (rural, suburban, urban), there was no

evidence of strong opposition to consolidation in any one of them. A 2006 policy perspective on school consolidation in Texas stated, “Most studies concur that students perform better in smaller elementary and middle schools, while research on high schools remains largely inconclusive.” This report goes on to argue that, “considerable money can be saved and educational services can be improved by a practice perfected in the private sector — “shared services.” It suggests that a growing number of schools and districts have, “established agreements to share student transportation, technology, library services, food services, curriculum development, teacher training, special education, academic programs, custodial services, and purchasing…sharing personnel—administrators, health care professionals, and technical experts.”

In studying elements of the educational programs of the three school districts that make up Tippecanoe County, some effort should be made to understand if schools and districts could likely be aligned programmatically and/or organizationally. A review of the information and performance data of the three Tippecanoe County school systems related to curriculum and instruction results in the following shared perspectives:

1. There is evidence in all three districts of high levels of academic achievement.
2. There is evidence in all three districts of effort to obtain greater levels of equity-driven achievement.
3. There is evidence of high levels of professionalism among teachers, staff, leaders, and decision-makers.
4. There is evidence of distinctive educational programs in all three districts.
5. There is evidence of high levels of pride and dedication to children and the community.
6. There is an existing level of “co-oping” of policy and practice within the educational organizations of the three county systems.
7. There is a perception of a “healthy competition” among the three school corporations that contributes to individuality, stakeholder satisfaction, and overall performance.

Given those characteristics how might we begin to consider the value, advantage, or leverage gained through some collaborative or consolidated arrangement? Another consideration, given the previous introduction of research related to school consolidation, is how decision makers understand the values or opportunities related to a systems perspective. Peter Senge in his work *The Fifth Discipline* stated that, “From a very early age, we are taught to break problems apart, to fragment the world. This apparently makes complex tasks and subjects more manageable, but we pay a hidden, enormous price. We can no longer see the consequences of our actions; we lose our intrinsic sense of connection to a larger whole (Senge 1990, 3).” In this study, we are being asked to consider curriculum and instruction from a “larger whole,” or community perspective. In the

Educational Research Service (EDS) report, *Supporting School Improvement: Lessons from Districts Successfully Meeting the Challenge*, researchers quickly realized if school performance was going to improve, "more radical and intense efforts were needed than the typical school-by-school improvement (p. 4)." In the EDS research study, it was reported that the Brazosport, Texas, school district was able to eliminate gaps in reading achievement, mathematics, and writing, with at least 95% of the students in each subgroup (African American, Hispanic, economically disadvantaged) receiving a passing score on the state test. In a 2002 study of effective schools, the author stated, "A systems perspective requires a broadened focus from the individual school to the larger context in which the school is embedded… To achieve effectiveness, comprehensive and coordinated approaches are needed at the classroom, grade level; or department, school, and district levels. Without support from the top, as well as system coherence, individual school change can be quickly undermined (Chrispeels, 2002, 19)."

The Learning First Alliance noted the lessons learned from the five districts that had successfully changed ways of supporting higher levels of student achievement (Cawelti and Protheroe, 54-57):

1. Districts can make a difference.
2. Let truth be heard.
3. Focus on instruction to improve student achievement.
4. Improving instruction requires a coherent, system wide approach.
5. Make decisions based on good data.
6. Rethink professional development.
7. Everyone has a role in improving instruction.
8. Working together takes work.
9. There are no quick fixes.
10. Current structures and funding limit success.

This researcher suggests that the lessons set forth above provide a framework to guide organizational dialogue, community engagement, and systems planning.

The importance of developing a learning community was emphasized in a report titled, *Technical Guide to School and District Factors Impacting Student Learning* (National Study of School Evaluation (2005). Critical to systems success was the ability of the community to:

- ✓ Share common visions and goals that have student learning as the focus.
- ✓ Improve individual and collective performance by coming together regularly for learning, decision-making, problem solving, and celebration.
- ✓ Enhance continuously individual effectiveness through inquiry, practice, and peer reflection.
- ✓ Support a culture of collegiality, collaboration, respect, and trust.

Consideration of shared, collaborative, or consolidated practices asks that, "Leaders for change recognize that the people in the organization are its greatest resource…. This characteristic has three dimensions. The first is the leaders' valuing the professional contributions of the staff, while the second is the leaders' ability to relate to people. The third dimension is fostering collaborative relationships (Southwestern Educational Development Laboratory n.d., online)."

Change is a consideration underlying our study in this report; that is, are there advantages or disadvantages, and what would be the impact of consolidation? In a recent article by McNulty and Bailey, they introduce a framework for leadership that they support with empirical evidence and theoretical research. Using this theoretical research, they hypothesize that the impact is due to the focus and magnitude of the change needed for impacting student achievement (Balanced Leadership Framework: School Leadership That Works, *3*, 1, p. 17). They state, "leadership is a delicate dance between the needs of the people, the organization, and the context and environment in which the leadership is located (p. 28)." They adopted *first order* and *second order* change as important considerations when planning and implementing change.

| First Order Change | Second Order Change |
|---|---|
| An extension of the past | A break with the past |
| Within existing paradigms | Outside existing paradigms |
| Consistent with prevailing values and norms | Conflicted with prevailing values and norms |
| Incremental | Complex |
| Linear | Nonlinear |
| Implemented with existing knowledge and skills | Requires new knowledge and skills to implement |
| Implemented by experts | Implemented by stakeholders |

"To be effective in addressing second order change, people need to re-examine and often change their current mental models of how they think schools work and what students are capable of learning (McNulty and Bailey, 2004, 26)." The authors offer that there needs to be a balance between first and second order change, a balance between when to stabilize and destabilize an organization, a balance between the role of authority and distributed leadership, and a need to balance choice of school and teacher practices with those of leadership practices. As Nevis, Lancourt, and Vassallo point out, "this is particularly difficult work because mental models are inherently self-perpetuating; they are emotional as well as shared constructs; and since they are shared constructs, they are communally reinforced (McNulty and Bailey 2004, 26)." Each finding and insight provided in this study might help inform the "mental model" of those individuals considering consolidation.

**Systemic Considerations**

An effort has been made to identify specific insights from the text of this study as prevailing or significant considerations. Though helpful, the following list likely does not touch on all the insights developed in this study. It could be argued that this list represents program areas that provide an organizational foundation to determine advantages or disadvantages for "shared" or "collaborative" engagements.

1. All three districts have in place a similar curriculum development and management plan, which establishes guidelines and procedures for aligning content with Indiana standards, adoption of text material, and the implementation of instruction. The school corporations use the IDOE textbook adoption schedule to review and align curriculum with the Indiana Curriculum Standards and the results of the ISTEP+ performance measure.
2. Though all three districts are showing gains in academic performance among all student groups, the data indicates that achievement, opportunity, and attainment gaps likely exist among some student categories (African American, Hispanic, economically disadvantaged, special needs) in all three of the county districts.
3. Though the curriculum review plan fulfills the intent of school corporation leadership and outlines cyclical curriculum examination for the purposeful upgrade of curriculum, overall program evaluation and alignment of assessment practices are absent.
4. A method for understanding how consolidation and collaboration could work in the context of curriculum and instruction is to create improvement premised on a comparison with higher performing school entities. Although the use of comparative data has been in use for several years, benchmarking, as we understand it today was developed in the 1980's. This concept is important both conceptually and practically as it can be used to improve administrative processes as well as instructional models. It is an ongoing, systematic process for measuring and comparing

your work with the processes of another. The goal of benchmarking is to provide an external standard for measuring and understanding the quality and cost of internal activities, and to help identify where improvement can be gained. Leibfried and McNair, 1992, describe benchmarking as analogous to the human learning process, and it has been described as teaching an institution how to improve. It asks the questions:

- How well are we doing compared to others?
- How good do we want to be?
- Who is doing it best?
- How do they do it?
- How can we adapt what they do to our institution?
- How can we be better than the best? (Kempner, 1993)

5. A characteristic of effective organizations and successful shared services systems is flexibility, or as the Baldrige Model emphasizes, "agility." A collaborative or consolidated systems program approach would require a contractual definition for assignment and evaluation of professional staff that permits flexibility or agility.
6. All three systems report the development and maintenance of ENL programs in their school districts. Instructional focus and staffing are both similar in delivery and effectiveness.
7. There has been an increase in the Hispanic population within the county. The greatest growth in enrollment numbers has occurred in the Lafayette School Corporation.
8. School improvement plans for all three districts focus on strategies and interventions designed to increase academic achievement for low achieving student subgroups, African American, Hispanic, special needs, and economically disadvantaged.
9. There is currently a school/community Hispanic liaison that serves to solve problems, support program delivery, and to help parents work school and community officials.
10. Though two anomalies related to the high school schedule are the existence of a block schedule at Lafayette Jefferson and the open campus component at West Lafayette High School, comparison of scheduling options in other school systems revealed that traditional and modified schedules can coexist within the same system (Evansville).
11. Consolidation would likely preserve the high performance noted among Asian and white students throughout the County.
12. It is not certain that consolidation would provide greater leverage and capacity to decrease the achievement, opportunity, and attainment gaps that exist among Black and Hispanic students within the County.
13. Consistent with current provision for student transfers, consolidation could provide a greater number of school site choices or referral options for educational placement (Fort Wayne Community Schools).
14. Numbers show an upward trend of minority student enrollment for the county, therefore providing a shared opportunity for educational programming to support and appreciate the opportunity and challenges that growing diversity bring to the community and to the school systems.
15. In each district there is a growing number of children identified at-risk based on economic circumstance.
16. The middle level program orientation in each district varies philosophically and organizationally. Consolidation might necessitate adoption of a shared perspective related to the intellectual and developmental needs of middle level students.

17. The need for pre-school programs, all day kindergarten, drug education programs, obesity education, teenage pregnancy, safe school provisions, anti-bullying, character education, as well as a myriad of other mandated and/or implied program needs, create significant challenges and opportunity for shared services for schools experiencing dwindling resources and increased program expectations.
18. Curricular and instructional programs at the elementary level are similar among all three school corporations. Examples include, Title I, STAR Reading and Math, Accelerated Reader, Math Their Way, gifted and talented programs, ENL, Reading Recovery, as well as other programs designed to meet the learning needs of a variety of learners.
19. School sites within each corporation participate in alternative education programs designed to address the educational needs of suspended or expelled students; for example, BEAMS, JEDI, and the Carey Home.
20. Statewide assessments are in place in each of the school corporations and serve as the primary data source for understanding student progress. Locally adopted assessment tools are teacher driven and include a variety of assessment techniques. Classroom based standardized measures vary among the three systems.
21. Academies share a number of attributes that are both collaborative in nature and systemic in program orientation. Magnet programs exist within the three districts that could serve as models for collaborative development. Research notes that magnet programs are "proving to be successful in serving specific interests and abilities of a diverse student population." Magnets attract students and parents by creating supportive, personal environments while placing high expectations on student potential and progress.
22. Evidence of collaborative program support is apparent in that TSC serves as the local educational agent for the delivery of vocational educational programs for students enrolled in Tippecanoe, Benton, and Clinton counties, and for special needs services throughout the County.
23. The data indicate a higher level of college interest and preparation among students of WLCSC, with similar interests reported by the other districts. Based on current curriculum and support services in each of the high schools, transfer rates in each of the school districts, vocational educational programs, consolidation would not likely impact students' selection of college-bound educational programs.
24. The student population of Tippecanoe County, like the population of Indiana, is very mobile, and the three districts could collaborate to ensure effective instructional programs, consistent curricular scope and sequence, and informed transition of students throughout the system.
25. The emphasis on improving the academic performance of under achieving children and youth is counter balanced by the need to challenge our average students, and excel our most talented students. Shared resources and programs would increase the ability of all county educational entities to support high achieving students through additional academic courses, AP courses, possible implementation of an International Baccalaureate program, and increased emphasis on obtaining CORE 40 and Academic Diplomas.
26. The three school corporations have similar provision for enrollment and dual credit courses at Purdue University and Ivy Tech Community College-Lafayette Region.
27. District personnel in all three systems reported that student transfer is a persistent and supported process among all the schools within the county. Student transfer may be based on geographic locale, program interest, or overcrowding at some school sites. Though there is evidence of well informed practices adopted by all three systems, it is also clear that additional flexibility would allow schools to better address student academic needs or interests. This phenomenon is likely supportive of collaborative or consolidated program provisions.

28. The special education cooperative (GLASS) serves students of the district, ranked twelve in the state in percentage of the total population (23%).
29. Collaborative work could be done to support an International Baccalaureate program for schools in the community.
30. Summer programs adopted by each school corporation are designed to provide both enrichment and remediation and in many instances are coordinated or supported by government, public agencies, and private agencies in the community.
31. Indiana Department of Education graduation and diploma requirements are different for each class, and all schools in this study follow the prescribed curriculum guidelines. Though there are policy differences, the three school corporations have provisions for dual credit, student intern, cooperative, audited classes, class rank, class standing, grade point averaging, honor roll, and academic recognition.
32. Indiana Department of Education course requirements are satisfied in the three school corporations.
33. Offerings at each high school for honors and advanced placement courses are similar and consistent among all program sites.
34. Based on individual needs of students and credentials of faculty, there are differences between the high schools in offering remedial courses, alternative courses, electives, intensive learning opportunities, and, experiential learning opportunities. This is a similar circumstance to other school settings, for example, in Vigo County and Evansville Community Schools.
35. The differences in course offerings and access are not significant impediments to existing collaboration or consideration of a consolidated model. Issues related to transportation, faculty assignment, course enrollment numbers, course sequencing, are items that a collaborative model should be designed to address.
36. Student enrollment numbers for all areas of the curriculum are adequate to strong, with some courses lower enrollments indicating the impact of specialized or advanced levels of study. Though principals did not report a concern for the frequency and consistency of offering courses in each academic term, it is reasonable to argue that greater flexibility, efficiency, and ability to meet student needs, could be gained in a collaborative or consolidated model.
37. Wildcat Creek Career Cooperative includes eight school corporations with nine high schools within Benton, Clinton, and Tippecanoe counties. Access and content are not issues that consolidation would be expected to impact negatively. Tippecanoe School Corporation serves as the LEA for the cooperative and provides for the director of the cooperative.
38. Paul E. Barton, former Director of the Policy Information Center at Educational Testing Service, in a review of work by Mishel and Hoy on graduation rates states, “I think there is good reason to do much more as far as quality controls of this administrative data if it is to be used as an important means for estimating high school graduation.” Shared information systems could create advantages for data-driven decision making to support of higher levels of student performance.
39. Collaborative work could be done to support development of an International Baccalaureate program for elementary, middle, and high school programs in the community. The International Baccalaureate Diploma is a building-specific, comprehensive, two-year, pre-college curriculum in the classical liberal arts that is offered in schools across the globe.
40. The university, community, business, and cultural context of Tippecanoe County public schools, provide rich resource and capacity to compete with other progressive districts that successfully engage low achieving learners and very bright learners.
41. Sequence of courses, course content, Indiana State Standards, Advanced Placement, dual credit courses, access to vocational education programs, diploma options, and student support services are similar among all high school settings.

42. Project Lead the Way and Jefferson Academies are unique program offerings within the total curricular format of the three school settings.
43. Middle level programs are varied in organization, program philosophy, size, program offerings, and faculty engagement.
44. By its very nature, GLASS has developed or amended existing collaborative practices in order to meet the organizational, educational, and programmatic requirements of special needs students.
45. Consistent with an earlier premise cited in this report, “considerable money can be saved and educational services can be improved by a practice perfected in the private sector—shared services.” Though the GLASS model for delivery of services has altered since its inception in 1973, a prevailing orientation has been the need for shared services and collaboration.
46. GLASS coordinated services can be effectively and efficiently provided across school systems, program differences, schedules, and staffing.
47. In considering extracurricular activities provided by the three school corporations, this researcher questions if understanding the causal relationships between participation and desirable student characteristics have been sufficiently demonstrated. There is a need to balance the value of comprehensive programming gained in larger schools against the levels of participation among all students. Students in smaller schools participate in a greater number and variety of extracurricular activities than students in larger schools. Low-ability and lower SES students are more involved in school life in smaller schools. The national existing findings might justify additional local research into the processes by which participation influences students' lives. In an article by Ralph B. McNeal (Journal of Educational Research, 1998), the author argues, “student participation in extracurricular activities is associated with a host of positive outcomes that include increased academic achievement and a reduced likelihood of dropping out of high school.” Given the positive benefits gained through participation, a question that could be addressed collectively is who participates and what sorts of benefits do they reap?
48. A consolidated system would require athletic policy and procedural guidelines for student transfer, student eligibility, academic class enrollment, and athletic membership. Individual differences between consolidated programs would need to be addressed to respond to differences in fields and facilities, sport options, as well as current administrative support.
49. The formal athletic programs of area schools are supported by city and county informal recreation programs such as summer athletic youth camps, Little League, community-based youth football programs, a local community soccer league, as well as private clubs for tennis and golf.
50. There is currently shared activity for extracurricular participation among the schools and potential for greater advantages in areas like transportation, officiating, coaching, facilities, and purchasing.
51. Due to existing site limitations for expanding and supporting increased program offerings, consolidation might provide greater leverage to access and share athletic facilities.
52. Lafayette and Tippecanoe County schools are members of the same athletic conference, Hoosier Crossroads Conference, and share 4A class status for all sports except football. West Lafayette is a member of the Hoosier Conference and is assigned to class 3A.

## Overview of Data and information Related to Educational Programs

### Introduction

Conversation about curriculum and instruction with members of the administrative teams in each of the three districts resulted in a better understanding of certain attitudes and beliefs that define both the distinctive and shared disposition of professional educators in each of the three districts. For example, each leadership team was careful to express the perspective that people who move into the Lafayette community are told that they have access to "great educational opportunity" no matter which district they live in or whether it be in a public or parochial setting. At the same time, each leadership team stressed the high quality of their individual educational programs, professional staff, academic achievement of their students, and overall performance compared to others. This pride, confidence, and competitive edge are supported by performance data as well as by the existence of distinctive programs in each district.

There is also awareness and recognition that the context of delivering educational programming in each of the three districts is changing. Certain themes related to defining a changing context emerged from conversations with leadership teams in each district and from study of each of their educational programs. For example, in each district there are a growing number of children identified at-risk based on economic circumstance. The increasing number of children in poverty has significant implication for curriculum, instruction, and performance achievement. In a study of districts that successfully addressed the needs of low achieving students, the Learning First Alliance study focused on high-poverty districts that had made substantial progress in improving student achievement…. researchers were 'interested in learning more about how districts promoted good instruction across their system.'" (Cawelti and Protheroe, 47). In a similar study of effective school practices researchers reported, "… initiated changes that moved the districts from a collection of loosely coupled, individual campuses to coherent, focused, district-wide organizations, a change that was almost as revolutionary as their stance against the old belief that schools could not succeed with some groups of children (Skrla, Scheurich, and Johnson 2000, 17-18)." Also reported is the growing number of Hispanic families throughout Tippecanoe County and the implications for educational program delivery. The dynamics and demographics related to family circumstance impact educational programming.

The need for pre-school programs, all day kindergarten, drug education programs, obesity education, teenage pregnancy, safe school provisions, anti-bullying programs, character education, as well as a myriad of other mandated and/or implied program needs, create significant challenges for schools experiencing dwindling resources and increased program expectations. Another significant element of educational programming is the need to address the expectations for school improvement. The legislated school performance framework of P.L. 221 and No Child Left Behind, have resulted in a new structural level within the organization of each school system. For example, school systems need to respond to the changing need for data management, curriculum alignment, parent involvement, increases in Hispanic student enrollment, and staff development. There is a need to further refine planning and implementation methods for addressing the educational performance of all students, creating effective educational interventions for all students, and developing powerful and meaningful ways to assess the measured and anticipated level of academic performance for all students. Requirements related to the academic performance of special need children, ELL children, children of poverty, and other academically challenged student populations are reported in percentages of those passing mandated achievement tests, Annual Yearly Progress (AYP), attendance rates, graduation rates, and percentage of students completing Core 40 and an Academic Honors diploma in high school. The emphasis on improving the academic performance of under achieving children and youth is counter balanced by the need to challenge our average students, and excel our most talented students.

To some degree or at some level, the changing and existing context described in the previous paragraphs is a circumstance shared by the three school districts that make up Tippecanoe County schools. Likewise, each of the three systems has developed programs that are both similar to one another and distinctive from one another, in an effort to address the learning needs of their students.

**Part 1: Are there curricular advantages that could be realized by consolidation? Specifically, could instructional programs and course offerings for students be enhanced or preserved through consolidation? Would any curricular programs or offerings be harmed?**

**Tippecanoe School Corporation (TSC)**

The school district has experienced persistent growth since 1989, and currently supports nine elementary schools that vary considerably in enrollment (300 to 850). There are six middle schools (300 to 650), and two high schools. With continued growth anticipated the district expects to open a new elementary in 2008 and to replace Battle Ground Middle School in 2008. The district provides for open enrollment among all schools internally based on parent ability to transport their child. There are nearly 200 students who transfer to WLCSC and LSC based largely on proximity, the dynamics related to increasing enrollments, and to a lesser degree based on program needs. The district has experienced considerable growth in Hispanic families that has led to the development of ENL programs at all levels of the educational program. The efforts are supported with the services of a School-Community Liaison, tutoring, and a parent education component.

The educational program of TSC was described as a "blend of uniformity" with schools sharing similar programs related to Title I, remediation, a character education program, and ESL. The schools operate on the same school calendar, adopt the same textbook series, and have adopted individualized programs such as phonics, Shurley Method, some Reading Recovery, and CLASS. TSC supports a district-wide emphasis on full inclusion, and has developed all-day kindergarten formats. Gifted and talented students participate in a pullout program in grades 2 through 5, and there are magnet programs. Elementary schools are assigned specialists for art, music, physical education, and an individual assigned to provide media/library services. Each elementary school has computer labs and classroom computer stations that are used for remedial instruction, support classroom work processes, and as a tool for instruction.

The school corporation has organized department chairs to oversee curriculum review and development. The curriculum is based on and aligned with state standards. Assessments of student progress are largely teacher-driven; there are some school-wide rubrics, and there is a set of TSC objectives to guide and define teaching content. The emphasis on staff development is to keep teachers in the classroom. Consolidation would likely need to clarify staff development beliefs and delivery. Though there are district-wide rules and expectations, each school has nurtured a climate and culture expressive of the students, parents, and staff. TSC serves as the local educational agent for the delivery of vocational educational programs for students enrolled in Tippecanoe, Benton, and Clinton counties. TSC has provision for enrollment and dual credit courses at Purdue University and Indiana Vocational and Technical College. TSC schools

participate in alternative education programs designed to address the educational needs of suspended or expelled students. The middle level program is maintained at six sites and is reportedly the most expensive educational program. The program is designed on an eight-period day that focuses on teaming, exploratory curriculum, advisor/advisee, social adaptation, unified arts, and foreign language program provisions. Summer programs include a grade 1 through 5 Jump Start program to support ISTEP+ readiness and a high school program. There is a community based recreation program, a high school summer sport camp, and a summer musical production company.

**Lafayette School Corporation (LSC)**

The Lafayette School Corporation (LSC) provides educational programs for children pre-K-12. An early intervention strategy is the pre-K, Even Start program. It serves 36 families including Latino mothers and their children. It is a very successful state and federally supported program that is intended to nurture the seamless transition from pre-K, to kindergarten, to the primary grades. A CAPE grant funds activities that include a focus on a limited day care program for children of poverty, pre-school transition program, and a family literacy and parenting component. The kindergarten program provides a developmentally appropriate setting for social and academic growth. There is a locally funded full-day program for at-risk children and a Kids English Language Learning (KELL) program for children needing English language acquisition instruction. In the primary and intermediate grades (1-5), traditional elementary programs in language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies are provided. The school corporation has adopted a variety of instructional and curricular methods to address the achievement needs of a wide range of individual learners. Some of those programs include Title I, STAR Reading program, Accelerated Math, Accelerated Reading, Soar to Success, and a gifted and talented program in grades K through 5. The school district provides music, physical education, art, library, and media services at the elementary level. The current grade level structure includes K-5, 6-8, and 9-12. Future plans suggest grade level reorganization to a K-4, 5-6, 7-8, 9-12 configuration.

The district utilizes Area Content Teams (ACT) to review K-12 curricular areas. The school corporation has used the textbook adoption schedule to review and align curriculum with the Indiana Curriculum Standards and the ISTEP+ performance measure. This process supports vertical and horizontal alignment and identification of power standards. The district has completed mathematics and science and is currently reviewing language arts and related arts. The district has adopted the same textbook series for mathematics and science in all elementary schools. With a

40% mobility rate, this was deemed an important strategy to ensure curriculum alignment. The decision-making model has moved from a site-based model to consensus building as a district.

The leadership team expressed satisfaction with their model for professional development, identified significant community engagement in their schools, and the existence of many programs in the community that are not school-based. The growth of Latino families is geographically spread out. The program for non-English speaking clients is a cooperative process with other community entities and includes a community liaison.

There is a K-12 English Language Learning titled KELL in three buildings within the district. There is also a researched-based program titled AVENUES in eight of the nine buildings that utilizes teaching assistants to address the needs of language minorities. At the middle level there are two certified teachers, and in the high school there are three certified teachers. The focus of the program is English language acquisition based on the need of the student. The tiered, gifted and talented program includes an early entry Kindergarten program, a first grade cluster, and accelerated math, science, reading, and expanded social studies. All staff have gifted and talented endorsements. The program includes EXCEL, CHALLENGE, and ACCELERATED ($8^{th}$). The special education cooperative (GLASS) serves students of the district, ranked twelve in the state in percentage of the total population (23%). It was reported that this number does not include an over-representation of minority students. Programs are delivered in both a resource room setting, and grade-level instruction in the regular class. Services are provided in speech at the primary level for students with both emotional and severe disabilities. There is a growing number of children entering kindergarten with mild and moderate disability, and they are being mainstreamed into regular kindergarten classes. The district provides after-school tutoring for all students, and ISTEP+ remediation during the academic year and summer. The district also has developed alternative education programs for suspended and/or expelled students across grade level, i.e., ATLAS, JEDI, BEEMS and AIM.

The district provides summer school for entering primary students. The program focuses on reading, with intensive reading development activities and uses the DIBBLES assessment tool to monitor and measure progress. School staff is selected on the basis of seniority. This circumstance sometimes results in teachers that are not trained or disposed to teach this research-based reading intervention program. The after-school program at the elementary level includes extra-curricular athletics for fifth graders, a Homework Club, Choir, and science for fifth grade interested students. There is a student magnet program in K-8 and scheduling is underway at the

high school. The administrative team reports that the middle school program structure is in a state of flux with some interdisciplinary teaming introduced into the more traditional program mode. The schedule includes a related arts rotation, enrichment for the arts, and career skills. Foreign language is offered before school in grades 7 and 8.

The school district is highly involved with and supportive of the Purdue University professional preparation programs. District schools support the teacher education BLOC program, practicum experiences in a variety of disciplines, student teacher assignments, Literacy Collaborative, and mentoring of elementary teachers.

The district has a comprehensive high school of approximately 2300 students and 132 faculty. The school is on a Block 8 class schedule with a 92-minute class period. It is the only high school in the county with a bloc schedule. The student body includes 22% special needs, 77% Caucasian, 13% Latino, and 8% African American. The drop-out rate is about 15% and post-secondary program enrollment is about 75%. The Jefferson Academies were developed to support student connections to post-secondary educational planning, attendance in post-secondary educational settings, opportunities to complete college credits simultaneously with high school credits, with a focus on guidance and advising throughout high school. The academy options include: Arts and Communications; Business and Technology; Life-Centered Achievement; Political and Social Services/International Studies; and, Science, Engineering and Mathematics; General Studies; and, Core 40.

**West Lafayette Community School Corporation (WLCSC)**

The WLCSC is located in the community adjacent to Purdue University. This circumstance has broad impact on the community, especially elements related to diversity, academic achievement, community culture and image, parental expectations, professionalism, leadership, and the high level of pride among stakeholders. The achievement levels tracked by ISTEP+ test scores indicate a high level of proficiency among 90+% of all students. Individuals who have been identified as at-risk are a concern, and efforts to address their needs have included developing appropriate instructional and curricular strategies, such as Math Their Way, teacher-created materials, and continuing effort to develop methods for tracking classroom performance data to ensure their progress. The West Lafayette Community School Corporation is participating in an ongoing program of curriculum alignment with the Indiana State Standards as well as curriculum articulation. The process coincides with the textbook adoption cycle. The language arts adoption process resulted in different adoptions at each grade level. Some factors that influenced this process were

the wish for variety, a focus on leveled readers, Title I and Reading Recovery intervention programs, the ENL program, 6+1 Writing Traits, as well as the wide range of individual learner needs. The leadership team would like to see the development of a science-learning center. The schools have media and library resources, computer laboratories, wireless access, mini-labs, and a Nature Center. Members of the leadership team reported that 57 nationalities attend schools within the district. This circumstance is related to the closeness of Purdue University. An English as a new language program is offered to students on a pullout basis.

In their recent history, the elementary schools went through a reorganization of grade levels, clustering grade levels, creating greater efficiency, departmental by grade level, and provisions for teacher collaboration. The focus of the instructional program is based on developing good basic skills, wide range of learning activities, lots of technology, development of a TV studio learning lab, lots of academic competition, and recognition of the international dynamics of the student population.

The biggest challenge addressed in their school setting is to sustain the good performance of their extremely bright children while engaging the average child. This is a circumstance in which capable average children struggle to compete with the very bright, and staff continues to work with how they do and how they fit in. Efforts are made to ensure that students transitioning to the next level have good information and readiness. There is a strong fine arts program, 45-minute planning time for teachers, each grade level has some shared planning time, and there is a shared lunch period at each grade level. Retired teachers voluntarily monitor classes so that teachers have collaborative planning time. There is a summer Jump Start program, summer remediation, and a summer band and orchestra program.

The schools are tightly connected to the Purdue University teacher education program through pre-service, block, university classes in the buildings, college students work assignments in the buildings, as well as modeling and other professional development interactions. The professional development setting is a contractual one with both Purdue University and Indiana Wesleyan.

The junior-senior high school program has a well-developed curriculum and instruction alignment with the Indiana State Standards. There are about 11% special needs students enrolled. The normal measures of student and teacher success are all quite strong. For example, the graduating class of 2004 noted 97% going on to post-secondary settings. The school found it necessary to

remove class rank as a meaningful measure of student performance. Fine arts is a strongly supported program. Teachers and students have access to Smart Boards, and teachers are very technologically proficient in instructional applications. Approximately 90% of all students complete CORE 40 and Academic Honors diplomas. Students have access to dual credit courses at Purdue University. About 80% of all students are engaged in extra-curricular activities at the school. It is an open campus with opportunity for extra-curricular participation during that time. The school is experiencing a change in population demographics with newly arriving families, economic diversity, tuition transfers, and a growing special-needs population.

Some of the areas of strength that were noted by the administrative team include the strong academic skills of students, professionalism and camaraderie of the staff, parental involvement, working with the West Lafayette Parks Department and Library in support of the summer program, the strong athletic program, and the long and valued history of the school (established 1875).

**Performance Information**

The following description is intended to provide an overview of the impact on curriculum and instruction of existing educational programs in each of the three school districts reported on in this study. In doing so, this author expects to create a general sense for the influences related to curriculum and instruction programs that are in place. An effort will be made to show distinct differences as well as areas of common program emphasis among the three districts. In the final analysis, an effort will be made to suggest areas or lack of opportunity, for consolidated or collaborative effort that could be considered as links or loops for shared delivery of needed and preferred educational programs.

The three corporations share common demographics that are helpful in understanding each of their educational programs. Information obtained from the Indiana Department of Education (ASAP) for 2004-2005 provides the following perspectives related to ethnicity and free and reduced lunch percentages:

**Table 1.1: Percentages of Ethnic Enrollment**

| | Lafayette School Corporation | West Lafayette Community Schools | Tippecanoe School Corporation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Multiracial | 4% | 3% | 3% |
| Native American | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| Asian | 1% | 17% | 2% |
| Hispanic | 16% | 3% | 5% |
| Black | 8% | 4% | 2% |
| White | 71% | 73% | 87% |

Several trends are apparent in these data. First, school personnel reported that the high percentage of Asian children in the West Lafayette school district is due to the enrollment of Asian students in Purdue University graduate programs. These students tend to be high performing, highly motivated, short-term enrollees in the local educational system. The district reports 98 Limited English Students, with approximately 340 Asian students. Second, though there has been an increase in the Hispanic population within the county, the greatest growth in enrollment numbers has occurred in the Lafayette School Corporation. Evansville-Vanderburgh high schools have ethnic mixes and vary some when compared with the above data. For example, the Asian, Multiracial and Hispanic populations are about one or two percent of the total population. Black student enrollments vary based on school site from 5% to 35% of the total population, and white students from 61% to 93%. South Bend Community Schools have four high schools with an ethnic mix more similar to Tippecanoe County and enrollment patterns for each school site show more ethnic balance. For example, all schools report about two percent Multiracial, no Native American, and one percent Asian enrollment. The range for Hispanic enrollment is from 4% to 15%, for black students 28% to 44%, and for white students 46% to 60%. In Vigo County of the three high schools, two are comparable with Tippecanoe County school settings. Both schools have no Native American students, are about 3% Multiracial and 2% Asian, with six to eight percent black students and 84% and 89% white.

**Considerations:**

1. All three systems report the development and maintenance of ENL programs in their school districts. Instructional focus and staffing are both similar in delivery and effectiveness.
2. There is currently a school/community liaison that serves to solve problems, support program delivery, and to help parents work school and community officials.

3. Enrollment of high numbers of Asian and Hispanic students creates challenges for the development and implementation of curricular and instructional accommodations in the three school corporations.

A review of the trend data reported for ethnic enrollment by each district for the ten-year period of 1995-1996 through 2004-05 results in the following insights.

**Table 1.2: Trend Data of Ethnic Enrollment**
**(Reported as Limited English Students)**

| | Lafayette School Corporation | West Lafayette Community Schools | Tippecanoe School Corporation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1995-96 | 86 | 59 | 81 |
| 2004-05 | 836 | 98 | 276 |

It is apparent in actual numbers and percentage of total population the Lafayette School Corporation (LSC) has shown the greatest growth in ethnic enrollment. It is believed that this is a countywide phenomenon that is likely to continue.

In terms of minority student enrollment, a similar upward trend is apparent in all three school districts. The following table provides a summary of minority enrollment data for the same ten-year period.

**Table 1.3: Minority Students, Percent of Total**

| | Lafayette School Corporation | West Lafayette Community Schools | Tippecanoe School Corporation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1995-96 | 9.7% | 17.6% | 5.6% |
| 2004-05 | 28.8% | 26.9% | 12.7% |

The greatest gains in the percentage of minority students were experienced by LSC, with TSC showing accelerated growth in the past few years. These students require focused intervention programs to ensure improved achievement. The numbers show an upward trend for the county, therefore requiring educational programming to support and appreciate the opportunity and challenges that growing diversity bring to the community and to the school systems.

There are three kinds of student performance gaps nationwide. First is the achievement gap, or that level at which students master the content of a given curriculum or subject area. Second is the

opportunity gap, that is, those students' participating and succeeding in high-level courses. Finally is the attainment gap, that is, those students' earning a high school diploma. Though the following data does not specifically address the opportunity or attainment gaps, it does provide insight into the consequences of being a member of an under performing student subgroup.

Performance data for minority students are reported below. The ISTEP+ test scores for 2004-2005 provide insight about academic progress, program needs, and the success of current student interventions to improve the academic performance of all students. This author selected grades 3, 5, 6, 8, and 10 to report on as a means for showing program level and program transition performance data. Blank cells are used when there are less than 10 students reported at that grade level. The author will compare student performance data for ethnicity, free/reduced lunch, gender, limited English, and special education.

**Tippecanoe School Corporation—Language Arts, grades 3, 5, 6, 8, and 10**

| Ethnicity | Number Tested | | | | | | Percent Passing | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Black | 25 | 20 | 18 | 15 | 10 | | 60% | 70% | 44% | 60% | 30% |
| Asian | 20 | 18 | 11 | 13 | | | 90% | 94% | 91% | 92% | |
| Hispanic | 64 | 50 | 49 | 50 | 41 | | 58% | 64% | 53% | 54% | 56% |
| White | 727 | 727 | 708 | 791 | 746 | | 82% | 80% | 76% | 73% | 80% |

**Lafayette School Corporation—Language Arts, grades 3, 5, 6, 8, and 10**

| Ethnicity | Number Tested | | | | | | Percent Passing | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Black | 44 | 42 | 35 | 41 | 37 | | 52% | 50% | 40% | 27% | 46% |
| Asian | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hispanic | 103 | 88 | 71 | 72 | 69 | | 60% | 52% | 55% | 64% | 32% |
| White | 364 | 408 | 456 | 418 | 469 | | 72% | 71% | 68% | 68% | 65% |

**West Lafayette Community School Corporation,**

**Language Arts, grades 3, 5, 6, 8, and 10**

| Ethnicity | Number Tested | | | | | | Percent Passing | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Black | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Asian | 18 | 28 | 15 | 30 | 23 | | 100% | 100% | 100% | 93% | 78% |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | | | | | |
| White | 99 | 107 | 110 | 120 | 117 | | 92% | 94% | 95% | 95% | 95% |

**Considerations:**

1. Black students and Hispanic students scored lower than their white counterparts in language arts at all grade levels.
2. The performance of Hispanic students is similar when comparing student test data reported for LSC and TSC. For example, compare performance of Hispanic students at each grade level across all grades. The same thing cannot be said for the performance of black students across all grade levels.
3. Consolidation would likely preserve the high performance noted among Asian and white students throughout the County.
4. There is a need related to school improvement to ensure that consolidation would provide greater leverage and capacity to decrease the achievement, opportunity, and attainment gaps that exist among black and Hispanic students within the county.
5. Consolidation could provide family's greater number of school site choices to enroll their children.
6. The data indicate that achievement, opportunity, and attainment gaps exist among some students in all three of the county districts.

**Tippecanoe School Corporation--Mathematics, grades 3, 5, 6, 8, and 10**

| Ethnicity | Number Tested | | | | | | Percent Passing | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Black | 25 | 20 | 18 | 15 | 10 | | 52% | 60% | 44% | 60% | 40% |
| Asian | | 18 | 11 | 13 | 0 | | | 89% | 91% | 92% | |
| Hispanic | 64 | 50 | 49 | 50 | 41 | | 48% | 66% | 61% | 64% | 51% |
| White | 746 | 727 | 708 | 791 | 746 | | 83% | 81% | 77% | 76% | 80% |

**Lafayette School Corporation—Mathematics, grades 3, 5, 6, 8, and 10**

| Ethnicity | Number Tested | | | | | | Percent Passing | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Black | 44 | 42 | 35 | 41 | 37 | | 48% | 40% | 43% | 32% | 38% |
| Asian | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hispanic | 103 | 88 | 71 | 72 | 69 | | 51% | 65% | 68% | 63% | 43% |
| White | 364 | 408 | 456 | 416 | 469 | | 67% | 71% | 71% | 74% | 66% |

**West Lafayette Community School Corporation**

**Mathematics, grades 3, 5, 6, 8, and 10**

| Ethnicity | Number Tested | | | | | | Percent Passing | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Black | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Asian | 18 | 28 | 15 | 30 | 23 | | 100% | 100% | 100% | 97% | 100% |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | | | | | |
| White | 99 | 107 | 110 | 120 | 117 | | 86% | 96% | 93% | 95% | 94% |

**Considerations:**

1. Black students and Hispanic students scored lower than their white counterparts in mathematics at all grade levels.
2. The performance of Hispanic students is similar when comparing student test data reported for LSC and TSC. For example, compare performance of Hispanic and black students at each grade level across all grades.
3. Overall, Hispanic students scored better than black students.
4. Efforts concerning consolidation should be designed to provide greater leverage and capacity to increase the mathematics achievement, opportunity, and attainment gaps that exist among black and Hispanic students within the county.
5. Consolidation would likely preserve the high performance noted among Asian and White students throughout the county.

**Corporation ISTEP Language Arts and Mathematics Cross Tabulation, Grade 6, 04-05**

| School Corporation | Ethnicity | Number Tested | Percent Passing |
|---|---|---|---|
| Evansville | Black-LA | 279 | 34% |
| | Black-Math | 279 | 33% |
| South Bend | Black-LA | 578 | 40% |
| | Black-Math | 578 | 48% |
| Vigo County | Black-LA | 85 | 40% |
| | Black-Math | 85 | 34% |
| Evansville | Asian-LA | 12 | 67% |
| | Asian-Math | 12 | 75% |
| South Bend | Asian-LA | 14 | 64% |
| | Asian-Math | 14 | 86% |
| Vigo County | Asian –LA | 13 | 92% |
| | Asian-Math | 13 | 77% |
| Evansville | Hispanic-LA | 13 | 62% |
| | Hispanic-Math | 13 | 54% |
| South Bend | Hispanic-LA | 184 | 47% |
| | Hispanic-Math | 184 | 54% |
| Vigo County | Hispanic-LA | Not Reported | Not Reported |
| | Hispanic-Math | Not Reported | Not Reported |
| Evansville | White-LA | 1387 | 69% |
| | White-Math | 1387 | 66% |
| South Bend | White-LA | 688 | 71% |
| | White-Math | 688 | 78% |
| Vigo County | White-LA | 1128 | 70% |
| | White-Math | 1128 | 70% |

**Considerations:**

1. The numbers of students in each ethnic group varied considerably among the four school corporations. It can also be argued that if one compares specific sub-groups residing in different communities, it is difficult to make generalizations about achievement without describing the specific attributes of the population.
2. If other school settings give evidence of higher levels of achievement, it is important to understand how and why they achieved those results. This consideration is related to the concept of benchmarking referenced later in this paper.

Another demographic dynamic shared by the three school districts of the county is the percentage of children from backgrounds of poverty. This is reported on the ASAP website as free and reduced lunch statistics. The information for the three districts is summarized in Table 1.4 and Table 1.5.

**Table 1.4: Free Lunch 2004-05**

| | Lafayette School Corporation | West Lafayette Community Schools | Tippecanoe School Corporation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Free | 41% | 7% | 18% |
| Reduced | 10% | 3% | 5% |

**Table 1.5: Free Lunches/Textbooks, Percent of Students**

| | Lafayette School Corporation | West Lafayette Community Schools | Tippecanoe School Corporation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1997-98 | 32% | 9% | 14% |
| 2003-04 | 49% | 10% | 22% |

**Considerations:**

1. Increasing numbers of families seek financial support especially in LSC and TSC communities.
2. Consolidation could provide opportunity to continue effective efforts to address the learning needs of economically disadvantaged students.

## Lafayette School Corporation—ISTEP+ Test Scores, Language Arts

| Free/Reduced--Paid | Number Tested | Percent Passing |
|---|---|---|
| Grade 3 F/R | 302 | 60% |
| Grade 3 Paid | 247 | 76% |
| Grade 5 F/R | 307 | 60% |
| Grade 5 Paid | 261 | 75% |
| Grade 6 F/R | 311 | 59% |
| Grade 6 Paid | 279 | 72% |
| Grade 8 F/R | 251 | 51% |
| Grade 8 Paid | 305 | 75% |
| Grade 10 F/R | 155 | 41% |
| Grade 10 Paid | 436 | 67% |

## West Lafayette Community School Corporation—ISTEP+ Test Scores, Language Arts

| Free/Reduced--Paid | Number Tested | Percent Passing |
|---|---|---|
| Grade 3 F/R | 22 | 77% |
| Grade 3 Paid | 106 | 96% |
| Grade 5 F/R | 12 | 83% |
| Grade 5 Paid | 140 | 96% |
| Grade 6 F/R | 17 | 76% |
| Grade 6 Paid | 126 | 97% |
| Grade 8 F/R | 12 | 83% |
| Grade 8 Paid | 157 | 96% |
| Grade 10 F/R | 14 | 57% |
| Grade 10 Paid | 142 | 93% |

**Tippecanoe School Corporation—ISTEP+ Test Scores, Language Arts**

| Free/Reduced--Paid | Number Tested | Percent Passing |
|---|---|---|
| Grade 3 F/R | 231 | 68% |
| Grade 3 Paid | 649 | 85% |
| Grade 5 F/R | 204 | 67% |
| Grade 5 Paid | 639 | 83% |
| Grade 6 F/R | 169 | 51% |
| Grade 6 Paid | 651 | 79% |
| Grade 8 F/R | 201 | 54% |
| Grade 8 Paid | 698 | 77% |
| Grade 10 F/R | 96 | 48% |
| Grade 10 Paid | 589 | 81% |

**Considerations:**

1. Students of poverty in all three districts show lower levels of academic achievement in language arts than their counterparts.
2. The differences in performance tend to grow greater as students advance to higher-grade levels.
3. Though all three districts are showing gains in academic performance among all student groups, the data indicates that achievement, opportunity, and attainment gaps likely exist among some student categories in all three of the county districts.

**Tippecanoe School Corporation—ISTEP+ Test Scores, Mathematics**

| Free/Reduced--Paid | Number Tested | Percent Passing |
|---|---|---|
| Grade 3 F/R | 231 | 65% |
| Grade 3 Paid | 649 | 84% |
| Grade 5 F/R | 204 | 68% |
| Grade 5 Paid | 639 | 83% |
| Grade 6 F/R | 169 | 54% |
| Grade 6 Paid | 651 | 81% |
| Grade 8 F/R | 201 | 61% |
| Grade 8 Paid | 698 | 79% |
| Grade 10 F/R | 96 | 45% |
| Grade 10 Paid | 735 | 81% |

**West Lafayette Community School Corporation—ISTEP+ Test Scores, Mathematics**

| Free/Reduced--Paid | Number Tested | Percent Passing |
|---|---|---|
| Grade 3 F/R | 22 | 68% |
| Grade 3 Paid | 106 | 91% |
| Grade 5 F/R | 12 | 83% |
| Grade 5 Paid | 140 | 96% |
| Grade 6 F/R | 17 | 82% |
| Grade 6 Paid | 126 | 94% |
| Grade 8 F/R | 12 | 83% |
| Grade 8 Paid | 157 | 96% |
| Grade 10 F/R | 14 | 71% |
| Grade 10 Paid | 142 | 95% |

**Lafayette School Corporation—ISTEP+ Test Scores, Mathematics**

| Free/Reduced--Paid | Number Tested | Percent Passing |
|---|---|---|
| Grade 3 F/R | 302 | 54% |
| Grade 3 Paid | 247 | 70% |
| Grade 5 F/R | 307 | 60% |
| Grade 5 Paid | 261 | 77% |
| Grade 6 F/R | 311 | 60% |
| Grade 6 Paid | 279 | 78% |
| Grade 8 F/R | 251 | 56% |
| Grade 8 Paid | 305 | 78% |
| Grade 10 F/R | 155 | 40% |
| Grade 10 Paid | 436 | 69% |

**Considerations:**

1. Students of poverty in all three districts show lower levels of academic achievement in mathematics than their counterparts.
2. The differences in performance grow greater as students advance to higher-grade levels. While gains have been shown, they are more pronounced at the lower grade levels.
3. Though all three districts are showing gains in academic performance among all student groups, the data indicates that achievement, opportunity, and attainment gaps likely exist among some student categories in all three of the county districts.

| School Corporations, 2004-2005 | Free/Reduced- Number/Percent Passing | Paid- Number/Percent Passing |
|---|---|---|
| Evansville-LA | 934/47% | 856/80% |
| Math | 934/43% | 856/78% |
| South Bend-LA | 990/45% | 540/75% |
| Math | 990/55% | 540/55% |
| Vigo County-LA | 586/54% | 7209/78% |
| Math | 586/54% | 720/78% |

The researcher examined documents presented as curricula by district personnel. These included framework documents, curriculum guides, course descriptions, and school improvement plans.

**Considerations:**

1. All three districts have in place a similar curriculum development and management plan, which establishes guidelines and procedures for aligning content with Indiana standards, adoption of text material, and the implementation of instruction.
2. Though the curriculum review plan fulfills the intent of district leadership and outlines cyclical curriculum examination for the purposeful upgrade of curriculum, overall program evaluation and alignment of assessment practices are absent.
3. A method for understanding how consolidation and collaboration could work in the context of curriculum and instruction is to create improvement premised on a comparison with higher performing school entities. Although the use of comparative data has been in use for several years, benchmarking, as we understand it today was developed in the 1980's. This concept is important both conceptually and practically as it can be used to improve administrative processes as well as instructional models. It is an ongoing, systematic process for measuring and comparing your work with the processes of another. The goal of benchmarking is to provide an external standard for measuring and understanding the quality and cost of internal activities, and to help identify where improvement can be gained. Leibfried and McNair, 1992, describe benchmarking as analogous to the human learning process, and it has been described as teaching an institution how to improve. It asks the questions:
    a. How well are we doing compared to others?
    b. How good do we want to be?
    c. Who is doing it best?
    d. How do they do it?
    e. How can we adapt what they do to our institution?
    f. How can we be better than the best? (Kempner, 1993)

With the passage of Public Law 221 and No Child Left Behind, the achievement gap for special populations of students has required school systems to change the way they instruct, monitor, and measure the academic growth of these students. Table 1.6 shows the changes in special needs students for the three districts.

**Table 1.6: Special Education, Percent (1997-98 through 2004-05)**

| | Lafayette School Corporation | West Lafayette Community Schools | Tippecanoe School Corporation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1997-98 | 20.2% | 10.9% | 12.9% |
| 2004-05 | 23.1% | 13.2% | 15.7% |

**Lafayette School Corporation—ISTEP+ Test Scores, Language Arts**

| Special Needs/General Ed | Number Tested | Percent Passing |
|---|---|---|
| Grade 3 Sp Ed | 125 | 42% |
| Grade 3 Gen Ed | 424 | 75% |
| Grade 5 Sp Ed | 117 | 38% |
| Grade 5 Gen Ed | 451 | 74% |
| Grade 6 Sp Ed | 105 | 29% |
| Grade 6 Gen Ed | 485 | 73% |
| Grade 8 Sp Ed | 98 | 29% |
| Grade 8 Gen Ed | 458 | 72% |
| Grade 10 Sp Ed | 94 | 22% |
| Grade 10 Gen Ed | 497 | 67% |

## Tippecanoe School Corporation—ISTEP+ Test Scores, Language Arts

| Special Needs/General Ed | Number Tested | Percent Passing |
|---|---|---|
| Grade 3 Sp Ed | 123 | 52% |
| Grade 3 Gen Ed | 757 | 85% |
| Grade 5 Sp Ed | 124 | 39% |
| Grade 5 Gen Ed | 719 | 86% |
| Grade 6 Sp Ed | 114 | 34% |
| Grade 6 Gen Ed | 706 | 79% |
| Grade 8 Sp Ed | 104 | 28% |
| Grade 8 Gen Ed | 795 | 78% |
| Grade 10 Sp Ed | 84 | 31% |
| Grade 10 Gen Ed | 747 | 82% |

## West Lafayette Community School Corporation—ISTEP+ Test Scores, Language Arts

| Special Needs/General Ed | Number Tested | Percent Passing |
|---|---|---|
| Grade 3 Sp Ed | 17 | 82% |
| Grade 3 Gen Ed | 111 | 95% |
| Grade 5 Sp Ed | 13 | 85% |
| Grade 5 Gen Ed | 139 | 96% |
| Grade 6 Sp Ed | 15 | 80% |
| Grade 6 Gen Ed | 128 | 96% |
| Grade 8 Sp Ed | 15 | 60% |
| Grade 8 Gen Ed | 154 | 98% |
| Grade 10 Sp Ed | 13 | 69% |
| Grade 10 Gen Ed | 143 | 92% |

## West Lafayette Community School Corporation—ISTEP+ Test Scores, Mathematics

| Special Needs/General Ed | Number Tested | Percent Passing |
|---|---|---|
| Grade 3 Sp Ed | 17 | 71% |
| Grade 3 Gen Ed | 111 | 89% |
| Grade 5 Sp Ed | 13 | 92% |
| Grade 5 Gen Ed | 139 | 96% |
| Grade 6 Sp Ed | 15 | 67% |
| Grade 6 Gen Ed | 128 | 95% |
| Grade 8 Sp Ed | 15 | 67% |
| Grade 8 Gen Ed | 154 | 98% |
| Grade 10 Sp Ed | 13 | 69% |
| Grade 10 Gen Ed | 143 | 95% |

## Lafayette School Corporation—ISTEP+ Test Scores, Mathematics

| Special Needs/General Ed | Number Tested | Percent Passing |
|---|---|---|
| Grade 3 Sp Ed | 125 | 42% |
| Grade 3 Gen Ed | 424 | 67% |
| Grade 5 Sp Ed | 117 | 48% |
| Grade 5 Gen Ed | 451 | 73% |
| Grade 6 Sp Ed | 105 | 31% |
| Grade 6 Gen Ed | 485 | 77% |
| Grade 8 Sp Ed | 98 | 29% |
| Grade 8 Gen Ed | 458 | 76% |
| Grade 10 Sp Ed | 94 | 27% |
| Grade 10 Gen Ed | 497 | 68% |

**Tippecanoe School Corporation—ISTEP+ Test Scores, Mathematics**

| Special Needs/General Ed | Number Tested | Percent Passing |
|---|---|---|
| Grade 3 Sp Ed | 123 | 56% |
| Grade 3 Gen Ed | 757 | 83% |
| Grade 5 Sp Ed | 124 | 48% |
| Grade 5 Gen Ed | 719 | 85% |
| Grade 6 Sp Ed | 114 | 37% |
| Grade 6 Gen Ed | 706 | 81% |
| Grade 8 Sp Ed | 104 | 37% |
| Grade 8 Gen Ed | 795 | 80% |
| Grade 10 Sp Ed | 84 | 35% |
| Grade 10 Gen Ed | 747 | 82% |

**Considerations:**

1. Special needs students in all three districts show lower levels of academic achievement in language arts and math than their counterparts.
2. The differences in performance grow greater as students advance to higher-grade levels. While gains have been shown, they are more pronounced at the lower grade levels.
3. Though all three districts are showing gains in academic performance among student groups, the data indicates that achievement, opportunity, and attainment gaps likely exist among special need student categories in all three of the county districts.
4. A collaborative school improvement plan for each district, along with IEP interventions and assessments, might have a focus to improve the performance of special needs students at risk of failure. The percentage of students identified as special needs has increased for all three systems.

There is likely to be persistent and consistent growth of the special needs population for all three school districts. It is also apparent in reviewing the individual school improvement plans for the three districts that their focus is on addressing the needs of learners who have special needs, come from a condition of poverty, or have English language needs.

LSC has seen the greatest change in student demographics that impact program offering and has nearly the same amount of dollars expended per pupil and percentage of increase as WLCSC. Both LSC and WLCSC have experienced a drop in student enrollment during this period. TSC has experienced significant gains in student enrollment (see Table 1.8) as well as some increase in the percentage of students who have special or programmatic intervention needs.

**Table 1.8: Enrollment, 1995-96 to 2004-05**

| | Lafayette School Corporation | West Lafayette Community Schools | Tippecanoe School Corporation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1995-96 | 7,555 | 2,149 | 8,522 |
| 2004-05 | 7,137 | 1,994 | 10,589 |

### Student Transfers

District personnel in all three systems reported that student transfer is a persistent and supported process among all the schools within the county. It is their opinion that transfers are based on geographic locale, program interest, and overcrowding at some school sites. Some of the areas of program interest or influence include fine arts, science education, and the academy program of LSC. Some adjustments and accommodations in tuition costs have been made to ease the impact of the transfer process among the three districts. Students in TSC are permitted to transfer to other school sites in the county at no charge. This circumstance is in response to increasing numbers in the already crowded school settings.

Also noted is the student migration data for the 2003-04 to 2004-05 school years as reported by the IDOE for WLCSC which indicated 19 pupils to LSC and 22 to TSC, with 14 from LSC and 36 from TSC. Lafayette School Corporation figures for the same period indicated 24 pupils to Benton Community Schools, 23 to Delphi Community Schools, 356 to TSC, and 14 to WLCSC. During the same period LSC received 22 pupils from Benton Community Schools; 11 from Delphi; 16 from

Frankfort; 15 from Southeast Fountain; 199 from TSC; 19 from WLCSC; 18 from Twin Lakes; 28 from the Diocese of Lafayette; and 17 from Lutheran Schools of Indiana. Tippecanoe School Corporation sent 30 pupils to Benton Community Schools; 16 to Delphi; 11 to Clinton Prairie; 12 to Rossville; 12 to Attica; 199 to LSC; 36 to WLCSC; and, 12 to Frontier School Corporation. TSC received 13 from Benton; 17 from Delphi; 12 from Clinton Prairie; 10 from Frankfort; 12 from Attica; 356 from LSC; 22 from WLCSC; 12 from North White; 14 from Frontier; 25 from the Diocese of Lafayette; and, 17 from Lutheran Schools of Indiana.

**Course Offering**

A review of course offerings available in the three school corporations that make up Tippecanoe County found few differences in overall academic opportunity for area students. Guidance and Counseling Services are designed to assist students in various ways, including: academic planning, personal counseling, career interest, and vocational and college choice. Indiana Department of Education graduation requirements are different for each class, and schools follow the prescribed curriculum guidelines. The three school corporations have provisions for dual credit, student internships, cooperative, audited classes, class rank, class standing, grade point averaging, honor roll, and academic recognition.

The area high schools provide traditional course offerings that for the most part are similar in content and delivery. West Lafayette High School offers AP courses in Calculus AB, Computer Science, Chemistry, English Literature and Composition, Physics, Spanish Language, French Language, and German Language. The Business Technology Education Department offers course opportunity in accounting, computer applications, business related topics, and computer applications. Course options in Family and Consumer Science include: child development, consumerism, nutrition, housing, personal and human development, textiles and fashion, and, life and career orientation. The Fine Arts curriculum includes music course options: band, chorus, theory, composition, history, orchestra, electronic, and, appreciation. Visual Arts course options include: two-dimensional, ceramics, painting, and media. Health Education courses meet state graduation requirements. Language Arts courses include basic English, Honors, English Literature, American Literature, Composition, and Advanced Placement. Elective courses include Biblical, Film, World, and Contemporary Literature, ENL, Debate, Etymology, Journalism, Mass Media, Novels, Short Stories, Speech, journalism, student publication, and Poetry. The Mathematics curriculum includes levels of courses in: Algebra, Geometry, Pre-Calculus, Calculus, Probability and Statistics, Discrete Math, Honors, and optional Purdue University math courses. Multidisciplinary courses are offered to support special needs, cadet teaching, and AP Computer Science. Physical Education courses are offered to meet state requirements and elective options are available. Science courses include levels and options in: Biology, Earth/Space, Physics, Chemistry, Honors, and electives. The Department offers Advanced Placement in Chemistry and Physics. Social Studies course offerings include: World History and Civilization, Geography, US History, American Government, Economics, Psychology, and International Relations. Technology

Education courses are designed to engage students in study of designing technology, technological processes, technological devices and systems, and the impact of technology. The school offers an Interdisciplinary Cooperative Education program, and students can enroll in programs of the Wildcat Creek Area Vocational Cooperative. World Language is required for an Academic Honors Diploma, and course offerings include French, Spanish, Latin, and German. Japanese is available at Harrison High School. Services are available to special education students as determined by the case conference committee.

Jefferson High School provides traditional academic studies and academy options that are designed to plan for and connect to post-secondary educational opportunities. Art Departments offering Two-Dimensional Art experiences include art history, art criticism, aesthetics, and production, drawing, painting, printmaking, and media. Three Dimensional Art experiences include levels of ceramics, jewelry, sculpture, and fiber arts. Other options include Visual Design, Computer Graphics, Visual Communication, honors options, and AP Studio Art. Business Technology course offerings include study of: Accounting, Business, Computer Keyboarding, Computer Applications, Finance, Tourism, Marketing, Information Support, and International Business. English department offerings include regular grade level offerings, Occupational Tech Prep courses, intensive, and honors courses. Electives include creative writing, developmental reading, ENL, GQE Remediation, Journalism, student publications, radio-TV, speech, debate, Etymology, and theater arts. Family and Consumer Science course options include courses related to child development, human development, textiles and fashion, nutrition and wellness, adult roles, housing, and a H.E.R.O. Foreign Languages are offered in French, German, Japanese, Russian, and Spanish. The Mathematics Department courses include levels of courses in: Algebra, Geometry, Pre-calculus, Calculus, and Probability and Statistics. Students can enroll in intensive and remedial courses. The Music Department provides for study of: Dance, Band, Electronic Music, Chorus, Applied Music, Chamber Music, history and appreciation, and theory and composition. Physical and Health Education courses meet state requirements and provide elective courses in physical education. Science Department offerings include levels of: Biology, Chemistry, Physics, Earth/Space, Environmental, with honors and advanced placement options, as well as a science research focus with Purdue University. The Social Studies Department includes course offerings in: current studies, economics, law, psychology, peer tutoring, service learning, sociology, US History, US Government, philosophy, global studies, military history, World Geography, and

World History. Honors and advanced placement courses are offered. Services are available to special education students as determined by the case conference committee. Project Lead The Way provides a high school pre-engineering curriculum that incorporates a four-year course sequence with traditional mathematics and science courses in high school. All Project Lead The Way courses may allow the student to earn dual credit from Purdue University.

Both TSC high schools offer programs in Agriscience: Large Animal Science, Small Animal Science, Landscape Management, Agribusiness Management, Plant/Horticulture, and Food Science. Course offerings in Art at Harrison and McCutcheon include two-dimensional offerings: introductory, drawing, photography, painting, and commercial design. Three-dimensional offerings include levels of: introductory, ceramics, sculpture, and fiber forms. Advanced art studies and advanced placement options are available. Business Department studies include business content related to: accounting, finance, keyboarding, business, computer applications, management, business cooperative, and I.C.E. In addition to the state-required curriculum offerings at each grade level, the English Department offers courses in: Mythology, Speech, Film Literature and History, Public Relations, mass media, student publications, independent reading, theater, novels, and creative writing. Basic, academic, honors, and advanced placement courses are available to students. Family and Consumer Science course offerings include: child development, nutrition, textiles, housing, foods, OLC, life and careers, and interpersonal relationships. Foreign Language course offerings include levels of: Spanish, French, German, and Japanese. Program offerings in this discipline include advanced levels, honors, and advanced placement options. The Mathematics Department offers levels of courses in: Algebra, Geometry, pre-calculus, Probability and Statistics, and Calculus. Intensive math courses, math labs, Advanced Placement, and honors options are available for students. Fine arts curriculum is offered in performing arts areas that include beginning and advanced options in: band, chorus, music theory, dance, and theater. The Physical Education and Health Education curriculums meet requirements set forth by the Indiana Department of Education and provide electives in: conditioning, team sports, water, and games. Science Departments in the two TSC high schools provide for the following course options at regular, honors, and advanced placement levels: Biology, Physics, Chemistry, Anatomy, Genetics, Ecological Life Science, and Earth/Space Science. The Social Studies Department offers course options at regular and honors placement levels in: US History, Government, World History, Economics, World War II, Geography, Psychology, Sociology, Anthropology, World Geography, and World History. Special services are available to special education students as determined by the case conference committee in English, mathematics, science, social studies, as well as skill

development in reading and personal growth. Career and Technology options include the Agriscience program at both TSC high schools, as well as courses in systems and processes related to: transportation, construction, computer design, management, design processes, and communication. Furthermore, McCutcheon High School also provides additional vocational options in automotive, agricultural science, graphic arts, I.C.E., and agricultural mechanics.

**Considerations:**

1. Indiana Department of Education course requirements are satisfied in the three school corporations.
2. Offerings at each high school for honors and advanced placement courses are similar and consistent among all program sites.
3. Based on individual needs of students and credentials of faculty, there are differences between the high schools in offering remedial courses, alternative courses, electives, intensive learning opportunities, and experiential learning opportunities. This is a similar circumstance to other school settings, for example, in Vigo County and Evansville Community Schools.
4. The Jefferson Academies is a program format unique to that school setting.
5. The differences in course offerings and access are not significant impediments to existing collaboration or consideration of a consolidated model.
6. Student enrollment numbers for all areas of the curriculum are adequate to strong, with some courses lower enrollments indicating the impact of specialized or advanced levels of study.

**Wildcat Creek Career Cooperative Programs**

School districts in Tippecanoe County are members of the Wildcat Creek Career Cooperative Program. This is an educational program shared with school settings in Clinton and Benton counties. Students must apply for enrollment in WCCC programs. Access and content are not issues that consolidation would be expected to impact. Wildcat Creek Career Cooperative includes eight school corporations with nine high schools within Benton, Clinton, and Tippecanoe counties. Tippecanoe School Corporation serves as the LEA for the cooperative and provides for the director of the cooperative. The cooperative is directed by a governing board composed of the superintendent or designee from each of the eight school corporations. That group selects the career and technical education director and meets on a monthly basis to give direction to the director. Students from any of the schools in the cooperative can attend classes at any of the other eight high schools within the cooperative and may also attend post-secondary career and technical education classes at Ivy Tech Community College and Purdue University. A budget is developed by the career and technical education director and approved by the governing board. Each school is assessed a portion of the budget based on assessed value of each school corporation and the average daily membership (ADM) of each school corporation.

Money is generated by career and technical education enrollment of students from two sources: Perkins dollars and additional pupil count funds. Those students who are enrolled in classes that are preparing them for jobs that are in high demand and will generate a high wage qualify for $450 per period. Students enrolled in classes preparing them for jobs that are low paying and have low demand generate only $300 per period. The figures for each of the school corporations in Tippecanoe County are tabled below.

| School Corporation | # Of Career and Technical Education Students | Perkins Funds | Additional Per Pupil Count Funds | Cost to belong to WCCC | Net Financial Benefit |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lafayette | 1319 | $91,570.00 | $587,700.00 | $46,786.13 | $632,483.87 |
| Tippecanoe | 1690 | $93,351.00 | $754,225.00 | $69,302.87 | $778,273.13 |
| West Lafayette | 59 | $15,974.00 | $7,650.00 | $4,734.03 | $18,889.97 |
| **Total** | 3,068 | $200,895.00 | $1,349,575.00 | $120,823.03 | $1,429,646.97 |

These figures indicate that over 3,000 students were enrolled in career and technical education classes in the fall of 2006. These students generated over $1.5 million to the three school corporations. It also indicates the cost to each school corporation to pay their portion of the WCCC budget. By adding the dollars generated by Perkins and the additional pupil count dollars, then subtracting the cost to belong to the cooperative, you get the dollars generated by these students enrollment in career and technical education classes.

The director of WCCC reported that he visits member high schools as many as twenty to twenty-five times per year. He frequently visits with counselors at each of these sites, stays in less frequent contact with each of the principals, and visits each of the faculty at least one time per year in their classroom area.

**Considerations:**

It is likely that consolidation would not have an impact on program delivery for WCCC. Currently, a major limiting factor is when there is a different master schedule; for instance, Lafayette Jefferson has a block schedule, a format different than the traditional seven period schedules in place at the

other schools. Another complication occurs when some school sites begin their academic day at 7:30 a.m. and others at 8:30 a.m. This is a circumstance that might be alleviated by consolidation. Another concern is the possibility that with an increased expectation on student completion of Core 40 and Academic Honors diplomas, students will have fewer elective periods that will result in a reduced number seeking career and technical education programs. Student travel distance to access programs is not an issue.

There are examples of how collaboration among members of the governing board with the director resulted in program changes. For example, the addition of Project Lead the Way occurred as the result of survey results that indicated an increased need for engineers. Another area of program growth is the need to expand the training and development of health care professionals. These conditions might be eased through consolidation. Another area of existing collaboration is occasional staff development activities designed to meet the needs of teachers within all school corporations in the cooperative.

**Considerations:**

1. The implications of projected labor needs and vocational education create potential opportunity for collaborative planning and program delivery among the three schools districts and WCCC.
2. Continuing gains related to career and vocational education may be enhanced if collaborative efforts are made to imbed curricular and instructional focus in school-based programs. Lewin (1984) suggests that "in order for elementary and secondary education to meet future labor market conditions, strong general skills to enhance versatility and the ability to benefit from further training should be stressed…. planners should develop a system of recurrent education that would take place in a "recurring pattern with work and leisure."
3. In a similar vein, Dyrenfurth (1984) and Lemons (1984) have each described models for providing pre-technology or technological literacy education. Dyrenfurth's model recommends engaging the school, public, and private sectors in efforts to address three stages of technological literacy; first order, awareness of all technology; second-order, awareness and exploration of a subset of technologies; and, third-order, exploration, pre-specialization, and preparation in a component of a subset of technology. He goes on to state that first order should be incorporated into existing elementary, junior high, and middle school curricula. Second-order can be infused into middle and secondary social studies, industrial arts, family and consumer science, and practical arts curricula.
4. David Thornberg, in a monograph published by ASCD titled, "The New Basics: Education and the Future of Work in the Telematic Age," interprets the needs of the today's learner as preparing for the *Knowledge-Value Era* (Taichi Sakaiya, 1991). He notes that, "the intellect and application of ideas are what drive the current economy…The real value workers bring to their jobs lies in their knowledge and creativity"(p. 31). Innovative and exploratory learning opportunities are an area of potential collaborative development within the three districts. He goes on to state, "The shift to a knowledge-value economy makes globalization attractive not because it reduces costs, but because it expands opportunity…(p. 70)." In the *Learning Plan* report published by WLCSC in April

of 2004, the task force members suggested, “Our greatest challenge is producing persons who practice “Global Citizenship” (that is), respect for cultural and ethnic differences, understanding global and societal issues in their proper context, and engaging students in how one lives as a good citizen in the global context (p. 87). This curricular emphasis and interest are best understood as a “community” disposition or capacity, a collaborative engagement, rather than a building specific. Thornberg states that, “When thinking about schools in the 21st century, two fundamental characteristics come to mind: that learning is contextual; and that school is a process, not a place (p. 92).” The university, community, business, and cultural context of the Tippecanoe County public school educational setting provide rich resource and community to compete with other progressive districts that successfully engage low achieving learners and very bright learners.

Thornberg also states, “The existence of standards doesn’t mean that new ideas can’t spring into popular acceptance.”

### Ivy Tech Community College Program Offerings

Students enrolled in WCCC can begin coursework that can apply to the completion of a certificate or associate degree program at Ivy Tech Community College. Programs include Automotive Service Technology, Health Occupations, Heating and Air Conditioning Technology, Manufacturing Design Technology, and Welding Technology.

Another source of information about the educational programs in each of the districts is related to the number of students seeking post high school educational opportunities. TSC and LSC have extended ITCC offerings to students outside the vocational area.

### Jefferson Academies

An article by Gary Burnett addressed the value of career academies as a “school restructuring tool” to help cut dropout rates, improve student performance, and to equip students to face the complexities of future employment. He indicates that these academies share a number of attributes that are both collaborative in nature and systemic in program orientation:

- Are organized as schools-within-schools
- Recruit students to volunteer for the program
- Focus on broadly-defined career themes
- Choose career themes with growing demands and good employment opportunities
- Integrate academic and vocational curricula
- Eliminate tracking
- Make work experience a component of the educational process
- Sustained by high levels of involvement by local businesses
- Receive significant outside funding

He goes on to note that one of their strongest features is their curricular and pedagogical coordination. Its academic and vocational integration not only prepares students for college as well as careers, but its small size allows for collaboration between teachers. It allows the "creation of strong career development programs" and "also generates consistently high expectations for student success" (Archer, Weinbaum, & Montesano, 1989).

The Jefferson Academies were developed to support student connections to post-secondary educational planning, attendance in post-secondary educational settings, opportunities to complete college credits simultaneously with high school credits, with a focus on guidance and advising throughout high school. The academy options include: Arts and Communication, Business and Technology, Life-Centered, Political and Social Sciences, and, Science and Mathematics.

In an article titled, "Magnet Schools," Amy Klauke notes that magnet programs are "proving to be successful in serving specific interests and abilities of a diverse student population." Magnets attract students and parents by creating supportive, personal environments while placing high expectations on student potential and progress. Studies show that magnets improve minority achievement without hurting white achievement. Denis Doyle and Marsha Levine (1984) report that student attendance and participation are higher in magnet schools, as are teacher satisfaction and parental control. These results allow magnet schools to challenge the assumption that standardization is the most equitable system. Metz (1986) advises that to remain viable, magnets must not be seen as temporary or experimental, but must participate in a mutually beneficial relationship with the regular schools. Magnets must appear attractive but not elitist by appealing to interest rather than ability. They must appear diverse but not second-rate by proving sound criteria and objectives. They must develop in students the ability to work cooperatively with persons of different backgrounds and skills and the ability to take responsibility for their own progress in learning. Magnets must respond to constituent needs—welcoming continual parent, community, teacher, and student input in design and direction. They must locate in neutral neighborhoods and avoid situations that indirectly discriminate. The Hillsborough County school system in Tampa, Florida, defines their magnet program as one based on "unique instructional strategies at each magnet school emphasize integrated curriculum supported by technology-rich environments and learner-centered educational communities." Students are enabled to construct meaning through concept scaffolding, Cooperative Learning, based on recognition of learning styles and multiple intelligences. The following characteristics define the research-based, experiential, technologically rich environment of their magnet programs:

- ✓ Small learning community
- ✓ Rigorous and relevant integrated curriculum
- ✓ Co-teaching model
- ✓ Technology-rich environment
- ✓ Thematically focused, project-based education
- ✓ Compacted accelerated curriculum

## Comparative Performance Data for High Schools

### Table 1.10: Graduates Pursuing College Education, Percentage

| | Tippecanoe School Corporation | West Lafayette Community School Corporation | Lafayette School Corporation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2001-2002 | 67.8% | 94.5% | 74.8% |
| 2002-2003 | 81.6% | 93.4% | 75.7% |
| 2003-2004 | 76.5% | 93.8% | Revised data |

The data indicates a higher level of college interest and preparation among students of WLCSC. Based on current curriculum and support services in each of the high schools, transfer rates in each of the school districts, vocational educational programs, consolidation would not likely impact students' selection of college bound educational programs.

### Scholastic Aptitude Test Scores, U.S., Indiana and Tippecanoe County

| | U.S | Indiana | West Lafayette | Lafayette | Tippecanoe |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2002-2003 | 1,026 | 1,004 | 1,206 | 1,039 | 1,042 |
| 2003-2004 | 1,026 | 1,007 | 1,165 | 1,032 | 1,056 |
| 2004-2005 | 1,028 | 1,012 | 1,200 | 1,038 | 1,061 |

All three districts score above national and state averages with LSC and TSC scoring similarly and WLCSC showing higher scores.

**Scholastic Aptitude Test Scores, U.S., Indiana and Tippecanoe County, Mathematics**

| | U.S | Indiana | West Lafayette | Lafayette | Tippecanoe |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2001-2002 | 516.0 | 503.0 | 609 | 508 | 530 |
| 2002-2003 | 519.0 | 504.0 | 617 | 516 | 530 |
| 2003-2004 | 518.0 | 506.0 | 602 | 513 | 539 |

**SAT Scores, U.S., Indiana and Tippecanoe County, Mathematics (GPA = A)**

| | U.S | Indiana | West Lafayette | Lafayette | Tippecanoe |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2001-2002 | 577.0 | 576.0 | 674 | 571 | 592 |
| 2002-2003 | 577.0 | 574.0 | 677 | 579 | 599 |
| 2003-2004 | 573.0 | 572.0 | 684 | 571 | 609 |

**SAT Scores, U.S., Indiana and Tippecanoe County, Verbal**

| | U.S | Indiana | West Lafayette | Lafayette | Tippecanoe |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2001-2002 | 504.0 | 498.0 | 570 | 506 | 509 |
| 2002-2003 | 507.0 | 500.0 | 589 | 523 | 512 |
| 2003-2004 | 508.0 | 501.0 | 563 | 519 | 517 |

**SAT Scores, U.S., Indiana and Tippecanoe County, Verbal (GPA = A)**

| | U.S | Indiana | West Lafayette | Lafayette | Tippecanoe |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2001-2002 | 561 | 561 | 570 | 570 | 509 |
| 2002-2003 | 561 | 560 | 589 | 571 | 512 |
| 2003-2004 | 560 | 560 | 563 | 570 | 517 |

**Considerations:**

1. Collaborative work could be done to support an International Baccalaureate program at the elementary, middle and high school levels in the community. The International Baccalaureate Diploma is building specific. It is administered by a not-for-profit organization based in Geneva, Switzerland. Information provided by the Minnesota Office of Higher Education noted that in 2003-2004, 1,220 students took 2,734 IB exams. Students receive a certificate for the successful passing of an exam. Of the number of students reported on in Minnesota, a total of 237 low-income

students took 475 exams. IB Diplomas were earned by 110 students, which mean these students took six or more exams, completed a 4,000-word essay, and did 150 hours of creativity, action, and community service. Students qualify for the IB Diploma by pursuing a college-level curriculum including six subject areas. The students' achievement level in each subject area is monitored by both their teachers (internal assessment) and examiners from around the world (external assessment). There are fourteen IB high schools in Indiana.

2. Collaborative efforts could include community efforts to increase the number and diversity of students enrolled in postsecondary courses. The report titled, "Dual Enrollment of High School Students at Postsecondary Institutions: 2002-2003," found that more than half of all colleges and universities in the nation enrolled high school students in courses for college credit during the 2002-2003 academic year, which translates into about 813,000 or about 5% of high school students. A second report, "Dual-Credit and Exam-Based Courses in US Public High Schools: 2002-03," found that 71 percent of public high schools offered programs in which students earned credit at both high school and college for the same course. In addition, 67 percent of public high schools offered
3. Advanced Placement courses, while 2 percent offered IB courses. "These two studies provide further credible evidence that we need to do all we can to ensure that all students, and especially
4. those who need our help most, have more opportunities to further their education after high school," Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings stated.
5. Advanced Placement courses that are offered in the county high schools include classes in Calculus AB, Computer Science, Chemistry, English Literature and Composition, Physics, Spanish Language (IV), and French Language (IV). The high schools recognize pre-high school credit for students in Algebra I: Honors and Algebra I.
6. The area high schools provide students with the appropriate diploma options defined by the Indiana Department of Education.

**Comparative Performance Data for High Schools, 2004-2005, Evansville**

| Evansville High Schools | Bosse | Central | Harrison | North | Reitz (Modified Block) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Attendance | 94.6% | 97.0% | 96.3% | 95.8% | 97.6% |
| Graduation | 82% | 96% | 90% | 94% | 96% |
| College % | 56% | 79% | 79% | 81% | 78% |
| Core 40 | 51% | 61% | 57% | 63% | 68% |
| Academic Honors | 27% | 29% | 29% | 32% | 32% |
| 12th-SAT | 25% | 35% | 53% | 52% | 43% |
| SAT Avg. | 1016 | 1045 | 981 | 1020 | 1008 |
| AP Scores 3,4,5 | 7% | 40% | 75% | 16% | 44% |
| Take AP (11/12) | 4% | 7% | 1% | 16% | 11% |
| Enrollment | 844 | 1354 | 1451 | 1451 | 1410 |

## Comparative Performance Data for High Schools, 2004-2005, Vigo County

| Vigo County (Trimester) | North High | South High |
|---|---|---|
| Attendance | 94.9% | 95.6% |
| Graduation | 98% | 98% |
| College % | 84% | 90% |
| Core 40 | 66% | 68% |
| Academic Honors | 25% | 26% |
| 12th-SAT | 52% | 57% |
| SAT Avg. | 1034 | 1009 |
| AP Scores 3,4,5 | 39% | 74% |
| Take AP (11/12) | 11% | 18% |
| Enrollment | 2074 | 1787 |

## Comparative Performance Data for High Schools, 2004-2005, South Bend

| South Bend | Adams | Clay | Riley | Washington |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Attendance | 90.2% | 91.5% | 87.2% | 87.3% |
| Graduation | 88% | 98% | 97% | 96% |
| College % | 66% | 72% | 66% | 75% |
| Core 40 | 57% | 61% | 53% | 55% |
| Academic Honors | 16% | 24% | 15% | 17% |
| 12th-SAT | 56% | 55% | 64% | 52% |
| SAT Avg. | 983 | 1048 | 944 | 915 |
| AP Scores 3,4,5 | 46% | 47% | 53% | 7% |
| Take AP (11/12) | 10% | 6% | 5% | 5% |
| Enrollment | 1547 | 1574 | 1520 | 1573 |

**Comparative Performance Data for High Schools, 2004-2005, Tippecanoe County**

| Tippecanoe County | Harrison | Jefferson | McCutcheon | West Lafayette |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Attendance | 97.7% | 95.4% | 96.6% | 96.7% |
| Graduation | 94% | 77% | 89% | 98% |
| College % | 82% | 84% | 62% | 97% |
| Core 40 | 66% | 59% | 65% | 93% |
| Academic Honors | 31% | 29% | 30% | 51% |
| 12th-SAT | 65% | 50% | 54% | 94% |
| SAT Avg. | 1088 | 1038 | 1026 | 1200 |
| AP Scores 3,4,5 | 88% | 65% | 43% | 84% |
| Take AP (11/12) | 12% | 8% | 5% | 29% |
| Enrollment | 1539 | 1981 | 1505 | 1007 |

**Considerations:**

1. In the Executive Summary of "High School Graduation Rates in the United States," Dr. J.P. Greene, Senior Fellow of The Manhattan Institute for Policy Research, reports the following findings:
   - The national graduation rate for the class of 1998 was 71%. For White students the rate was 78%, while it was 56% for African-American students and 54% for Latino students.
   - The National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) finds a national high school completion rate of 86% for the class of 1998. The discrepancy between the NCES' findings and this report's finding of 71% rate is largely caused by NCES' counting of General Educational Development (GED) graduates and others with alternative credentials as high school graduates, and by its reliance on a methodology that is likely to undercount dropouts.
   - "Given the strength of the relationship between high school graduation and students' life prospects, graduation rates are at least as important as test scores in assessing the performance of our school system…. The way in which those statistics are calculated and how they should be interpreted is often opaque to the trained researcher, let alone the general public (p. 11)."
   - Graduation rates in the comparison group schools range from 77% reported for Lafayette Jefferson to the 98% reported for North and South Vigo, and Clay High School in South Bend. It is not possible to compare among these school districts unless one understands how the statistic was calculated and how this should be interpreted. For example, in the report cited above Dr. J.P. Greene looked at four types of statistics that can be reported and

provide insight into actual performance levels of all students. The four statistics reported are: event dropout rates (given year), status dropout rates (not currently enrolled), high school completion rates, and promoting power rates (ratio of the number of students in certain grade to the number that graduate when expected).

- ACT report of December 2003 predicted, "The number of public high school graduates (Indiana) is expected to increase to 63,245 in 2017-2018, a 12.6 change over 2001-2002. Nonpublic high school graduates accounted for 6 percent of all Indiana graduates in 1987-1988; by 2001-02 that proportion had increased to 9.1 percent, or 5,651 nonpublic graduates. The number of nonpublic graduates is expected to increase through 2017-18 to approximately 14,500, and their share is projected to double."

2. In October, 2005, 68.6% of high school graduates from the class of 2005 were enrolled in colleges or universities, according to data released by the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics. The college enrollment rate of young women, 70.4 percent, continued to exceed that of young men, 66.5 percent. Asians were more likely than whites, blacks, and Hispanics to be enrolled in college in the fall following their high school graduation.
3. Paul E. Barton, former Director of the Policy Information Center at Educational Testing Service, in a review of work by Mishel and Hoy on graduation rates states, "I think there is good reason to do much more as far as quality controls of this administrative data if it is to be used as an important means for estimating high school graduation."
4. Core 40 and academic honors comparison data are indicators of the level at which students take academic courses. Core 40 data for the schools range from 51% at Bosse High School, to 93% at West Lafayette. Other schools in the comparison group have approximately 66 percent of all students enrolled in the Core 40 program. There is a range of 15 percent (South Bend) to 51 percent (West Lafayette) of students enrolled in academic honors courses. In the comparison group, South Bend schools have lower enrollment levels, while Evansville and Tippecanoe County have similar rates.
5. SAT Test scores averages are highest at West Lafayette (1200). The Tippecanoe County high schools SAT average is higher than their counterparts in Vandeburgh, Vigo, and South Bend.

## Part 2: How would consolidation impact the Greater Lafayette Special Services Cooperative?

The Greater Lafayette Special Services (GLASS) cooperative grew out of consolidation activities that can be traced back to 1973. The rationale was to pool financial resources and to create a shared program delivery model for special needs services and students. The Lafayette School Corporation was identified as the fiscal agent or local educational agent. In the beginning, teachers, school psychologists, speech therapists, occupational and physical therapists were employed and supervised by GLASS regardless of where they were assigned. If they were assigned in LSC (LEA), the building principal assigned supervisory responsibility. In the 1990's, as the community began to experience expansion in the number of programs and students, it was decided that a decentralized model would be a more effective delivery model for services, staffing, and support. As professional staff openings occurred in classrooms that served high incidence

categories of special needs students, the host school corporation (WLCSC, TSC, LSC), hired and placed the teacher or aide. Among students in low incidence categories, GLASS assigns students to appropriate program sites in the three school corporations, staffs and supervises those programs, and transports students. In categories for very severe needs, GLASS is responsible for the staff and support of all day placement provisions. There is a community outpatient mental health center in Lafayette. GLASS assigns a program coordinator, teachers, and aides for that program, and students from all three corporations are enrolled based on the recommendations of the IEP. The Wabash Valley Hospital supports the GLASS all day treatment program for older students in Tippecanoe County as well as other outlying communities. In addition, GLASS supports a special needs alternative education site for students who experience problems in existing educational programs. GLASS is responsible to transport special needs students to the variety of program sites. TSC, LSC, WLCSC school corporations pool money to support the special needs transport system. The three school corporations are required by law to follow GLASS rules and regulations. GLASS professionals provide training and staff development for building level teachers, principals, and staff related to special needs practices and developmental needs of students. Consultants are assigned by GLASS to attend and support annual case conferences, interpret accommodation, as well as support children, families, and professional staff. Their pervasive philosophical orientation for meeting the needs of special needs students, instructional design, and performance accountability is an "inclusive" model for intervention and accommodation. High incidence students generally operate in a full inclusion environment, with aides and teachers working and teaching together with classroom teachers. The responsibility for meeting mandated performance expectations for Annual Yearly Progress and No Child Left Behind, have resulted in a shared perspective of service delivery between GLASS and local school corporations. This is evident in efforts to improve program performance through observation and training in instructional practices that are researched based and have proven ability to improve student performance. An example of this type of personnel and program development is the work of the Blumberg Center for Interdisciplinary Studies, Indiana State University with five different schools in the county.

**Considerations:**

1. By its very nature, GLASS has developed or amended existing collaborative practices in order to meet the organizational, educational, and programmatic requirements of special needs students.
2. Consistent with an earlier premise cited in this report, "considerable money can be saved and educational services can be improved by a practice perfected in the private sector—shared services." The GLASS model for delivery of services has altered since inception in 1973; a prevailing orientation has been the need for shared services and collaboration.

3. Coordinated services can be effectively and efficiently provided across school systems, program differences, schedules, and staffing.

**Part 3: How would consolidation impact the schedules and school calendars for the districts?**

***West Lafayette Community School Corporation***

Each of the three school districts share similarities and differences. WLCSC is made up of Cumberland Elementary School, a K-3 setting of approximately 550 students with 26 classroom teachers; Happy Hollow Elementary School, a 4-6 setting with an enrollment of about 450 students with 21 classroom teachers; and West Lafayette Junior-Senior High School, a 7-12 educational program of about 1,000 students with about 66 assigned faculty (full and part time). The elementary school settings have assigned faculty and support staff consistent with the number of students enrolled. The elementary programs include nurse, school counselor, media center specialist, physical education, art, ENL coordinator, and a technology specialist. Elementary programs share similar emphases including ENL, Title I, Math Bowl, Spell Bowl, D.A.R.E, outdoor education, National Geographic Bee, Spelling Bee, field trips, speakers, and common curriculum enhancers, as well as additional program areas specific to their interests and needs. WLCSC elementary schools have adopted a standardized assessment package that includes ISTEP+; CTBS Terra Nova; K-3 Reading Assessment (Reading Counts); Reading Recovery assessment; Early Screening Inventory-ESI-R (Pre-K for Early Entry); and, CLASSWORKS. The calendar for elementary and the junior-senior high school has the same begin, vacation, and closing dates. The professional development days are the same for the elementary schools, with several exceptions during the spring term at the junior-senior high school. All schools are on a 9-week grading period, and the elementary schools have the same scheduled parent conference dates in both the fall and spring terms. The same snow days are scheduled for all school sites. The instructional day begins at 8:00 AM for the elementary and ends at 3:00 PM. The junior senior high school begins at 8:05 AM and ends at 3:20 PM. Both the elementary and junior-senior educational programs include pre-academic day instructional and remedial programs, for example “Zero Hour” at the junior-senior high school and instrumental music at the elementary school. The junior-senior high school is on an 8-period day with instructional periods of 50 minutes in length, except for first period that is 53 minutes long. West Lafayette Junior-Senior High School participates in ISTEP+ (grades 7-9), Graduation Qualifying Exam GQE (grade 10), Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude and Scholastic Aptitude exams (grades 11-12), Advanced Placement, and Intouch Account (electronic access to

grade reports issued on a quarterly basis). Weighted grades are approved by the educational board but not currently used. The junior-senior high school has an open campus lunch period in periods 5 and 6, scheduled for 100 minutes. The administrative team consists of a 7-12 principal, assistant principal for the junior high program, assistant principal for the high school, a guidance director 7-12, assistant guidance junior high, assistant guidance high school, athletic director 7-12, media specialist 7-12, nurse, food service director, attendance specialist, and a network specialist. The non-certified staff (Secretary to the Principal, Accounts Secretary, Secretary to Assistant Principal, Secretary to High School Guidance, Secretary to Athletic Director, Library Clerk), number six with an additional two persons who serve as network technicians.

**Lafayette School Corporation**

The Lafayette School Corporation reported eight elementary schools, two middle level programs, and a high school. The following table shows the grade levels with approximate enrollment numbers.

| Name of School | Grade Levels | Enrollment |
|---|---|---|
| Earhart | K-5 | 381 |
| Edgelea | K-5 | 488 |
| Durgan | K-5 | 267 |
| Glen Acres | K-5 | 432 |
| Linwood | K-5 | 212 |
| Miami | K-5 | 375 |
| Murdock | K-5 | 205 |
| Oakland | K-5 | 269 |

The school corporation has continued to make changes in the number of schools it operates and the grade level configuration for existing school sites. The instructional day begins at 8:00 AM for the elementary and ends at 2:45 PM. The middle school begins at 8:00 AM and end at 3:10 PM. The LSC elementary schools have adopted multiple programs that may be shared or distinctive

among the schools, some examples include: Title I, STAR Math, STAR Reading, Process Writing format, ELL, Accelerated Math, Accelerated Reader, Mountain Math Program, EXCEL, Open Book, K-Pal, Reading First, Optimize (early reading initiative in full-day K), after school programs, Math Olympics, KELL, Literacy Collaborative, Technology Enables Us, Skills for Life, and Scientifically Based Reading Research (SBRR). The school has adopted an assessment system that includes: ISTEP+, NWEA, Star Math and Reading, K Core Writing Assessment, DIBELS Assessment (K-2), standards based report cards, Accelerated Reading and Math, Otis-Lennon, Woodcock Munoz, and Open Book. Elementary schools within the system share similar program emphases, demographics, school improvement intentions, and professional staffing arrangements. However, individual school sites adopt materials and implement strategies unique to their learner needs such as ELL, exceptional learners, economically disadvantaged and development needs at the pre-school, primary, and intermediate levels. There are two middle schools. Sunnyside is a 6-8 educational setting and has an approximate student enrollment of 675 students with approximately 54 faculty, including practical and fine arts, core subjects; special needs; and specialized course offerings. The educational program includes English as a new language and special needs program for students with disability (emotional; mild; moderate; and learning). The administrative team includes a principal and assistant principal. Sunnyside will house grades 5-6 and Tecumseh 7-8. The Tecumseh educational setting has an approximate student enrollment of 950 students, with about 76 faculty, including practical and fine arts, core subjects, special needs, and specialized course offerings. The administrative team includes a principal, two assistant principals, and a gifted and talented department head. The educational program includes advisor/advisee, basic skills development, special needs (Emotional Disability, Learning Disability, Communication Disorder), and English as a new language. Schools have isolated “power standards” for each grade level. Jefferson High School has developed courses of study for junior and senior students to support “Project Lead the Way.” Areas of study include Aerospace Technology, Biotechnology, Civil Engineering and Architecture, Computer Integrated Manufacturing, Digital electronic Technology, Engineering Design and Development, Introduction to Engineering Design (9-12), and Principles of Engineering (9-12). The Jefferson Academies were developed to provide greater opportunity for an in-depth program of study with high standards and high expectations. The high school uses weighted credit for honors courses, Advanced Placement, IB courses, and approved college level courses.

| | Lafayette School Corporation | West Lafayette Community School Corporation | Tippecanoe School Corporation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Elementary | 8:00 a.m. to 2:45 p.m. | 8:00 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. | 8:35 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. |
| Middle | 8:00 a.m. to 3:10 p.m. | 8:05 a.m. to 3:20 p.m. | 8:35 a.m. to 3:40 p.m. |
| High School | | 8:05 a.m. to 3:20 p.m. | 7:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. |

### Tippecanoe School Corporation

The Tippecanoe School Corporation is made up of the following educational sites and configurations. The elementary programs include regular education, art, music, special education, media specialist, GT/PACE, physical education, counselor, and nurse. The TSC assessment package includes ISTEP+, CTBS, Dibbles, a standards based elementary report card, language assessment skills, Accelerated Reader, and Accelerated Math. Special programs at the elementary level include Title I, ESL, Accelerated Reader, 4 Block Literacy Cooperative, Accelerated Math, 4 Block, Literacy Cooperative, Mountain Math, 6 Trait Writing, Intensive Phonics, and Reading Recovery. Some staff numbers for each school include speech specialist, psychologist, or Title I professionals. There is a principal, and elementary schools have other assigned staff that may include an assistant principal in four schools, secretary, clerical professional, bookkeeper, attendance, at risk tutor, instructional support staff and instructional assistants.

| | Grade Levels | Enrollment | Number of Classroom/Teachers |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Battle Ground** | K-5 | 350 | 17/24 |
| **Burnett Creek (ESL)** | K-5 | 520 | 24/38 |
| **James Cole (Title I)** | K-5 | 300 | 13/22 |
| **Dayton (ESL/Title I)** | K-5 | 520 | 23/34 |
| **Hershey** | K-5 | 743 | 31/46 |
| **Klondike (multi-age; RR; ESL; Title I)** | K-5 | 860 | 41/66 |
| **Mayflower Mill (ESL and Title I)** | K-5 | 682 | 30/46 |
| **Mintonye (GLASS)** | K-5 | 380 | 17/31 |
| **Wea Ridge (Title I, ESL Liaison)** | K-5 | 820 | 34/51 |

There are six middle level sites in the school corporation. The elementary academic day begins at 8:35 AM and ends at 3:30 PM. For most settings, the middle level program begin at 8:35 AM and ends at 3:39 PM. Wainwright Middle School begins at 7:30 AM and ends at 2:30 PM. Schools typically have an eight period day with a homeroom of 18 minutes. In addition to an English class, the middle school program includes a communication class which covers writing, computer skills, and research skills. FAST Math provides an effective supplement to the math curriculum and is scheduled for all middle school students. Wainwright has a homeroom of 28 minutes and 42-minute class periods, with 30 minute lunch sessions. Class periods are 43 minutes in length, with thirty-minute lunch sessions that include special programs. Staffing patterns include a principal, assistant principal at two sites, guidance, GLASS, and enhancement professional. Support staff includes nurse, office assistants, secretary, clerical, and treasurer. The athletic director assigned at East Tipp serves all middle-level programs with part time assistants at each program site.

| | Grade Levels | Enrollment | Number of *Classroom/Teachers |
|---|---|---|---|
| Battle Ground | 06-08 | 400 | 27/31 |
| East Tipp | 06-08 | 425 | 24/27 |
| Klondike | 06-08 | 465 | 29/32 |
| Southwestern | 06-08 | 305 | 21/26 |
| Wainwright | 06-08 | 390 | 24/28 |
| Wea Ridge | 06-08 | 650 | 38/45 |

***Designates grade level team faculty***

The corporation supports two alternative programs for middle level students, the Middle Academy North and Middle Academy South. There are two high schools in the corporation, McCuthcheon and William Henry Harrison. The TSC has developed programs providing senior students the opportunity to attend Ivy Tech Community College full time or take thirty credit hours at Purdue University free of charge. Their academic day begins at 7:30 AM and ends at 2:30 PM. McCuthcheon High School has a principal, two assistant principals, administrative assistant, athletic director, five school counselors, and two media specialists. In addition to core subject areas, fine arts, practical arts, business, foreign language, and career and technology education, the program includes agriculture, ICT, technology, health and substance abuse, ISTEP remediation, and

GLASS. The 9-12 enrollment is about 1620 and there are about 100 professional staff. William Henry Harrison enrolls about 1600 students in grades 9-12. The administrative staff includes a principal, dean, athletic director, student service professional, six counselors, and two media specialists. In addition to core subject areas, fine arts, practical arts, business education, foreign language, there are programs in ICT, health, industrial technology, performing arts, O.L.C, building trades, GLASS, and remediation.

**Considerations:**

1. Sequence of courses, course content, Indiana State Standards, Advanced Placement, dual-credit courses, access to vocational education programs, diploma options, and student support services are similar among all high school settings.
2. Project Lead the Way and Jefferson Academies are unique program offerings within the total curricular format of the three school settings.
3. Middle level programs are varied in organization, program philosophy, size, program offerings, and faculty engagement.
4. There is a variety of grade-level organizational structures in the three school corporations. If a collaborative or consolidated approach is to be considered, it is important that the reasons for the differences in grade-level building assignments be understood. For example, differences could be attributed to enrollment patterns, building design, or program philosophy.

**School Calendar**

A comparison of the school-year calendar identified areas of similarity and difference. Calendars adopted for the 2006-2007 school year were analyzed on a monthly basis. Summer calendars were not considered.

| Monthly Schedule | TSC | WLCSC | LSC |
|---|---|---|---|
| **August 14** | No school, Teachers First Day | Staff All Day Students p.m. only | |
| **August 15** | Students First Full Day | | |
| **August 18** | | | First Teacher Day |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **August 21** | | | First Student Day |
| **September 4** | Labor Day – No School | Labor Day – No School | Labor Day – No School |
| **October 18** | | Elementary Parent Conferences (p.m.) | |
| **October 19** | Elementary Parent Conferences (p.m.) | Elementary Parent Conferences (p.m.) | |
| | Elementary Parent Conferences (p.m.) | | |
| **October 20** | | Fall Break-No School | |
| **October 25** | | | Parent Conferences |
| **October 27** | Fall Break-No School | | Fall Break-No School |
| **October 30** | Fall Break-No School | | |
| **November 23-24** | Thanksgiving Holiday-No School | Thanksgiving Holiday-No School | Thanksgiving Holiday-No School |
| **December 22** | End First Semester | End First Semester | End First Semester |
| **December 23 to January 7** | Winter Break | Winter Break | Winter Break |
| **January 8** | No School-Teacher Work Day | No School-Teacher Work Day | School Resumes |
| **January 9** | School Resumes | School Resumes | |
| **January 15** | | M.L.K Day-No School | M.L.K Day-No School |
| **February 7** | | Professional Day-No Students | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **February 19** | | | President's Day-No School |
| **February 26** | Mid-winter Break-No School | | |
| **March 12** | | Spring Break Begins | |
| **March 15** | K-12 Parent Conferences (p.m.) | | |
| **March 16** | K-12 Parent Conferences (p.m.) | | |
| **March 19** | | School Resumes | |
| **March 24 to April 1st** | Spring Break | | Spring Break |
| **April 5** | | Professional Day-No Students | |
| **April 11-12** | | Elementary Parent Conferences (p.m.) | |
| **May 23** | Last Student Day | | |
| **May 24** | Last teacher Day | | |
| **May 25** | | Last Day | |
| **May 28** | | | Memorial Day-No School |
| **May 29** | | | Last Day |

**Considerations:**

1. Beginning of school year dates are different for each school corporation.
2. Parent conference dates are different for each school corporation.
3. Fall break dates are the same for LSC and TSC; different date for WLCSC.
4. Winter break is the same for all school corporations.
5. Scheduled holidays and professional days are different. WLCSC and LSC are closed for Martin Luther King holiday. LSC is closed for President's Day. TSC takes a mid-winter break. Spring break is the same for TSC and LSC. The last school date is different for each school corporation.
6. The school corporations share a common commitment to parent conference opportunities.
7. The school corporations share similar calendar provisions for nine week, semester, and major vacation dates during the academic year. Spring break for WLCSC is the exception to this pattern and is likely different because of the close programmatic connection to the Purdue University calendar.

8. The different patterns that exist for professional development and the celebration of specific national holidays are both topics that would require dialogue and agreement.

**Part 4: How would extra-curricular programs including athletics be impacted?**

The high schools in Tippecanoe County reside in District 2 of the IHSAA. The following chart contains data provided by the IHSAA and summarizes specific characteristics related to the sports programs at each school. In reality, each school corporation provides varying levels of administrative support based on their unique circumstance, the organization of their schools, job descriptions, and resources.

| | Conference | Staff | Boys Sports | Class | Girls Sports |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Harrison** | Hoosier Crossroads | AD<br>AAD-MS<br>Ath. Sec.<br>Trainer (2) | BA;<br>BB;CC;FB;GO;<br>SO;SW;TE;TR<br>WR | 4A | BB;CC;GO;<br>GY;SO;SB;<br>SW;TE;TR;<br>VB |
| **Lafayette Jefferson** | Hoosier Crossroads | AD<br>Co-AD<br>AAD<br>GSD<br>Ath. Sec.<br>Trainer (2) | BA;<br>BB;CC;FB;GO;<br>SO;SW;TE;TR<br>WR | 4A<br>FB-5A | BB;CC;GO;<br>GY;SO;SB;<br>SW;TE;TR;<br>VB |
| **McCutcheon** | Hoosier Crossroads | AD<br>Ath. Sec.<br>Trainer (1) | BA;<br>BB;CC;FB;GO;<br>SO;SW;TE;TR<br>WR | 4A | BB;CC;GO;<br>GY;SO;SB;<br>SW;TE;TR;<br>VB |
| **West Lafayette** | Hoosier | AD<br>Ath. Sec.<br>Trainer (2) | BA;<br>BB;CC;FB;GO;<br>SO;SW;TE;TR<br>WR | 3A | BB;CC;GO;<br>GY;SO;SB;<br>SW;TE;TR;<br>VB |

The Hoosier Crossroads Conference membership includes six schools in central Indiana: Avon, Brownsburg, Hamilton Southeastern, Noblesville, Westfield, and Zionsville. The Hoosier Conference membership includes six other schools in central Indiana: Benton Central, Delphi, Rensselaer Central, Sheridan, Tipton, and Twin Lakes.

Due to a scheduling conflict, the researcher was not able to meet with all athletic directors, however, participants assured me that their discussion was inclusive of those who could not attend. They have a natural rivalry in athletic competition. They do not share athletic facilities, though they do share some athletic transportation services, and students enroll in some shared academic programs. Middle school programs feed to each high school. Each of the middle school sites has a person who is allotted one hour of release time each day for athletic planning and scheduling, and this individual is responsible for supervision. Due to current responsibilities and scheduled activities, there is not a lot of interaction between middle and high school level personnel. There is much effort to be visible at middle school contests, and schools participate in the high school Field Day activities. The middle school coaching staffs are in charge of their own programs, and continuity with their high school equivalent is difficult. Due to the limited time allocated to the position of athletic director at the middle school, time and collaboration are limited opportunities. TSC did create a fifth administrator; a portion of this individual's responsibility is to support athletics, though this has not gained the anticipated support. Though the student population is growing, McCutcheon High School is located in a land locked site with no place to expand athletic facilities. This has resulted in our inability to add competitive sports, such as soccer. Other conference teams introduce this sport in the freshman year. With the greater number of sports, there is more use of existing facilities for both practice and competition. Another issue is availability for parking at athletic contests. Each of the high schools has a Booster Club, and is beginning an alumni network. The corporation has interpreted parity to mean that what one program gets, the other also gets.

Each sport has its own budget, and is self-sufficient in terms of equipment and maintenance. Though there has been significant growth in numbers of Hispanic students at Harrison, a small percentage of those students participate in sports. The membership in the Hoosier Conference has helped broaden the media market, and there has been good fan support of athletic contests.

There is a great deal of involvement in the sport programs with approximately 85% of students involved in extra-curricular activities and twenty sports. This exceptional circumstance places a burden on existing facilities, especially scheduling for the gymnasium. There are no intramurals, though programs are available for younger children through the city and county parks departments. The scheduling of existing gyms has resulted in 97% utilization, including practices and games, with

fourteen teams. These facilities also serve the summer recreational program scheduled by the city and county. Parent support is very high. Parents are well informed, are easy to work with, ask good questions and are good listeners. Scheduling is pretty good, though it is important to allow for flexibility and to stay away from statewide testing dates. There are no real travel issues. Athletic teams operate in a healthy competitive environment. The Tippecanoe School Corporation makes sure that their coaches participate in the state association, attend clinics, and have coaching education credentials. The Booster Club is active, supports all sports with fundraisers, runs the concessions, and is financially supportive and available to the community. Like other school settings, they are landlocked.

**Considerations:**

1. A consolidated system would require policy and procedural guidelines for student transfer, student eligibility, academic class enrollment, and athletic membership. Individual differences between consolidated programs would need to be addressed to respond to differences in fields and facilities, sport options, as well as the current administrative support. There is likely to be similar requirement so that individual school sites could develop and maintain existing extracurricular activities.
2. Allyce Holland and Thomas Andre conducted a study titled, “Participation in Extracurricular Activities in Secondary School: What is known, What Needs to Be Known?” The abstract states that their paper reviews literature relating to extracurricular participation and adolescent development. Five areas are described: personal-social characteristics, academic achievement, educational aspirations and attainments, participants' roles in activities, and environmental social context. A methodological critique and directions for future research are provided. Participation correlated with higher levels of self-esteem, improved race relations, involvement in political/social activity in young adulthood, academic ability and grades in males, educational aspirations and attainments, feelings of control over one's life, and lower delinquency rates. However, causal relationships between participation and desirable characteristics have not been demonstrated. Students in smaller schools participate in a greater number and variety of extracurricular activities than students in larger schools. Low-ability and lower SES students are more involved in school life in smaller schools. The existing findings justify additional research into the processes by which participation may influence students' lives.
3. Another author provides perspective related to the benefits of extracurricular activities in an article by Ralph B. McNeal (Journal of Educational Research, 1998). He argues, “student participation in extracurricular activities is associated with a host of positive outcomes that include increased academic achievement and a reduced likelihood of dropping out of high school.” Given the positive benefits gained through participation, a question that could be addressed collectively is who participates and what sorts of benefits do they reap?
4. The formal athletic programs of area schools are supported by city and county informal recreation programs, such as summer athletic youth camps, Little League, community-based youth football programs, a local community soccer league, as well as private clubs for tennis and golf.
5. There is currently shared activity among the schools for support of athletics and extracurricular programs, and there is potential for greater advantages in areas like transportation, officiating, coaching, facilities, and purchasing.

6. Lafayette and Tippecanoe County schools are members of the same athletic conference, Hoosier Crossroads Conference, and share 4A-class status for all sports except football. West Lafayette is a member of the Hoosier Conference and is assigned to class 3A.
7. Athletics and extracurricular programs create a specific culture within a school setting that is defined by mascots, fight songs, school spirit, conference memberships, rivalries, logos, and a myriad of other elements that contribute to the overall identity. These circumstances are not likely to change as a result of greater collaboration or consolidation.
8. Athletic and extracurricular programs have been very successful and have a positive image in the community and state. Cooperation among area athletic directors is terrific. Purdue University accesses some of the area facilities to support practices and team competition. The students enrolled in preparation programs also volunteer and assist with coaching. The greatest level of involvement with Purdue University likely occurs at West Lafayette High School.
9. Due to existing site limitations for expanding and supporting increased program offerings, consolidation might provide greater leverage to access and share athletic facilities.
10. The current staff for coaching and administration of athletic programs is insufficient. One factor is not enough teacher coaches. This phenomenon is a concern for a number of reasons. Teachers tend to be better coaches because they: develop better discipline, are organized, have better communication, have better time commitment connected to their professional role, have know-how to deal with and motivate young people, can create consistency and continuity, and hold the same expectations as the school for performance and behavior. Consolidation might increase the cadre of professional staff that is available and committed to coaching athletic and extra-curricular activities.

## References


Bard, Gardener, and Wieland (2005). *Rural School Consolidation Report.* A report prepared for the National Rural Education Association, Executive Board, April 1-2, 2005.

Berry and West (June, 2005). *Growing Pains: The School Consolidation Movement and Student Outcomes.* Draft report not to be cited without authors' permission.

Chris Patterson (2006). *School Consolidation and Public School Efficiency.* Texas Public Policy Foundation, Policy Perspective, February 2006.

Lisa Ray and David N. Plank. *Consolidation of Michigan Schools: Results from the 2002 State of the State Survey.* The Education Policy Center, Michigan State University, Policy Report No. 14, February 2003.

Drizzten (2004). *The Theoretical Impact of School Consolidation on the Role of Superintendents.* Unpublished class paper in Educational Administration, St. Edwards University, http://www.drizzten.com/blarchives/001043.html.

Marx, Gary (2000). *Ten trends: Educating Children for a Profoundly Different Future.* Educational Research Service.

*Numerous Factors Contribute to the Knowledge Gap.* Keytext report from the following source: Viadero, D. (2000, March 22). Retrieved August 28, 2002, from http://www.edweek.org/ew/ewstory.cfm?slug=28causes.h19.

Thornburg, David (2002). *The New Basics: Education and the Future of Work in the Telematic Age.* Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, April 2002, Alexandria, VA.

Brandt, Ronald S., Editor (2000). *Education in A New Era.* Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Yearbook, April 2002, Alexandria, VA.

Gordon Cawelti and Nancy Protheroe (2003). *Supporting School Improvement: Lessons from Districts Successfully Meeting the Challenge.* Educational Research Service, *ERS Report*, Alexandria, VA.

*Accreditation for Quality School Systems: A Practitioners' Guide.* National Study of School Evaluation, 1699 East Woodfield Road, Schaumburg, IL, 2004.

## SUBSECTION B

- What would be the impact of school consolidation on the need to construct or remodel school facilities?

**PREPARED BY:**

Dr. Robert L. Boyd
Dr. Gregory R. Ulm

**Tippecanoe County Consolidation Report**

**Research Summary**

# COMMUNITY AND STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS AND THE IMPACT ON EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES

Prepared for the School Corporations of Tippecanoe County, Indiana
Boards of School Trustees
Lafayette School Corporation
Tippecanoe School Corporation
West Lafayette Community School Corporation

&

Dr. Edward Eiler, Superintendent
Dr Richard Wood, Superintendent
Mr. Iran Floyd, Superintendent

Dr. Robert L. Boyd
Department of Educational Leadership
Indiana State University

July 2006

## INTRODUCTION

In the fall of 2005 the Board of School Trustees of the three Tippecanoe County, Indiana school corporations authorized a comprehensive study of the advantages and disadvantages of school reorganization involving the three school corporations in Tippecanoe County, Indiana. Those corporations are Lafayette School Corporation, Tippecanoe School Corporation and the West Lafayette Community School Corporation. The study was designed to include an analysis of community and student demographics to set the cultural and demographic context of the study, delivery of current curricular and extra curricular programs grounded in "best practice" across the three corporations, an analysis of space available for student population changes and program expansion considerations, and a variety of financial, governance, staffing and technological considerations. The specific questions to be address in this report are as follows:

- Are there curricular advantages that could be realized by consolidation? Specifically, could instructional programs and course offerings for students be enhanced or preserved through consolidation? Would any curricular programs of offerings be harmed?
- What would be the impact of school consolidation on the need to construct or remodel school facilities?
- How would the administrative and support services of the school districts be impacted? Specifically, how would consolidation impact transportation, food service, maintenance of facilities including grounds, custodial and administrative costs? The corporations would expect an analysis of the present costs compared with school corporations that would compare in size after consolidation.
- How would the staffing of schools and class sizes of schools be impacted by consolidation? This analysis should include instructional support, guidance, media, and other non-classroom professionals as well as paraprofessionals.
- How would consolidation impact distribution of poverty and eligibility for and the receipt of grant money?
- How would consolidation impact governance? Specifically, what options would exist for a Board of School Trustees?
- How would the tax rates be impacted for taxpayers in each school district?
- How would labor contracts be handled?
- How would consolidation impact the Greater Lafayette Special Services Co-operative?
- How would consolidation impact the technology infrastructure and software being used in the respective school corporations?
- How would consolidation impact the schedules and school calendars for the districts?
- How would extra-curricular programs including athletics be impacted?

The intent of the reports contained herein is to provide a baseline of data and conceptual considerations for the respective Boards of School Trustees as they continue their dialogue on ways the three corporations can cooperate, collaborate and consolidate the delivery of

educational programs in the county in the most effective and efficient manner for the students of Tippecanoe County, Indiana, now and in the future.

The data collection and analysis relied heavily on the support of the central office administrative and clerical staffs of the three corporations. In addition, a wealth of document sources was utilized to provide a comprehensive view of the advantages of further cooperation, collaboration and consolidation efforts among the three corporations. The data provided along with the perceptions of the administrative staffs consulted during the study is demonstrative of a strong commitment to quality education for the students of the three Tippecanoe county school corporations.

## THE COMMUNITY AND SCHOOL CORPORATION DEMOGRAPHICS

The historical growth in general population and public school student population in Tippecanoe County over recent years has placed planning and operational pressures on the three school corporations to deliver effective and efficient educational programming. Secondly, a migration of population from the Lafayette School Corporation to the Tippecanoe School Corporation geographical areas has caused adjustments to be made in the use of existing educational facilities and the development of additional educational facilities. Lastly, a pronounced change in the socio-economic makeup of the students, particularly in the schools in the Lafayette School Corporation and the Tippecanoe School Corporation, has impacted on the elementary, middle school and high school educational programming that is offered at individual schools. The impact of these considerations will be explored in this study.

A significant part of the consideration in expanded cooperation, collaboration and consolidation efforts within Tippecanoe County will involve enrollment dynamics and demographic trends in the three school corporations. Such considerations are very important in the planning process for any school corporation. However, such considerations are always subject to many variables that might modify apparent trends. Therefore, a number of important considerations should be taken into account when reviewing past, current and future trends. The public schools of any community are a reflection of the understanding of the people they serve. The geography, population trends, socio-economic status, and work opportunities in the community will influence the type of educational programs to be offered by the schools. For this reason, a description of the more significant of these factors is essential in developing a perspective for the study of a school corporation.

In some instances these community factors may act as an inhibiting influence on the development of the highest possible quality of education. Such factors as a lack of understanding of the vital role education plays in the lives of today's citizens, and a lack of resources to pay the price for quality education can inhibit the development of a sound educational program.

The schools of a corporation have their own unique problems which are the result of changes in population, in the nature of the school children, the social, cultural, and economic life of the area, and the changes that occur in school programs.

There are, however, other factors of a national scope that must be considered in planning and executing an educational program that meets the needs of the future citizens of our society. To the best of its ability, a modern school system must translate the demands of our times into experiences that equip students to live in a society that emphasizes change, mobility, and adaptability. Technological advances are creating a rapidly changing employment picture. The U.S. Department of Labor has estimated that these advances in technology will force some people to change the nature of their employment ten or more times during their lifetime.

While statistical summaries of any community can be misleading, they can provide prompts for thinking about the community and the role that a quality educational system does play in the viability of that community. In this regard, it is noted that according to the Federal Bureau of the Census, 153,875 people lived in Tippecanoe County in 2005. One Tippecanoe County township, Fairfield Township, generally makes up the Lafayette School Corporation area and contains approximately 32.1 percent of the county population. One township, Wabash Township, encompasses most of the West Lafayette Community School Corporation and includes 33.6 percent of the county population. This total for Wabash Township includes Purdue University students who reside in the township. All other townships, excluding Shelby Township, make up the Tippecanoe School Corporation and include approximately 32.5 percent of the county population. Thus, each of the three corporations contains approximately one third of the total population of the county. Shelby Township, with just 2,693 people, is within the boundaries of the Benton Community School Corporation.

In 2004, nearly 20.9 percent of the county population was under 18 years of age, while 9.3 percent was 65 or over. The under-18 percentage was considerably lower than the state percentage of

25.7 percent even including the Purdue population in the county. The over-65-years-of-age percentage was significantly lower than the state's 12.4 percent. The median age in Tippecanoe County was 28.1 compared to a statewide median age of 35.7. Thus the population of the county, in terms of median age, is considerably younger than the state average. Further, 87.8 percent of the county population over age 25 has a high school diploma compared to 82.1 percent statewide, while 33.2 percent of the residents have four or more years of college compared to just 19.4 percent of the statewide population.

In 2003, the county's median household income was $39,471 or about $3,852 less than the state average, while per capita income for 2004 was $26,752 or $3,452 less than the state per capita personal income. While both comparisons reflect the presence of the university student community, Tippecanoe County ranks 46$^{th}$ out of Indiana's 92 counties in per capita personal income, and 58$^{th}$ out the 92 counties in median household income. This suggests a less affluent community in terms of household and personal economics. The county had a total resident labor force of 79,203 in 2005 with a May 2006 unemployment rate of 4.0 percent compared to 4.8 percent statewide. Thus, the county population is a bit younger, more educated, earning less money both in median household income and per capita income, and has a lower unemployment rate than the state of Indiana.

Other statistics of note for Tippecanoe County compared to the state of Indiana totals follow in Figure 1.

Tippecanoe County's general population growth from 1990 projected to 2010 exceeds the general population growth in the state of Indiana. The influence of the Purdue University student population skews countywide data some; however, the county has a lower percentage of its population in the preschool and school age cohort groups than is generally found across Indiana. The median age in the county is 28.1 compared to 35.7 statewide. The general population is, therefore, younger and better educated with 87.8 percent with a high school education and 33.2 percent with a B.A. degree or higher compared to 82.1 percent and 19.4 percent respectively for the state. While the county has lower per capita and household incomes and higher rates of poverty than are found across Indiana, it does have a sound commercial and industrial tax base on which to fund governmental and human services. The county work force, supplemented by approximately one in five workers

commuting from out of county, enjoys a low unemployment rate. The total public school student population of the county ranks Tippecanoe County 9th out of the 92 Indiana counties.

**Figure 1**
**Selected Demographic Comparisons for Tippecanoe County and The State of Indiana, 2000 With Selected Updates For 2003, 2004, 2005**

| Demographic Characteristic | Tippecanoe County | State or, County v State |
|---|---|---|
| *Total Population 1990 | 130,598 | 5,544,156 |
| *Total Population 2005 | 153,875 | 6,271,973 |
| *Total Population 2010 EST. | 164,012 | 6,417,198 |
| *Percentage Increase 1990-2010 | 25.6% | 15.7% |
| *Preschool (age 0-4) | 9,388 | 6.2% / 6.9% |
| *School Age (age 5-17) | 22,338 | 14.7% / 18.8% |
| *Adults (age 18-64) | 106,246 | 69.9% / 61.9% |
| *Older (age 65+) | 14,070 | 9.3% / 12.4% |
| *K-12 School enrollment, 2004/2005 | 25,680 | 9th out of 92 counties |
| *Median Age | 28.1 | 35.7 |
| *Married couples with children | 11,781 | 21.3% / 23.8% |
| *Married without children | 14,137 | 25.6% / 29.8% |
| *Single Parents | 3,961 | 7.2% / 9.1% |
| *Residents high school graduates | 87.8% | 82.1% |
| *Residents four years or more college | 33.2% | 19.4% |
| *Median household income (2003) | $39,471 | $43,323 |
| *Per capita income (2004) | $26,752 | $30,204 |
| *Median Value Home (2000) | $112,200 | $94,300 |
| *Poverty Rate | 11.9% | 10.0% |
| *Assessed Value by property class | $1,609,223,130 | 8th highest in state |
| Commercial/Industrial | 49.5% | 43.2% |
| Residential | 41.6% | 41.5% |
| Agricultural | 5.9% | 9.6% |
| Utilities | 3.1% | 5.6% |
| *Residential bldg permits, (2005) | 939 | |
| *Residential bldg permits single family | 908 | |
| *Residential bldg permits multi family | 31 | |
| *Total resident labor force (2005) | 79,203 | 3,208,969 |
| *Employed | 75,543 | 3,035,204 |
| *Unemployed | 3,660 | 173,765 |
| *Unemployment rate (May, 2006) | 4.0% | 4.8% |

**Number & Percent of Tippecanoe County Employed Workers By Occupation 2004**

| OCCUPATIONS | TIPPECANOE COUNTY | COUNTY PERCENTAGE |
|---|---|---|
| Non-farm Proprietors | 12,229 | 12.7% |
| Farm | 941 | 1.0% |
| Private | 73,643 | 76.2% |
| Accommodation, Food Service | 7,476 | 7.7% |
| Arts, Entertainment, Recreation | 1,155 | 1.2% |
| Construction | 4,865 | 5.0% |
| Health Care, Social Service | 9,455 | 9.8% |
| Information | 1,196 | 1.2% |
| Manufacturing | 14,820 | 15.3% |
| Professional, Tech Services | 3,847 | 4.0% |
| Retail Trade | 11,264 | 1178% |
| Transportation, Warehousing | 1,990 | 2.1% |
| Wholesale Trade | 1,590 | 1.6% |
| Government | 22,053 | 22.8% |
| Other | 15,653 | 16.2% |

**Commuter Workforce, Tippecanoe County, 2004**

| |
|---|
| ***19,220 workers commute into Tippecanoe County** from Carroll (2,912), Clinton (2,830), White (2,582), Benton (1,532), Warren (1,096) and other counties. 18.4% of County workforce. |
| ***4,368 workers commute out of Tippecanoe County** to Marion (785), Clinton (633), White (418), Montgomery (341), Carroll (301), and other counties. 4.9% of County labor force. |

*Source: United States Census Bureau, Indiana Business Research Center*

Table 1 presents the total population for Tippecanoe County for 1970 through 2000 with the United States Bureau of the Census estimated population for 2005.

**Table 1**

**Census Data for Tippecanoe County 1970-2000 with Estimate for 2005**

| Year | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2005 Estimate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Population | 109,378 | 121,702 | 130,598 | 148,955 | 153,875 |

The total population of Tippecanoe County has increased from 109,378 in 1970 to 148,955 in 2000 for an increase of 39,577 people or 36.2 percent. In 1990, Tippecanoe County was the 8th largest county in Indiana. By 2005 Tippecanoe County was the 9th largest in Indiana in terms of total population, and continues on a growth curve thus making Tippecanoe County one of Indiana's growing population counties during the 1990's and early years of the 21st century. The Indiana Business Research Center projects Tippecanoe County will grow by 23,521 people or 14.9 percent during the next 20 years, while their projection for growth for all of Indiana is just 10.4 percent. Thus, recent growth in general population is projected to continue into the short-term future.

Table 2 presents the total population of the political subdivisions of Tippecanoe County for 1970 through 2005 (estimated), and the number and percent of change over the period studied.

**Table 2**
**Total Population of Political Subdivisions of Tippecanoe County For 1970-2005 (Estimated) With Number and Percent of Change Since 1970**

| TOWNSHIPS | 1970 | 1980 | 1990 | 2000 | 2005 Estimate | # Change | % Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **FAIRFIELD*** | **45,439** | **44,533** | **46,166** | **49,970** | **49,476** | **4,037** | **8.9** |
| | | | | | | | |
| **Jackson**** | 558 | 520 | 512 | 517 | 1,022 | 464 | 83.2 |
| **Lauramie**** | 2,245 | 2,125 | 2,119 | 2,410 | 3,021 | 776 | 34.6 |
| **Perry**** | 2,257 | 2,720 | 2,990 | 5,322 | 5,824 | 3,567 | 158.0 |
| **Randolph**** | 787 | 754 | 694 | 867 | 1,248 | 461 | 58.6 |
| **Sheffield**** | 2,145 | 2,254 | 2,454 | 3,016 | 3,493 | 1,752 | 81.7 |
| **Tippecanoe*** | 3,486 | 4,636 | 5,012 | 5,951 | 6,578 | 3,092 | 88.7 |
| **Union**** | 1,577 | 1,713 | 1,674 | 1,682 | 1,615 | 38 | 2.4 |
| **Washington*** | 2,245 | 2,394 | 2,393 | 2,473 | 2,806 | 561 | 25.0 |
| **Wayne**** | 1,034 | 1,233 | 1,184 | 1,306 | 1,705 | 671 | 64.9 |
| **Wea**** | 8,172 | 12,698 | 14,078 | 22,102 | 22,630 | 14,458 | 176.9 |
| **TSC's TOTAL**** | **24,506** | **31,047** | **33,110** | **45,646** | **49,942** | **25,436** | **103.8** |
| | | | | | | | |
| **WABASH***** | **37,853** | **44,267** | **49,348** | **51,261** | **51,764** | **13,911** | **36.8** |
| | | | | | | | |
| **Shelby****** | 1,580 | 1,855 | 1,974 | 2,078 | 2,693 | 1,113 | 70.4 |
| **TOTALS** | **109,378** | **121,702** | **130,598** | **148,955** | **153,875** | **44,497** | **40.7** |

*Sources: Bureau of Census, 1970-2000*
**Lafayette School Corporation*
***Tippecanoe School Corporation*
****West Lafayette Community School Corporation*
*****Benton Community School Corporation*

Fairfield Township (Lafayette School Corporation) population has increased by just 8.9 percent during the period studied, while Wabash Township has increased 36.8 percent. The total population of the townships that make up the Tippecanoe School Corporation has increased by 25,436 people or 103.8 percent during this 35 year period. In 1970, the Lafayette School Corporation contained 41.5 percent of the county population while in 2005 that percent has fallen to 32.2 percent of the total county population. Perry Township was the leader in terms of percentage growth during the period, while Wea Township is clearly the leader in number growth followed by Wabash Township.

Table 3 shows the projected growth by age cohort for Tippecanoe County for the years 2005, 2010, 2015, 2020 and 2025. The projections indicated an 11.5 percent increase in the pre- school-age cohort and an 11.4 percent increase in the school-age cohort between 2005 and 2025 for Tippecanoe County. This compares to just a 6.6 percent increase in the pre-school 0-to-age-4 cohort statewide and only a 3.1 percent increase in the school-age cohort statewide by 2025. Thus the likelihood of continued increased student populations among the three Tippecanoe County school corporations is apparent. The projection also indicates a 70.7 percent projected increase in the age 65-and-over age cohort between 2005 and 2025. The age cohort of 25-44 is another important consideration for the future of Tippecanoe County. It is projected that the state of Indiana will decrease this economically productive age group by 1.8 percent in the next 20 years as the "brain drain" demographic continues for the state.

**Table 3**

**Projected Population by Age Cohorts 2005, 2010, 2015, 2020 and 2025**
**For Tippecanoe County, Indiana**

| YEAR | AGE 0-4 | AGE 5-19 | AGE 20-24 | AGE 25-44 | AGE 45-64 | AGE 65+ | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2005** | 10,255 | 35,625 | 26,656 | 40,475 | 30,068 | 14,349 | 157,428 |
| **2010** | 10,692 | 36,628 | 26,966 | 41,066 | 33,155 | 15,505 | 164,012 |
| **2015** | 10,993 | 38,401 | 26,950 | 41,652 | 34,559 | 17,945 | 170,500 |
| **2020** | 11,219 | 39,107 | 27,077 | 42,050 | 35,289 | 21,167 | 175,909 |
| **2025** | 11,439 | 39,671 | 27,235 | 42,329 | 35,780 | 24,495 | 180,949 |
| **Projected County % Changes** | **11.5** | **11.4** | **2.2** | **4.6** | **19.0** | **70.7** | **14.9** |
| **Projected State % Changes** | **6.6** | **3.1** | **1.3** | **-1.8** | **9.3** | **50.5** | **10.4** |

Tippecanoe County, however, is projected to increase this age cohort by 4.6 percent based largely on education, quality of life and employment opportunities in the county.

The median age in Tippecanoe County in 2000 was 27.2 years of age. The median age for the county is projected to be 27.6 in 2005, 28.2 in 2010, 28.7 in 2015, 29.3 in 2020, and 29.9 by 2025. These median age projections compare to statewide projections of 36.0 in 2005, 36.7 in 2010, 37.4 in 2015, 38.1 in 2020 and 38.6 by 2025. The impact of the university students in the general population has a considerable impact on the median age in Tippecanoe County.

Table 4 presents the population changes by township in Tippecanoe County from 2000 to 2005 as estimated by the U. S, Census Bureau. The projected change in population by township further demonstrates the deceleration of population growth for Fairfield and Wabash townships, and the continuing accelerated growth for the townships of the Tippecanoe School Corporation. Only Union Township has shown a population decline since 2000; however, the 0.9 percent growth in Fairfield Township and 1.1 percent growth in Wabash Township were the lowest of the rest of the townships in the county from 2000-2005, while the townships of the TSC combined show a projected increase of 7.9 percent. The county as a whole shows a 3.2 percent increase in total population during the first half of the current decade.

**Table 4**
**Population Change 2000-2005 by Township for Tippecanoe County**

| Tippecanoe County Township | Population 2005 | Number Change Since 2000 | Percentage Change Since 2000 |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Fairfield** | **49,476** | **455** | **0.9** |
| | | | |
| **Wabash** | **51,764** | **572** | **1.1** |
| | | | |
| **Jackson** | 1,022 | 471 | 85.5 |
| **Lauramie** | 3,021 | 571 | 23.3 |
| **Perry** | 5,824 | 473 | 8.8 |
| **Randolph** | 1,248 | 356 | 39.9 |
| **Sheffield** | 3,393 | 349 | 11.5 |
| **Tippecanoe** | 6,578 | 598 | 10.0 |
| **Union** | 1,615 | -59 | -3.5 |
| **Washington** | 2,806 | 313 | 12.6 |
| **Wayne** | 1,705 | 374 | 28.1 |
| **Wea** | 22,630 | 492 | 2.2 |
| **TSC Totals** | **49,842** | **3,938** | **7.9** |
| | | | |
| **Shelby** | 2,693 | 576 | 27.2 |
| **Totals** | **153,875** | **4,731** | **3.2** |

## LAFAYETTE SCHOOL CORPORATION (FAIRFIELD TOWNSHIP), TIPPECANOE SCHOOL CORPORATION, WEST LAFAYETTE COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORPORATION (WABASH TOWNSHIP) AND STATE OF INDIANA GENERAL DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Table 5 presents a profile of general demographic characteristics for Fairfield Township (Lafayette School Corporation), all of the townships that comprise the Tippecanoe School Corporation, Wabash Township (West Lafayette Community School Corporation) and the state of Indiana. Table 5, and its continuation tables, demonstrate a number of distinct differences in population demographics when comparisons are made between and among the three school corporations.

**Table 5**

**Profile of General Demographic Characteristics for Lafayette School Corporation (Fairfield Township), West Lafayette Community School Corporation (Wabash Township) and Tippecanoe School Corporation (Remaining Tippecanoe County Townships Except Shelby Township) and the State of Indiana, 2000 Census**

| General Demographic Characteristic | Lafayette School Corporation, Fairfield Township | Tippecanoe School Corp Townships | West Lafayette CSC, Wabash Township | State of Indiana |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total Population** | 49,970(33.5%) | 47,724(30.6%) | 51,261(34.4%) | 6,080,485 |
| **Population Under 5** | 6.6% | 7.8% | 3.4% | 7.0% |
| **Population Under 19** | 19.5% | 24.8% | 30.1% | 25.9% |
| **Population Over 60** | 12.7% | 11.5% | 8.4% | 16.3% |
| **Born In Indiana** | 91.6% | 73.7% | 49.7% | 69.3% |
| **Median Age** | 32.5 | 27.2 | 21.9 | 35.2 |

In addition to the total county population and the percentages for a variety of age cohort groups presented earlier, it is noted that 91.6 percent of the population of the Lafayette School Corporation was born in Indiana compared to 73.7 percent for the population born in Indiana for the TSC and just 49.7 percent for the WLCSC. These differences among the three school corporations reflect the net immigration to the Tippecanoe County Schools over recent years and the university student population reflected in the WLCSC. Clearly the LSC has a preponderance of its population that has lived in the community for a long time if not all of their lives. Further, the median age of the LSC is considerably higher that the other two school corporations reflecting the aging nature of the population in that school corporation compared to the other two. The nearly five years difference in the median age between the LSC and TSC is a significant difference in terms of potential new, pre-school and school-aged populations. The very low median age for the WLCSC is a result of the university student population of Wabash Township.

Educational attainment provides another distinct comparison among the three school corporations. The population of the LSC is by far less educated than the population of the other two corporations. A full 17.6 percent of the LSC population does not have a high school education while just 24.3 percent have a B.S. degree or more. Clearly the highest levels of educational attainment for both

high school graduates and college degreed population are found in the WLCSC. However, the educational attainment levels found in both the TSC and the WLCSC are generally reflective of a community value system that has a high regard for the value of education, high expectation for students and a willingness to contribute the human and fiscal resources necessary to maintain quality educational programming.

**Table 5 Continued**

| General Demographic Characteristic | Lafayette School Corporation, Fairfield Township | Tippecanoe School Corp Townships | West Lafayette CSC, Wabash Township | State of Indiana |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Less Than High School Education** | 17.6% | 10.4% | 5.8% | 17.9% |
| **College Degree** | 24.3% | 33.2% | 61.3% | 19.4% |

The population of all three corporations is far less diverse than is found statewide. However, the percent of the total population that is of Hispanic or Latino origin in the LSC is 8.8 percent compared to 3.8 percent in the TSC, 3.2 percent in the WLCSC and 3.5 percent statewide. From 1990 to 2004, the minority student population of the LSC increased from 6.4 percent to 28.8 percent, while the minority population of the TSC increased from 2.8 percent to 12.7 percent. These represent a 22.4 and 9.9 percent increase respectively, and compare to just a 7.7 percent minority student population increase statewide. Further, in 1990 the LSC had 52 limited English students, while in 2004 that number had increased to 836 or a 748 student or 1,507 percent increase. The TSC increased from 7 limited English speaking students in 1990 to 276 in 2004 for a 269 student or 3,842 percent increase. The WLCSC on the other hand decreased from 156 limited English speaking students in 1990 to 98 in 2004. This population is projected to continue to grow in the county and the state of Indiana in the years ahead, and continues to present challenges to the equitable educational programming efforts of school corporations that have significant Hispanic and Latino populations.

**Table 5 Continued**

| General Demographic Characteristic | Lafayette School Corporation, Fairfield Township | Tippecanoe School Corp Townships | West Lafayette CSC, Wabash Township | State of Indiana |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **White Population** | 90.4% | 95.8% | 84.5% | 87.5% |
| **African-American** | 3.7% | 3.8% | 3.1% | 8.4% |
| **Hispanic-Latino** | 8.8% | 3.8% | 3.2% | 3.5% |

The percent of households with children under 18 is far more prominent in the TSC at 38.5 percent than it is in the TSC at 25.6 percent and just 21.3 percent in the WLCSC. The average family size is also larger in the TSC at 3.01 compared to 2.95 in the TSC and 2.93 in WLCSC. The average family size in Indiana is 3.05. Combine this information with median age information presented earlier and it is comfortable to predict that increases in pre-school and school aged populations will be more likely to occur in the TSC in the future than in the other two school corporations.

**Table 5 Continued**

| General Demographic Characteristic | Lafayette School Corporation, Fairfield Township | Tippecanoe School Corp Townships | West Lafayette CSC, Wabash Township | State of Indiana |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Households with Children Under 18** | 25.6% | 38.5% | 21.3% | 32.9% |
| **Average Family Size** | 2.95 | 3.01 | 2.93 | 3.05 |

By far the most housing units are found in the LSC even though they contain less of a percentage of the total county population than is true for the housing units in the WLCSC and just slightly more of the population than is found in the TSC. However, as pointed out above, those housing units in the LSC are occupied by older citizens with smaller family sizes than is the case in the TSC or the WLCSC. Further, just 13.1 percent of the housing units in the LSC have been built since 1990 while just over half of the housing units in the TSC and 22.2 percent of the housing units in the WLCSC have been built since 1990. Some 42.8 percent of the residents of the LSC are living in the same house in which they were living in 1995 while that is the case for just 26.9 percent of the residents of TSC and 23.7 percent in the WLCSC. Further, it is noted that some 36.9 percent of the households in the TSC are residing in a different house in Tippecanoe County than they were in 1995 and that 21.4 percent of the TSC households have residents who have moved to Tippecanoe County from a different state since 1995. While the 60.9 percent of the housing units in the WLCSC are rental units is not surprising, given the university population in Wabash Township, it is significant that nearly half of the housing units in the LSC, 49.2 percent, are rental units while only 16.8 percent of the housing units in the TSC are rental units. This clearly reflects a more highly stable, less transient population for the TSC.

The Tippecanoe School Corporation by far has the most two-parent working households among the three school corporations in the county. Nearly 70 percent of the females 16 and older in the TSC are in the labor force, while 60.5 percent of the 16 and older females in the LSC and just 57.9

**Table 5 Continued**

| General Demographic Characteristic | Lafayette School Corporation, Fairfield Township | Tippecanoe School Corp Townships | West Lafayette CSC, Wabash Township | State of Indiana |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total Housing Units | 22,913 | 18,737 | 16,693 | 2,532,319 |
| Percent of County Households | 39.3% | 32.1% | 28.6% | |
| Housing Units Built Since 1990 | 13.1% | 53.3% | 22.2% | 17.3% |
| Housing Units Built Since 1995 | 8.2% | 50.4% | 12.2% | 10.3% |
| Same House Since 1995 | 42.8% | 26.9% | 23.7% | 55.0% |
| Different House/ Same County Since 1995 | 31.1% | 36.9% | 14.7% | 25.5% |
| Different House/ Different State Since 1995 | 11.3% | 21.4% | 18.7% | 8.0% |
| Renter Occupied Housing Units | 49.2% | 16.8% | 60.9% | 28.6% |

**Table 5 Continued**

| General Demographic Characteristic | Lafayette School Corporation, Fairfield Township | Tippecanoe School Corp Townships | West Lafayette CSC, Wabash Township | State of Indiana |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Females 16+ in Labor Force | 60.5% | 69.8% | 57.9% | 60.0% |
| Females With Children Under Six All Parents in Labor Force | 61.3% | 65.3% | 49.8% | 62.5% |

percent in the WLCSC are in the labor force. In the TSC, 65.3 percent of the females with children under six have all parents in labor force compared with 61.3 percent in the LSC and only 49.8 percent in the WLCSC. All percentages for both the LSC and TSC are greater than the statewide average of 60 percent.

The percent of the population in the LSC that is employed in management and professional-related occupations at 31.5 percent is clearly less than the 36.7 percent in the TSC and the 48.7 percent found in the WLCSC. Further, the LSC resident labor force is more actively employed in the production and construction/maintenance sectors of the economy than is true for the population of the other two school corporations. All three of the school corporations have a high percentage of their workforce engaged in the service sector of the economy which is a reflection of the economic nature of the Tippecanoe County economy in general.

**Table 5 Continued**

| General Demographic Characteristic, Employment | Lafayette School Corporation, Fairfield Township | Tippecanoe School Corp Townships | West Lafayette CSC, Wabash Township | State of Indiana |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Management/ Professional and Related** | 31.5% | 36.7% | 48.7% | 28.7% |
| **Service** | 17.0% | 16.0% | 18.0% | 14.2% |
| **Sales/Office** | 22.7% | 23.2% | 21.5% | 25.3% |
| **Farming** | 0.3% | 0.5% | 0.9% | 0.4% |
| **Construction/ Maintenance** | 8.1% | 6.9% | 3.0% | 10.0% |
| **Production** | 20.5% | 16.6% | 8.0% | 21.4% |

The median household income for Tippecanoe County, and for each of three areas of Tippecanoe County analyzed for this study, is below the median household income for the state of Indiana. The TSC township's median household income is $2,915 less than the state median while LSC is $6,782. The median household income in the WLCSC is some $12,522 less than the state median and reflects the university student population's impact on the total. The per capita income in both the LSC and the TSC is slightly below the state per capita income, while again the per capita income in the WLCSC is significantly below the state of Indiana's per capita total.

**Table 5 Continued**

| General Demographic Characteristic, Employment | Lafayette School Corporation, Fairfield Township | Tippecanoe School Corp Townships | West Lafayette CSC, Wabash Township | State of Indiana |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Median Household Income** | $34,785 | $38,652 | $29,045 | $41,567 |
| **Median Household Income Less Than $50,000** | 68.1% | 49.4% | 67.6% | 59.4% |
| **Per Capita Income** | $19,751 | $19,375 | $16,811 | $20,397 |

Poverty figures for the residents of the LSC clearly exceed statewide totals. For families with children under the age of 18 in the LSC, some 14.7 percent are classified as poverty status compared to 10.2 statewide and just 10.7 percent in both the TSC and the WLCSC. For families with a child under age of five, some 23.3 percent of the TSC families are classified as poverty status compared to 13.7 percent statewide. Some 18.3 percent of the families in the TSC, and 22.3 percent of the families with child under 5 in the WLCSC, are classified as poverty status by the U. S. Census Bureau.

**Table 5 Continued**

| General Demographic Characteristic, Employment | Lafayette School Corporation, Fairfield Township | Tippecanoe School Corp Townships | West Lafayette CSC, Wabash Township | State of Indiana |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Poverty Status For Families With Child Under 18** | 14.7% | 10.7% | 10.7% | 10.2% |
| **Poverty Status For Families With Child Under 5** | 23.3% | 18.3% | 22.3% | 13.7% |
| **Poverty Families No Husband Present** | 25.8% | 21.8% | 19.8% | 23.4% |

Table 5, continued below, details some additional comparisons regarding the socio-economic makeup of the student population of the three Tippecanoe County school corporations. Clearly, the LSC has the highest percentage of families in poverty, single parent families, children with at-risk mothers, free lunch students, special education students, students with limited English skills and the number of home-schooled youngsters of the three Tippecanoe County school corporations, and higher in the percentage of all measures except children with at-risk mothers than is found across the state of Indiana. The continued centralizing of these student socio-economic characteristics within one of the three county school corporations could lead to continued difficult and expensive educational programming to meet their social and academic needs.

**Table 5 Continued**

| Comparative Characteristic | Lafayette School Corp | Tippecanoe School Corp | West Lafayette CSC | State of Indiana |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Families in Poverty* | 14.5% | 7.9% | 9.1% | 6.7% |
| **Single Parent Families** | 34.3% | 22.4% | 16.8% | 27.8% |
| **Children with At-Risk Mothers** | 2.0% | 0.6% | 0.6% | 3.6% |
| **Free Lunch** | 41.5% | 16.8% | 7.1% | 27.1% |
| **Special Education Students** | 23.1% | 15.7% | 13.2% | 17.7% |
| **Minority Students** | 28.7% | 12.8% | 26.9% | 21.3% |
| **Limited English** | 11.7% | 2.6% | 4.9% | 2.9% |
| **Home School** | 137 | 116 | 32 | 23,455 |

The median housing value in the LSC is by far the lowest of the areas examined in this study at $90,000 compared to $112,200 in the TSC and $141,600 in the WLCSC. Some 61 percent of the homes in the LSC are valued at less than $100,000 compared to 35.2 percent in the TSC and just 12.8 percent in the WLCSC. In the WLCSC, 66.8 percent of the homes are valued between $100,000 and $200,000 compared to 53 percent in the TSC and just 30.3 in the LSC.

**Table 5 Continued**

| General Demographic Characteristic, Employment | Lafayette School Corporation, Fairfield Township | Tippecanoe School Corp Townships | West Lafayette CSC, Wabash Township | State of Indiana |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Housing Value Under $100,000** | 61. 0% | 35.2% | 12.8% | 55.3% |
| **Housing Value $100,000-$200,000** | 30.3% | 53.0% | 66.8% | 36.4% |
| **Housing Value Above $200,000** | 8.9% | 11.8% | 20.4% | 8.3% |
| **Median Housing Value** | $90,000 | $112,200 | $141,600 | NA |

**Summary of LSC Demographics:**

The demographics of the LSC can be summarized as follows. The LSC, essentially Fairfield Township, contains 33.5 percent of the general population of Tippecanoe County, 39.3 percent of the county households and 35.0 percent of the public school student population in the county. The percent of the population that is under the age of five is 6.6 percent compared to 7.0 percent statewide, while the median age is 32.5, which is the highest of the three geographical areas examined for this study. The population has 17.6 percent with less than a high school education and 24.3 percent with a college degree making it the most under-educated of the three areas of the county the study examined. The population is generally white; however, some 8.8 percent of the population is of Hispanic or Latino origin compared to 3.5 statewide. Just 25.6 percent of the households have children under the age of 18 compared to 38.5 percent in the TSC. The percent of homes built since 1990 and 1995 dramatically trails statewide percentages and the percentage of homes built in 1990 and 1995 in the TSC. A full 49.2 percent, nearly half, of the housing units are rental units in the LSC. Nearly one in five workers who reside in Fairfield Township is engaged in the production side of community employment while 31.5 percent are engaged in management and professional occupations. The percent of LSC households with median household incomes less that $50,000 annually is 68.1 percent compared to a statewide percentage of 59.4 percent, while

the percentage of families with children under 18 and under five who are classified in poverty status is far greater than statewide percentages. Some 61 percent of the homes in the LSC are valued under $100,000 compared to 35.2 percent in the TSC and 12.8 percent in the WLCSC. Clearly, the LSC general population and geographical area are in decline compared to the rest of the county in terms of where it once was in total population, student population and the economic viability of the area and the people who live there.

**Summary of TSC Demographics:**

The demographics of the TSC can be summarized as follows. The TSC, essentially all of the Tippecanoe County townships except for Fairfield, Wabash and most of Shelby townships, contains 30.6 percent of the general population of Tippecanoe County, 32.1 percent of the county households and yet has enrolled in its schools 54.8 percent of the public school student population in the county. The percent of the population that is under the age of five is 7.8 percent compared to 7.0 percent statewide and 6.6 percent in the LSC. The median age is 27.2, which is the second lowest of the three areas examined for the study. The population has just 10.4 percent with less than a high school education and 33.2 percent with a college degree making the general population far better educated than the general population of the state of Indiana. The population is generally white, and contains very limited diversity in its makeup. Fully 38.5 percent of the households have children under the age of 18 compared to 25.6 percent in the LSC and 23.1 percent in the WLCSC. The percent of homes built since 1990 and 1995 dramatically exceeds statewide and countywide percentages with a full 36.9 percent of the residents living in a different house in the same county than they did in 1995. Only 16.8 percent of the housing units in the TSC are rental units. Nearly 37 percent of the resident workers are employed in management and professionally related employment and the TSC has the highest percentage of two-parents-working households in the county. The percent of TSC households with median household incomes less that $50,000 annually is 10 percent less than the statewide percentage of 59.4 percent, while the percentage of families with children under 18 and under five who are classified in poverty status is far less than statewide percentages. Some 53 percent of the homes in the TSC are valued between $100,000 and $200,000 compared to 30.3 in the LSC and 66.8 percent in the WLCSC. Clearly, the TSC

general population and geographical area are expanding compared to the rest of the county in terms of where it once was in total population, student population, and the economic viability of the area and the people who this in the area.

**Summary of WLCSC Demographics:**

The demographics of the WLCSC can be summarized as follows. The WLCSC, contains 34.4 percent of the general population of Tippecanoe County, 28.6 percent of the county households and yet has enrolled in its schools just 10.2 percent of the public school student population in the county. The percent of the population that is under the age of five is 3.4 percent compared to 7.0 percent statewide, 6.6 percent in the LSC and 7.8 percent in TSC. The median age is 21.9, which is a reflection of the university population counted by the census within Wabash Township. The population has just 5.8 percent with less than a high school education and 61.3 percent with a college degree making the general population by far better educated than the general population of the state of Indiana and the rest of Tippecanoe County. The population is generally white, and contains limited diversity in its makeup. Only 23.1 percent of the households have children under the age of 18 compared to 25.6 percent in the LSC and 38.5 percent in the TSC. The percent of homes built since 1990 and 1995 dramatically exceeds statewide and countywide percentages. However, some 60.9 percent of the housing units in the WLCSC are rental units again reflecting the impact of the university student residents on census data. Nearly 49 percent of the resident workers are employed in management and professionally related employment and the WLCSC has the lowest percentage of two parents working households in the county. The percent of WLCSC households with median household incomes less that $50,000 annually is 67.6 percent, again a reflection of the university student population. The percentage of families with children under18 and under five years of age who are classified in poverty status is a bit greater than statewide percentages. Some 66.8 percent of the homes in the WLCSC are valued between $100,000 and $200,000 compared to 30.3 in the LSC and 53 percent in the TSC. Clearly, the WLCSC general population and geographical area are expanding compared to the rest of the county in terms of where it once was in total population and the economic viability of the area. The impact of the demographics of the resident university student population in Wabash Township tends to make direct comparisons with the demographics of the residents of the TSC and LSC difficult.

It was believed to be informative to this study to examine the demographic characteristics of a variety of Indiana areas that would closely approximate the demographic characteristics of a combined Tippecanoe County school corporation. While such a comparison is not an apples-to-apples comparison, some insights into a consolidated countywide school unit for Tippecanoe County can be determined by such a comparison. Thus, below are presented sets of demographic information previously examined for Tippecanoe County and for the Indiana areas of Lawrence Township of Marion County, St. Joseph County, Vanderburgh County and Vigo County, Indiana.

Vanderburgh County contains the Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation with five public high schools, one alternative high school and two Catholic high schools while Vigo county is a countywide school corporation with three public high schools. St. Joseph County is primarily the South Bend Community Schools with four public high schools and one parochial high school. Lawrence Township of Marion County is a township unit with two public high schools.

Table 6 presents a comparison of demographic information for Tippecanoe County, Lawrence Township of Marion County, St. Joseph, Vanderburgh and Vigo counties in Indiana. Total population growth over the past 15 years, and projected for the next five years, demonstrates that Tippecanoe County is clearly a high-growth area compared to other four areas. Further, the projected population increases for the period 2005 to 2025 indicate a 14.9 percent increase for Tippecanoe County. The projected increases for the areas of the comparison group are shown in the table and compare with a total increase projected for the state of Indiana of 10.4 percent for the period. This can be attributed to the growth at Purdue University, strong education, employment and economic opportunities in Tippecanoe County and a variety of measures of quality of life including culture, entertainment, recreation, and an aggressive housing development environment available in the county.

## Table 6
## Comparison of Tippecanoe County Demographics with Lawrence Township of Marion County, St. Joseph County, Vanderburgh County and Vigo County Indiana

| Demographic Characteristic | Tippecanoe County | Lawrence Twp Of Marion County | South Bend Community Schools, all of St. Joseph County | Vanderburgh County | Vigo County |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Total Population 1990 | 130,598 | 111,859 | 247,052 | 165,058 | 106,107 |
| *Total Population 2005 | 153,875 | 111,176 | 266,160 | 173,187 | 102,592 |
| *Total Population 2010 EST. | 164,012 | 112,633 | 270,266 | 174,355 | 107,185 |
| *Percentage Increase 1990-2010 Estimate | 25.6% | 0.7% | 9.4% | 5.6% | 1.0% |
| *Projected Population Change 2005-2025 | 14.9% | 8.2% | 9.2% | 7.0% | 7.0% |

Table 6 (continued below) shows that the pre-school and school-age cohorts of Tippecanoe County are projected to grow considerable more than is the case for the areas in the comparison group as well as for the state of Indiana. An 11.5 percent increase in the pre-school age population and an 11.4 percent increase in the school-age population are projected for Tippecanoe County. However, the percentage increase for the age cohort of 65 and over, the fixed income population of Tippecanoe, is projected to increase by nearly 71 percent by 2025 which is the largest percentage increase in the comparison group and is over 20 percent greater than the projection for all of Indiana. Thus, the need for continued growth in instructional space in the schools of the county, together with the growing senior population will, predictably, collide at some point with the property tax structure for school facilities currently in place in the state of Indiana.

## Table 6 Continued

| Indiana County 2005-2025 | Age 0-4 | Age 0-4 Percentage Change | Age 5-19 | Age 5-19 Percentage Change | Seniors 65 + | Seniors Percentage Change | Total Population Percentage Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Tippecanoe | 1,184 | 11.5% | 4,046 | 11.4% | 10,146 | 70.7% | 14.9% |
| Marion | 830 | 1.3% | 9,807 | 5.7% | 54,043 | 58.4% | 8.2% |
| St. Joe | 2,065 | 10.8% | 3,616 | 6.1% | 15,081 | 45.3% | 9.2% |
| Vanderburgh | 1,228 | 10.7% | 3,423 | 10.1% | 9,526 | 37.5% | 7.0% |
| Vigo | 722 | 11.2% | 905 | 4.1% | 5,865 | 40.3% | 7.1% |
| State | | 6.6% | | 3.1% | | 50.5% | 10.4% |

The total school enrollment for Tippecanoe County is about 9,000 students more than in the MSD of Lawrence Township and Vigo County, but some 5,000 less than Vanderburgh County. The 44,275 students in St. Joseph County are divided between five school corporations including the South Bend Community Schools, John Glen, Penn-Harrison-Madison, Mishawaka and the Union North School Corporation. The population of St. Joseph, Vanderburgh and Vigo counties is considerably older than the population of Tippecanoe County and Lawrence Township.

**Table 6 Continued**

| Demographic Characteristic | Tippecanoe County | Lawrence Twp Of Marion County | South Bend Community Schools, all of St. Joseph County | Vanderburgh County | Vigo County |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Preschool (age 0-4) | 6.2% | 8.3% | 7.2% | 6.7% | 6.1% |
| *School Age (age 5-19) | 14.7% | 15.9% | 18.8% | 16.7% | 21.2% |
| *Adults (age 20-64) | 69.9% | 59.9% | 60.8% | 61.8% | 58.3% |
| *Older (age 65+) | 9.3% | 8.3% | 13.2% | 14.8% | 14.3% |
| *K-12 School enrollment, 2004/2005 | 25,680 | 16,436 | 44,275 | 30,766 | 16,355 |
| *Median Age | 28.1 | 32.9 | 34.9 | 37.1 | 34.9 |

Tippecanoe County has the second highest percentage of married couples with children and the second lowest percentage of married couples without children. It also has the lowest percentage of single parents within the comparison. This suggests that the county as a whole is younger and has a stronger family basis than the others in the comparison group. Thus, the levels of general and student population growth experienced within Tippecanoe County in recent years are likely to continue into the future.

**Table 6 Continued**

| Demographic Characteristic | Tippecanoe County | Lawrence Twp Of Marion County | South Bend Community Schools, all of St. Joseph County | Vanderburgh County | Vigo County |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Married couples with children | 21.3% | 18.4% | 22.1% | 19.5% | 20.0% |
| *Married without children | 25.6% | 22.8% | 27.9% | 28.0% | 28.0% |
| *Single Parents | 7.2% | 11.6% | 9.9% | 9.1% | 9.6% |

Tippecanoe County is the second most highly educated population within the comparison group. Only the population of Lawrence Township, Marion County is better educated overall. The median household income ranks fourth out of the five in the comparison group while the per capita income in Tippecanoe County ranks third in the comparison group. The median home value is the second highest in the comparison group while the poverty rate is the highest among the comparison group. Tippecanoe County is not as healthy, economically, as many in the comparison group.

**Table 6 Continued**

| Demographic Characteristic | Tippecanoe County | Lawrence Twp Of Marion County | South Bend Community Schools, all of St. Joseph County | Vanderburgh County | Vigo County |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***Resident high school graduates** | 87.8% | 88.4% | 82.4% | 83.1% | 81.0% |
| ***Resident four years or more college** | 33.2% | 35.1% | 23.6% | 19.3% | 21.4% |
| ***Median household income (2003)** | $39,471 | $49,246 | $40,213 | $38,275 | $33,184 |
| ***Per capita income (2004)** | $26,752 | $25,784 | $31,181 | $32,928 | $17,620 |
| ***Median Value Home (2000)** | $112,200 | $124,300 | $85,700 | $82,400 | $72,500 |
| ***Poverty Rate** | 11.9% | 7.1% | 11.8% | 11.8% | 10.3% |

Tippecanoe County has the third highest total assessed value centered around nearly 50 percent commercial and industrial assessments. The county has enjoyed aggressive building permit activity over recent years primarily in single family dwellings and multi-family units in the TSC. Tippecanoe County has the lowest unemployment rate of any area in the comparison group.

**Table 6 Continued**

| Demographic Characteristic | Tippecanoe County | Lawrence Twp Of Marion County (Countywide Data) | South Bend Community Schools, all of St. Joseph County (Countywide Data) | Vanderburgh County | Vigo County |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Assessed Value by property class | $1.609 Bil | 9.598 Bil | $2.040 Bil | $1.467 Bil | $842 Mil |
| Commercial/Industrial | 49.5% | 57.1% | 47.0% | 53.4% | 46.4% |
| Residential | 41.6% | 38.3% | 44.7% | 40.8% | 37.8% |
| Agricultural | 5.9% | 0.3% | 4.1% | 2.3% | 6.1% |
| Utilities | 3.1% | 4.3% | 4.2% | 3.6% | 9.6% |
| *Residential bldg permits, (2004) | 1,365 | 5,125 | 1,140 | 1,024 | 518 |
| *Bldg permits- single family | 1,188 | 3,011 | 896 | 639 | 251 |
| *Bldg permits- multi family | 177 | 2,124 | 244 | 385 | 267 |
| *Total resident labor force (2005) | 79,203 | 60,904 | 134,798 | 91,606 | 50,176 |
| *Employed | 75,543 | 57,734 | 127,682 | 86,816 | 46,785 |
| *Unemployed | 3,660 | 2,924 | 7,116 | 4,790 | 3,391 |
| *Unemployment rate (May, 2006) | 4.4% | 4.8% | 5.4% | 4.9% | 6.9% |

Table 7 presents additional comparative data for the three Tippecanoe County School Corporations individually with the MSD of Lawrence Township, the South Bend Community Schools, the Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation and the Vigo County School Corporation for the 2005-2006 academic year. It is presented here without comment as a data source for reference to other observations presented in this study. However, the highest value for each measure has been highlighted for easy reference.

**Table 7**

**Additional Comparisons of the Three Tippecanoe County School Corporations with MSD Lawrence Township, South Bend Community Schools, Evansville-Vanderburgh Schools and the Vigo County School Corporation, 2005-2006**

| Statistical Measure | LSC | TSC | WLCSC | MSD Lawrence Twp | South Bend Comm. Schools | EVSC | Vigo County Schools |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Assessed Value/Student | $345,166 | $353,489 | **$472,891** | $320,118 | $239,751 | $347,603 | $234,324 |
| State Support Per ADM | $3,580 | $2,701 | **$1,879** | $3,430 | $4,526 | $3,604 | $4,200 |
| Attendance Rate | 95.7% | **96.8%** | 96.6% | 96.3% | 93.1% | **96.8%** | 95.8% |
| Graduation Rate | 77% | 91% | **98%** | 91% | 88% | 92% | 91% |
| College Attendance Rate | 83.9% | 73.0% | **96.6%** | 79.4% | 68.3% | 76.7% | 80.4% |
| SAT Scores | 1038 | 1061 | **1200** | 1039 | 979 | 1010 | 1007 |
| % Taking SAT | 50% | 60% | **94%** | 59% | 49% | 40% | 50% |
| ISTEP Pass Both Eng/Math | 54% | 69% | **89%** | 62% | 46% | 56% | 60% |
| Remediation Dollars per Student | $24 | $14 | $4 | $20 | **$32** | $24 | $22 |
| Square Miles (area) | 7 | **437** | 3 | 48 | 160 | 241 | 415 |
| Round Trip Bus Miles | 1,025 | 5,047 | 211 | **10,928** | 10,732 | 6,420 | 5,112 |
| Students Per Teacher | **13.0** | 18.4 | 17.2 | 17.9 | 16.5 | 15.7 | 16.0 |
| Suspension / Expulsion | 8.6 | 7.6 | 1.0 | 22.6 | **41.6** | 21.4 | 21.6 |
| Minority Students | 29.0% | 12.8% | 26.9% | 46.9% | **55.0%** | 22.0% | 12.6% |
| Limited English | **836** | 276 | 98 | 680 | 1,922 | 272 | 87 |
| Home School Enrollment | 137 | 116 | 32 | 221 | **549** | 490 | 373 |
| Free Lunch % | **51%** | 22% | 10% | 28.5% | 61% | 50% | 36.9% |

## STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

As this report moves toward projecting future student population, it is important to delineate some assumptions that, if not accurate, can change the outcome of the projections. Those assumptions are:

1. The legal age for attending schools in Indiana will remain the same
2. The percentage of children now attending public schools will remain at the present level
3. The school corporation boundaries will remain as they are at present

4. The students will progress through the grade levels at about the same retention rate as at present
5. The dropout rate will remain about the same
6. The current pattern of enrollment increases and decreases will remain the same

Table 8 presents the student enrollment for the three Tippecanoe County School Corporations for 1990, 1995, 2000 and 2005 together with the number and percentage change in total population over the fifteen year period. The Lafayette School Corporation had experienced a steady decline in total student population beginning in 1995 and has lost a total of 345 students since the 1990 base year and 728 students since the 1995 high enrollment of 7,555. This translates to a 9.6 percent decline since 1995. The Tippecanoe School Corporation, on the other hand, has had a steady and significant increase in total student population having increased from 7,636 students in 1990 to a

**Table 8**
**Student Population of Tippecanoe County School Corporations and Comparison Corporations for 1990, 1995. 2000, and 2005 with Number and Percentage Change From 1990 to 2005**

| School Corporation | 1990 Students | 1995 Students | 2000 Students | 2005 Students | Number Change | Percentage Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lafayette School Corp | 7,372 | 7,555 | 7,405 | 7,027 | -345 | -4.7 |
| Tippecanoe School Corp | 7,636 | 8,522 | 9,711 | 11,012 | 3,376 | 44.2% |
| West Lafayette CSC | 1,982 | 2,149 | 1,876 | 2,048 | 66 | 3.3% |
| | | | | | | |
| **County Totals** | **16,990** | **18,226** | **18,992** | **20,087** | **3,097** | **18.2%** |
| | | | | | | |
| MSD Lawrence Twp | 11,066 | 13,685 | 15,692 | 16,205 | 5,139 | 46.3% |
| South Bend CSC | 21,425 | 21,136 | 21,536 | 22,021 | 596 | 2.8% |
| EVSC | 22,918 | 23,713 | 22,875 | 22,110 | -808 | -3.5% |
| Vigo County | 16,982 | 16,971 | 16,545 | 16,420 | -562 | -3.3% |
| **Comparison Group Total** | **72,391** | **75,505** | **76,648** | **76,756** | **4,365** | **6.0%** |
| **State of Indiana** | **953,172** | **976,585** | **988,691** | **1,034,723** | **81,551** | **8.6%** |

total of 11,012 students in the 2005-2006 school year. This is an increase of 3,376 students or 44.2 percent. The West Lafayette Community School Corporation has increased 66 students over the period for a 3.3 percent increase reflecting relative stability in the student enrollment over time.

With respect to the state comparison groups used in this study, the MSD of Lawrence Township experienced a 46.3 percent increase during the period mirroring the TSC, while the South Bend Community Schools were relatively stable and the EVSC and Vigo County Schools were declining by 3.5 and 3.3 percent respectively.

As shown in Table 9, in terms of net migration within the three Tippecanoe County school corporations, it is interesting to note that for the 2004-2005 school year 578 students migrated out of the LSC with 455 of them migrating to a school corporation within the county while 296 students migrated into the LSC, 203 of them from other school corporations within the county. That is a net loss to in-county migration of 282 students for the LSC. In terms of the TSC, 325 migrated out of the system with 219 enrolling in a school within the county while 607 students migrated into the TSC, 467 of them from within the county. That is a net increase in in-county migration of 282 students migrating into the TSC. The WLCSC had 40 students migrate out of the WLCSC, all of whom migrated to Tippecanoe County school corporations while 65 migrated into the WLCSC, all from other school corporations within the county. Thus a total of 943 students migrated out of Tippecanoe County school corporations with 714 or 75.7 percent of them migrating within the county. The TSC was the clear gainer in the in-county migration process.

**Table 9**
**In and Out Migration of Students From the LSC, TSC and WLCSC for the 2004-2005 School Year**

| School Corporation | Migration Out | Migration Out Within County | Migration In | Migration In Within County |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Lafayette School Corp** | 578 | 455 | 296 | 203 |
| **Tippecanoe School Corp** | 325 | 219 | 607 | 467 |
| **West Lafayette CSC** | 40 | 40 | 65 | 65 |
| **Total** | **943** | **714** | **968** | **735** |

As shown in Table 10, in 1995 the LSC enrolled 41.5 percent of the area's public school enrollment. By 2005 the LSC enrolled just 35 percent of the public school student population in the county. The TSC, on the other hand, in 1995 enrolled 46.8 percent of the county public school population which increased to 54.8 percent by 2005. The WLCSC remained nearly the same at 11.8 percent in 1995

and 10.2 percent in 2005. The total public school population of the county increased from 18,226 in 1995 to 20,088 in 2005, an increase of 1,862 students or 10.2 percent. From 1995 to 2005, the total public school student population in the state of Indiana increased from 976,585 to 1,034,729 for a 58,144 student or 6.0 percent increase. Thus, the growth of total county public school population increased much more sharply in Tippecanoe County than in the state of Indiana with the majority of that county growth being in the TSC.

**Table 10**
**Student Population of Tippecanoe County School Corporations, and Percent of Total Comparison Group Student Population, 1995, 2000 and 2005**

| School Corporation | 1995 Students | % Of Area | 2000 Students | % Of Area | 2005 Students | % Of Area |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Lafayette School Corporation** | 7,555 | 41.5 | 7,405 | 39.0 | 7,028 | 35.0 |
| **Tippecanoe School Corporation** | 8,522 | 46.8 | 9,711 | 51.1 | 11,012 | 54.8 |
| **West Lafayette Community Schools** | 2,149 | 11.8 | 1,876 | 9.9 | 2,048 | 10.2 |
| **TOTALS** | **18,226** | | **18,992** | | **20,088** | |

Tables 11-13 present the enrollment by grade and grade configuration for the Lafayette School Corporation, Tippecanoe School Corporation and the West Lafayette Community School Corporation for 2001 through 2005 and the five year continuation rate at each grade level. The continuation rate is a ratio between the number of pupils at one grade level succeeding to the next grade level the next year. For example, if in one year there were 335 students in one grade level, and the following school year that number was 361 in the next grade level, the continuation rate would be 107.8 or a net in-migration of 7.8 percent for that grade cohort. A continuation rate of less that 100 would be evident in a grade that one year had 320 students while the next year at the next grade there were just 318 for a continuation rate of 99.4. These factors are influenced by migration in and out of the school district as well as retention policy or fluctuations in non-public school enrollments. Continuation rates are shown by grade, by grade configuration and by corporation total for each of the three school corporations.

Table 11 shows that the total enrollment for the LSC decreased from 7,447 students in 2001-2002 to 6,973 students in the 2005-2006 school year with a continuation rate of 96.8. The elementary student population decreased from 3,590 to 3,114 with a continuation rate of 96.3. The middle

grades decreased from 1,776 in 2001-2002 to 1,651 students in the 2005-2006 school year with a continuation rate of 97.6. The high school grades increased from 2,081 in the 2001-2002 school year to 2,208 students in the 2005-2006 school year with a continuation rate of 96.8. The high school enrollment increase is largely at grade nine. The continuation rates at grades 10, 11, and 12

**Table 11**
**Lafayette School Corporation Corporation-wide Enrollments by Grade Level and Grade Configuration, 2001-2005 with Five Year Continuation Rates**

| Grade Level | 2001-02 | 2002-03 | 2003-04 | 2004-05 | 2005-06 | Five Year Continuation Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| KDG | 604 | 583 | 566 | 591 | 527 | |
| 1 | 591 | 619 | 588 | 562 | 554 | 99.1 |
| 2 | 597 | 578 | 581 | 541 | 508 | 93.5 |
| 3 | 633 | 580 | 560 | 569 | 495 | 95.9 |
| 4 | 604 | 622 | 570 | 535 | 507 | 94.3 |
| 5 | 561 | 584 | 611 | 582 | 523 | 98.7 |
| **Elem. Total** | **3,590** | **3,566** | **3,476** | **3,380** | **3,114** | **96.3** |
| Ave Per Grade | 598 | 594 | 579 | 563 | 519 | |
| | | | | | | |
| 6 | 613 | 554 | 582 | 607 | 535 | 97.4 |
| 7 | 611 | 605 | 575 | 594 | 556 | 99.1 |
| 8 | 552 | 559 | 602 | 575 | 560 | 96.3 |
| **Middle School Total** | **1,776** | **1,718** | **1,759** | **1,776** | **1,651** | **97.6** |
| Ave Per Grade | 592 | 573 | 586 | 592 | 550 | |
| | | | | | | |
| 9 | 596 | 642 | 583 | 414 | 586 | 106.1 |
| 10 | 507 | 485 | 599 | 578 | 612 | 94.9 |
| 11 | 458 | 487 | 445 | 536 | 532 | 92.4 |
| 12 | 420 | 451 | 443 | 429 | 478 | 93.8 |
| **High School Total** | **2,081** | **2,265** | **2,070** | **2,157** | **2,208** | **96.8** |
| Ave Per Grade | 520 | 566 | 518 | 539 | 552 | |
| **Corporate Total** | **7,447** | **7,549** | **7,305** | **7,313** | **6,973** | **96.8** |
| **Ave Per Grade** | 572 | 581 | 562 | 563 | 536 | |
| **Number Change** | | +102 | -244 | +8 | -340 | |
| **Percentage Change** | | +1.4% | -3.2% | +0.1% | -4.6% | |

are 94.9, 92.4 and 93.8 respectively, and show that the LSC loses 18.9 percent of its high school enrollment, net in-out migration, during the high school years.

The elementary per-grade-average number of students decreased from 598 per grade to 519, while the middle grades decreased from 592 per grade to 550 per grade. Grades nine through twelve increased from an average of 520 to 552. Corporation-wide, the average number of students per grade decreased from 572 in 2001-2002 to 536 per grade in 2005-2006. That is a decrease of 36 students per grade or essentially two classrooms of students per grade over the five year period.

Table 12 shows that the total enrollment for the TSC increased from 9,803 students in 2001-2002 to 11,086 students in the 2005-2006 school year with a continuation rate of 101.5. The elementary student population increased from 4,744 to 5,200 with a continuation rate of 103.1. The middle grades increased from 2,287 in 2001-2002 to 2,624 students in the 2005-2006 school year with a continuation rate of 102.2. The high school grades increased from 2,772 in the 2001-2002 school year to 3,262 students in the 2005-2006 school year with a continuation rate of 99.1.

## Table 12

## Tippecanoe School Corporation Corporation-wide Enrollments By Grade Level and Grade Configuration, 2001-2005 with Five Year Continuation Rates

| Grade Level | 2001-02 | 2002-03 | 2003-04 | 2004-05 | 2005-06 | Five Year Continuation Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| KDG | 698 | 816 | 773 | 805 | 838 | |
| 1 | 809 | 784 | 875 | 859 | 917 | 111.1 |
| 2 | 806 | 785 | 764 | 861 | 856 | 98.1 |
| 3 | 805 | 795 | 813 | 800 | 888 | 102.5 |
| 4 | 831 | 812 | 812 | 838 | 845 | 102.8 |
| 5 | 795 | 835 | 836 | 804 | 856 | 101.2 |
| **Elem. Total** | **4,744** | **4,827** | **4,873** | **4,967** | **5,200** | **103.1** |
| Ave Per Grade | 791 | 805 | 812 | 829 | 867 | |
| | | | | | | |
| 6 | 827 | 802 | 870 | 879 | 836 | 103.6 |
| 7 | 774 | 826 | 824 | 869 | 870 | 100.4 |
| 8 | 686 | 779 | 839 | 830 | 918 | 102.1 |
| **Middle School Total** | **2,287** | **2,407** | **2,533** | **2,578** | **2,624** | **102.0** |
| Ave Per Grade | 762 | 802 | 844 | 859 | 875 | |
| | | | | | | |
| 9 | 746 | 724 | 816 | 861 | 921 | 105.9 |
| 10 | 705 | 730 | 711 | 825 | 869 | 99.5 |
| 11 | 692 | 679 | 700 | 700 | 773 | 96.1 |
| 12 | 630 | 628 | 638 | 658 | 699 | 94.7 |
| **High School Total** | **2,772** | **2,761** | **2,865** | **3,044** | **3,262** | **99.1** |
| Ave Per Grade | 693 | 690 | 716 | 761 | 816 | |
| **Corporate Total** | **9,803** | **9,995** | **10,271** | **10,589** | **11,086** | **101.5** |
| Ave Per Grade | 754 | 769 | 790 | 815 | 853 | |
| Number Change | 92 | 192 | 276 | 318 | 497 | |
| Percentage Change | 1.0% | 2.0% | 2.8% | 3.1% | 4.7% | |

The elementary, per-grade-average number of students increased from 791 per grade to 867, while the middle grades increased from 762 per grade to 875 per grade. Grades nine through twelve increased from an average of 693 to 816. Corporation-wide, the average number of students per grade increased from 754 in 2001-2002 to 853 per grade in 2005-2006. That is an increase of 99 students per grade or essentially five classrooms of students per grade over the five-year period.

Table 13 shows that the total enrollment for the WLCSC increased from 1,952 students in 2001-2002 to 2,028 students in the 2005-2006 school year with a continuation rate of 104.7. The primary elementary student population increased from 517 to 545 with a continuation rate of 111.2 while the intermediate elementary student population increased from 801 students to 863 students with a continuation rate of 104.4. The middle grades increased from 479 in 2001-2002 to 486 students in the 2005-2006 school year with a continuation rate of 105.4. The high school grades increased from 672 in the 2001-2002 school year to 679 students in the 2005-2006 school year with a continuation rate of 99.7.

The primary elementary, per-grade-average number of students increased from 517 per grade to 545, while the intermediate elementary increased from 134 to 144 students per grade. The middle grades increased from 160 per grade to 162 per grade. Grades nine through twelve increased from an average of 168 to 170. Corporation-wide, the average number of students per grade increased from 150 in 2001-2002 to 156 per grade in 2005-2006. That is an increase of 4 students per grade or essentially stable student population across the 13 grades.

**Table 13**

**West Lafayette Community School Corporation Corporation-wide Enrollments by Grade Level and Grade Configuration, 2001-2005 with Five Year Continuation Rates**

| Grade Level | 2001-02 | 2002-03 | 2003-04 | 2004-05 | 2005-06 | Five Year Continuation Rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| KDG | 123 | 109 | 108 | 111 | 108 | |
| 1 | 133 | 149 | 120 | 135 | 152 | 123.5 |
| 2 | 124 | 134 | 149 | 133 | 145 | 104.8 |
| 3 | 137 | 134 | 136 | 159 | 140 | 105.4 |
| Primary Total | 517 | 526 | 513 | 538 | 545 | 111.2 |
| Ave Per Grade | 129 | 132 | 128 | 135 | 136 | |
| | | | | | | |
| 4 | 145 | 145 | 132 | 146 | 164 | 103.7 |
| 5 | 139 | 157 | 138 | 142 | 154 | 104.2 |
| 6 | 141 | 154 | 145 | 161 | 144 | 105.3 |
| Intermediate Total | 801 | 828 | 783 | 826 | 863 | 104.4 |
| Ave Per Grade | 134 | 138 | 131 | 138 | 144 | |
| | | | | | | |
| 7 | 167 | 142 | 163 | 156 | 171 | 105.1 |
| 8 | 171 | 178 | 144 | 171 | 171 | 105.6 |
| Middle School Total | 479 | 474 | 452 | 488 | 486 | 105.4 |
| Ave Per Grade | 160 | 158 | 151 | 163 | 162 | |
| | | | | | | |
| 9 | 204 | 181 | 185 | 153 | 172 | 104.2 |
| 10 | 162 | 181 | 177 | 171 | 155 | 95.1 |
| 11 | 159 | 163 | 189 | 176 | 181 | 102.6 |
| 12 | 147 | 154 | 160 | 180 | 171 | 96.9 |
| High School Total | 672 | 679 | 711 | 680 | 679 | 99.7 |
| Ave Per Grade | 168 | 170 | 178 | 170 | 170 | |
| Corporate Total | 1,952 | 1,981 | 1,946 | 1,994 | 2,028 | 104.7 |
| Ave Per Grade | 150 | 152 | 150 | 153 | 156 | |
| Number Change | 79 | 29 | -35 | 48 | 34 | |
| Percentage Change | 4.2% | 1.5% | -1.8% | 2.5% | 1.1% | |

Table 14 presents an analysis of the resident live birth rates for Tippecanoe County, and the number of kindergarten students entering the Tippecanoe county school corporations five years later beginning with 1996. Such a calculation is important in determining future enrollments by projecting future kindergarten enrollments. There has been a steady increase in year-to-year resident live births in Tippecanoe County over the past eight years. From 1996 to 2000, the county averaged 1,816 resident live births per year. For the period 2001 to 2003, resident live births increased to an average of 1,957 per year an increase of 141 or 7.8 percent resident live births per year. In 2003, the most recent year for full year data, 2,012 resident live births were recorded for Tippecanoe County. It is interesting to note that 11.9 percent of the county's resident live births in 2003 were to Hispanic females while just 6.2 percent of the total county population is of Hispanic origin. It is generally believed that birth rates mirror local economic conditions. That is to say that as the economy is strong, birth rates are strong. As the economy weakens so do birth rates. This has not been the case in Tippecanoe County during the economic downturn experienced in Indiana during the early years of this decade.

**Table 14**
**Number of Live Births in Tippecanoe County from 1984 through 2003**
**and Number of Students Entering Kindergarten Five Years Later**
**in LSC, TSC, and WLCSC with Estimates Through 2015**

| YEAR | TIPPECANOE COUNTY RESIDENT LIVE BIRTHS | YEAR | LSC KDG ENROLLMENT AND PERCENT OF LIVE BIRTHS | | TSC KDG ENROLLMENT AND PERCENT OF LIVE BIRTHS | | WLCSC KDG ENROLLMENT AND PERCENT OF LIVE BIRTHS | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1996** | 1,737 | 2001 | 604 | 34.8% | 698 | 40.2% | 123 | 7.1% |
| **1997** | 1,804 | 2002 | 583 | 32.3% | 816 | 45.2% | 109 | 6.0% |
| **1998** | 1,770 | 2003 | 566 | 32.0% | 773 | 43.7% | 108 | 6.1% |
| **1999** | 1,838 | 2004 | 591 | 32.2% | 805 | 43.8% | 111 | 6.0% |
| **2000** | 1,931 | 2005 | 527 | 27.3% | 838 | 43.4% | 108 | 5.6% |
| **Totals** | **9,080 for an average of 1,816 per year** | | **2,871** | **30.8%** | **3,930** | **43.6%** | **559** | **5.9%** |
| **2001** | 1,917 | 2006 | 590* | | 836** | | 113*** | |
| **2002** | 1,941 | 2007 | 599* | | 846** | | 115*** | |
| **2003** | 2,012 | 2008 | 620* | | 877** | | 119*** | |
| **Totals** | **5,870 for an average of 1,957 per year** | | | | | | | |
| **2004** | 1,962**** | 2009 | 604* | | 855** | | 116*** | |
| **2005** | 1,962**** | 2010 | 604* | | 855** | | 116*** | |
| **2006** | 1,962**** | 2011 | 604* | | 855** | | 116*** | |
| **2007** | 1,997**** | 2012 | 615* | | 871** | | 118*** | |
| **2008** | 1,997**** | 2013 | 625* | | 871** | | 118*** | |
| **2009** | 1,997**** | 2014 | 615* | | 871** | | 118*** | |
| **2010** | 1,997**** | 2015 | 615* | | 871** | | 118*** | |

**Estimate based on 30.8 percent of resident live births*
***Estimate based on 43.6 percent of resident live births*
****Estimate based on 5.9 percent of resident live births*
*****Estimate based on past three year average plus 1.8 percent increase in 2007*

In terms of kindergarten enrollment five years after a given years' resident live births, from 2001 to 2005 the LSC enrolled 2,871 kindergarten students or 30.8 percent of the resident live births from the five previous years. The Tippecanoe School Corporation enrolled 3,930 kindergarten students five years after resident live birth or 43.6 percent of the county's resident live births. The WLCSC enrolled 559 kindergarten students during the period or 5.9 percent of the resident live births. The year-to-year percentage for both the TSC and the WLCSC has remained relatively stable; however, the percentage of resident live births that enroll in the LSC five years later has been declining for each of the last five years. Approximately 19.7 percent of the kindergarten age population of the county do not attend public school kindergarten programs but attend private, parochial or all-day programs offered within the community. Some do not attend kindergarten programs but may join the public schools in grade one.

This distribution of the resident live births is consistent with the analysis of the demographic data presented earlier in this study and suggests a continuing increase in total student population into the future as total population increases. It is speculative to project a continuing increase in resident live birth rates. It is less speculative to project that the percentage of resident live births in the townships of TSC will continue to increase. However, this study assumes a continuing resident live birth rate consistent with the average number of resident live births recorded over the past three years and increasing by 1.8 percent per year in 2007 consistent with recent increases. Further, this study assumes that the percentage of resident live births that will enroll in the each of the school corporations five years later will be 30.8 percent in the LSC, 43.6 percent in the TSC and 5.9 percent in the WLCSC over the next ten years. The projection of future kindergarten enrollments is shown in Table 14 above for each of the three Tippecanoe County school corporations. These projections represent continued increases in kindergarten enrollment when compared to the recent past. While the above calculations help project how many students will enter the system in kindergarten in the future, year-to-year continuation rates help to understand how students stay with the system once enrolled.

Tables 11-13 presented the five year average continuation rates for 2000-01 through 2005-06 by grade level and grade configuration for the Tippecanoe county school corporations. By using the projected kindergarten enrollments presented in Table 14 and the continuation rates as averaged in

Tables 11-13 for each corporation for the most recent five-year period, the projected enrollment for the Tippecanoe county school corporations, from the present to 2014 is presented in Tables 15-17.

Table 15 shows the projected total enrollment for the LSC between 2005 and 2014 decreasing from 6,973 students in the 2005 school year to 6,406 students by 2014. That is a decrease of 567 students or 8.1 percent. The elementary enrollment is projected to increase from 3,114 to 3,335 for a total of 221 students or 7.1 percent. The strength of the elementary enrollment projection turns on the recent increases in resident live births recorded in Tippecanoe County. However, the middle grades enrollment is projected to decrease by 219 students or 13.3 percent, while the high school enrollment is projected to decrease by 569 students or 25.8 percent. That would result in a total of

**Table 15**
**Lafayette School Corporation School Enrollment Projected by Three Average Resident Live Birth Rate Increased by 1.8% in 2007 and Five-Year Continuation Rates, 2005-2014**

| GRADE | Cont Rate | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| KDG | | 527 | 590 | 599 | 620 | 604 | 604 | 604 | 615 | 615 | 615 |
| 1 | 99.1 | 554 | 522 | 585 | 594 | 614 | 599 | 599 | 599 | 609 | 609 |
| 2 | 93.5 | 508 | 518 | 488 | 547 | 555 | 574 | 560 | 560 | 560 | 569 |
| 3 | 95.9 | 495 | 487 | 497 | 468 | 525 | 532 | 550 | 537 | 537 | 537 |
| 4 | 94.3 | 507 | 467 | 459 | 469 | 441 | 495 | 502 | 519 | 506 | 506 |
| 5 | 98.7 | 523 | 500 | 461 | 453 | 463 | 435 | 489 | 495 | 512 | 499 |
| **ELE TOTAL** | **96.3** | **3,114** | **3,084** | **3,189** | **3,151** | **3,202** | **3,239** | **3,304** | **3,325** | **3,339** | **3,335** |
| **AVE PER GRADE** | | 519 | 514 | 532 | 525 | 534 | 540 | 551 | 554 | 557 | 556 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | 97.4 | 535 | 509 | 487 | 449 | 441 | 451 | 424 | 476 | 482 | 499 |
| 7 | 99.1 | 556 | 530 | 504 | 483 | 445 | 437 | 447 | 420 | 472 | 478 |
| 8 | 96.3 | 560 | 535 | 510 | 485 | 465 | 429 | 421 | 430 | 404 | 455 |
| **MS TOTAL** | **97.6** | **1,651** | **1,574** | **1,501** | **1,417** | **1,351** | **1,317** | **1,292** | **1,326** | **1,358** | **1,432** |
| **AVE PER GRADE** | | 550 | 525 | 500 | 472 | 450 | 439 | 431 | 442 | 453 | 477 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | 106.1 | 586 | 594 | 568 | 541 | 515 | 493 | 455 | 447 | 456 | 429 |
| 10 | 94.9 | 612 | 556 | 564 | 539 | 513 | 487 | 468 | 432 | 424 | 433 |
| 11 | 92.4 | 532 | 565 | 514 | 521 | 498 | 474 | 500 | 432 | 410 | 392 |
| 12 | 93.8 | 478 | 499 | 530 | 482 | 489 | 467 | 445 | 469 | 405 | 385 |
| **HS TOTAL** | **96.8** | **2,208** | **2,214** | **2,176** | **2,083** | **2,015** | **2,023** | **1,868** | **1,780** | **1,695** | **1,639** |
| **AVE PER GRADE** | | 552 | 554 | 544 | 521 | 504 | 506 | 467 | 445 | 424 | 410 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CORP TOTAL** | **96.8** | **6,973** | **6,872** | **6,866** | **6,651** | **6,568** | **6,579** | **6,464** | **6,431** | **6,392** | **6,406** |
| **AVE PER GRADE** | | 536 | 529 | 528 | 512 | 505 | 506 | 497 | 495 | 492 | 493 |

1,639 students at the high school level in the LSC. The elementary per-grade average increases from 519 per grade to 556 per grade, while the middle school per-grade average decreases from 550 per grade to 477 per grade. The high school, per-grade-average decreased from 552 per grade to 410 students per grade in this projection.

Table 16 shows the projected enrollment for the TSC between 2005 and 2014 increasing from 11,086 students in the 2005 school year to 12,923 students by 2014. That is an increase of 1,837 students or 16.6 percent. The elementary enrollment is projected to increase from 5,200 to 5,720 for a total of 520 students or 10 percent. The middle grades enrollment is projected to increase by 485 students or 18.5 percent, while the high school enrollment is projected to increase by 832 students or 25.5 percent. That would result in a total of 4,094 students at the high school level in the TSC. The elementary per grade average increases from 867 per grade to 953 per grade, while the middle school per grade average increases from 875 per grade to 1,036 per grade. The high school per grade average increases from 816 per grade to 1,024 students per grade in this projection.

**Table 16**
**Tippecanoe School Corporation School Enrollment Projected by Three Average Resident Live Birth Rate Increased by 1.8% in 2007 and Five-Year Continuation Rates, 2005-2014**

| GRADE | Cont Rate | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **KDG** | | 838 | 836 | 846 | 877 | 855 | 855 | 855 | 871 | 871 | 871 |
| **1** | 111.1 | 917 | 931 | 929 | 940 | 974 | 950 | 950 | 950 | 968 | 968 |
| **2** | 98.1 | 856 | 900 | 913 | 911 | 922 | 955 | 932 | 932 | 932 | 950 |
| **3** | 102.5 | 888 | 877 | 923 | 936 | 934 | 945 | 979 | 955 | 955 | 955 |
| **4** | 102.8 | 845 | 913 | 902 | 949 | 962 | 960 | 971 | 1,006 | 982 | 982 |
| **5** | 101.2 | 856 | 855 | 924 | 913 | 961 | 974 | 972 | 983 | 1,018 | 994 |
| **ELE TOTAL** | **103.1** | **5,200** | **5,312** | **5,437** | **5,526** | **5,608** | **5,639** | **5,659** | **5,679** | **5,726** | **5,720** |
| **AVE PER GRADE** | | 867 | 885 | 906 | 921 | 935 | 940 | 943 | 950 | 954 | 953 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **6** | 103.6 | 836 | 887 | 886 | 957 | 946 | 996 | 1,009 | 1,007 | 1,018 | 1,055 |
| **7** | 100.4 | 870 | 839 | 891 | 890 | 961 | 950 | 1,000 | 1,013 | 1,011 | 1,022 |
| **8** | 102.1 | 918 | 888 | 857 | 910 | 909 | 981 | 970 | 1,021 | 1,034 | 1,032 |
| **MS TOTAL** | **102.0** | **2,624** | **2,614** | **2,634** | **2,757** | **2,816** | **2,927** | **2,979** | **3,041** | **3,063** | **3,109** |
| **AVE PER GRADE** | | 875 | 871 | 878 | 919 | 939 | 976 | 993 | 1,014 | 1,021 | 1,036 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **9** | 105.9 | 921 | 972 | 940 | 908 | 964 | 963 | 1039 | 1027 | 1081 | 1095 |
| **10** | 99.5 | 869 | 916 | 967 | 935 | 903 | 959 | 958 | 1034 | 1022 | 1076 |
| **11** | 96.1 | 773 | 835 | 880 | 929 | 899 | 868 | 922 | 921 | 994 | 982 |
| **12** | 94.7 | 699 | 732 | 791 | 833 | 808 | 851 | 822 | 873 | 872 | 941 |
| **HS TOTAL** | **99.1** | **3,262** | **3,455** | **3,578** | **3,605** | **3,646** | **3,641** | **3,741** | **3,855** | **3,969** | **4,094** |
| **AVE PER GRADE** | | 816 | 864 | 895 | 901 | 912 | 910 | 935 | 964 | 992 | 1,024 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CORP TOTAL** | **101.5** | **11,086** | **11,381** | **11,649** | **11,888** | **12,070** | **12,207** | **12,379** | **12,575** | **12,758** | **12,923** |
| **AVE PER GRADE** | | 853 | 875 | 896 | 914 | 928 | 939 | 952 | 967 | 981 | 994 |

Table 17 shows the projected enrollment for the WLCSC between 2005 and 2014 increasing from 2,028 students in the 2005 school year to 2,249 students by 2014. That is an increase of 223 students or 11.9 percent. The primary elementary enrollment is projected to increase from 545 to 572 for a total of 30 students or 5.5 percent, while the intermediate elementary enrollment is projected to increase by 57 students or 12.3 percent. The middle grades enrollment is projected to increase by 42 students or 12.3 percent, while the high school enrollment is projected to increase by 94 students or 13.8 percent. That would result in a total of 773 students at the high school level in the WLCSC. The primary elementary per-grade average increases from 545 per grade to 575

per grade, while the intermediate elementary per-grade-average increases from 462 students to 519 students per grade. The middle grades, grades seven and eight, per-grade-average increases from 342 per grade to 384 per grade. The high school per-grade average increases from 679 per grade to 773 students per grade in this projection.

**Table 17**
**West Lafayette Community School Corporation School Enrollment**
**Projected by Three Average Resident Live Birth Rate Increased by 1.8% Each Three Years and Five-Year Continuation Rates, 2005-2014**

| GRADE | Cont Rate | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **KDG** | | 108 | 113 | 115 | 119 | 116 | 116 | 116 | 118 | 118 | 118 |
| **1** | 123.5 | 152 | 133 | 140 | 142 | 147 | 143 | 143 | 143 | 146 | 146 |
| **2** | 104.8 | 145 | 159 | 139 | 147 | 149 | 154 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 153 |
| **3** | 105.4 | 140 | 153 | 168 | 147 | 155 | 157 | 162 | 158 | 158 | 158 |
| **Primary Total** | **111.2** | **545** | **558** | **572** | **555** | **567** | **570** | **571** | **569** | **572** | **575** |
| | | 136 | 140 | 143 | 139 | 142 | 143 | 143 | 142 | 143 | 144 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **4** | 103.7 | 164 | 145 | 159 | 174 | 152 | 161 | 163 | 168 | 164 | 164 |
| **5** | 104.2 | 154 | 171 | 151 | 166 | 181 | 158 | 168 | 170 | 175 | 171 |
| **6** | 105.3 | 144 | 162 | 180 | 159 | 175 | 191 | 166 | 177 | 179 | 184 |
| **Intermediate Total** | **104.4** | **462** | **478** | **490** | **499** | **508** | **510** | **497** | **515** | **518** | **519** |
| | | 154 | 159 | 163 | 166 | 169 | 170 | 166 | 172 | 173 | 173 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **7** | 105.1 | 171 | 151 | 170 | 189 | 167 | 184 | 201 | 174 | 186 | 188 |
| **8** | 105.6 | 171 | 181 | 159 | 180 | 200 | 176 | 194 | 212 | 184 | 196 |
| **MS TOTAL** | **105.4** | **342** | **332** | **329** | **369** | **367** | **360** | **395** | **386** | **370** | **384** |
| **AVE PER GRADE** | | 171 | 166 | 165 | 185 | 184 | 180 | 198 | 193 | 185 | 192 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **9** | 104.2 | 172 | 178 | 189 | 166 | 188 | 208 | 183 | 202 | 221 | 192 |
| **10** | 95.1 | 155 | 164 | 169 | 180 | 158 | 179 | 198 | 174 | 192 | 210 |
| **11** | 102.6 | 181 | 159 | 168 | 173 | 185 | 152 | 184 | 203 | 179 | 197 |
| **12** | 96.9 | 171 | 175 | 154 | 163 | 168 | 179 | 157 | 178 | 197 | 174 |
| **HS TOTAL** | **99.7** | **679** | **676** | **680** | **682** | **699** | **718** | **722** | **757** | **789** | **773** |
| **AVE PER GRADE** | | 170 | 169 | 170 | 171 | 175 | 180 | 181 | 189 | 197 | 193 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CORP TOTAL** | 104.7 | 2,028 | 2,044 | 2,071 | 2,105 | 2,141 | 2,158 | 2,185 | 2,227 | 2,249 | 2,251 |
| **AVE PER GRADE** | | 156 | 157 | 159 | 162 | 165 | 166 | 168 | 171 | 173 | 173 |

The total public school enrollment is projected to increase from the current year total of 20,087 to 21,580 by 2014. That is a 1,493 student increase or 7.4 percent. However, the LSC is projected to decrease by 567 students, while the TSC is projected to increase by 1,837 students. The WLCSC is projected to increase by 223 students. The per-grade averages for the K-5 enrollment of the three corporations combined is currently 1,530 students projected to increase to 1,660 students per grade by 2014. The middle grades, grades six through eight, currently average 1,587 students per grade, is projected to increase to 1,703 students per grade by 2014. The high school, grades nine through twelve enrollment, currently averages 1,537 students per grade, and is projected to average 1,627 students per grade by 2014. The total combined county enrollment currently averages 1,545 students per grade, and is projected to average 1,627 students per grade by 2014.

## Community and Student Demographic Impact on Educational Facilities and the Consideration of a Consolidated School Corporation in Tippecanoe County

The changing nature of the population and demographic distribution of the population throughout Tippecanoe County over recent years has caused changes in the delivery of educational programs in the three county school corporations. Lafayette School Corporation has been losing students and closing elementary school facilities as a result. Tippecanoe School Corporation has been gaining students in significant numbers throughout the grade configuration of the school corporation; has had to add new elementary and middle school facilities and add space to many elementary and middle school facilities as well as significant additions to both high schools. The student population in the West Lafayette Community School Corporation, while stable for the past several years, has had to close one elementary school and make significant physical improvements to the West Lafayette Junior/Senior High School and outside athletic facilities.

The educational facilities currently used by the three school corporations are generally modern, efficient and effective in the delivery of comprehensive and productive educational programming. Each of the schools has been updated consistently over the past several years through capital projects and building additions to keep them current with the needs of modern and effective school program delivery. They are well maintained, and the elementary and middle schools are generally located close to their student population source. This is important to the logistics in a school corporation such as the TSC with 437 square miles that essentially form a donut around Lafayette

and West Lafayette, and is bisected by the Wabash River. The locations of the school facilities in Lafayette and West Lafayette are generally within easy access to their student populations.

During the 2005-2006 academic year the three school corporations operated the number of elementary, middle and high schools shown in Table 18 below with the average number of students at each level of the grade configuration as shown. In addition, eight elementary, four pre-kindergarten through grade twelve, and one Junior/Senior high school were operated within the county by private or parochial interests.

**Table 18**
**Number and Average Enrollment of Elementary, Middle and High Schools in Tippecanoe County, 2005-2006**

| School Corporation | Elementary Number | Elementary Average Enrollment | Middle School Number | Middle School Average Enrollment | High School Number | High School Average Enrollment |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lafayette School Corporation | 9 | 457 | 2 | 823 | 1 | 2,269 |
| Tippecanoe School Corporation | 9 | 582 | 6 | 436 | 2 | 1,608 |
| West Lafayette CSC | 2 | 513 | | | 1 | 1,020 Jr./Sr. High School |
| Non-Public Schools | 3 | NA | | | 4 Pk-12 | NA |
| Catholic Schools | 3 | 215 | | | 1 Jr./Sr. High School | 355 |
| Lutheran Schools | 1 Pk-8th Grade | 235 | | | | |
| New Community School (West Lafayette) | 1 K-7th Grade | 46 | | | | |

Tables 19, 20 and 21 present the grade organization, site acreage, number of classrooms, student capacity and student enrollment for the 2005-2006 school year. Table 19 demonstrates that the LSC had an elementary student capacity of 3,656 students in 181 classrooms not including Linnwood Elementary School in 2005-2006. Linnwood is to be closed with the end of the 2005-2006 school year. The elementary schools had a total enrollment of 3,113. Thus the elementary schools

were operating at 85.1 percent of their capacity not including the Linnwood facility. Elementary schools are believed to be efficiently occupied at 90-92 percent of their capacity. The elementary enrollment projection generated for this study indicates an elementary enrollment for the LSC of 3,335 by the 2014 academic year. Thus, some space for elementary enrollment may be needed by that time. Currently all elementary schools are under-enrolled in terms of student capacity.

**Table 19**

**Grades Included, Date Facility Occupied, Site Acreage, Number of Classrooms, Student Capacity and 2005-2006 Enrollment for the LSC**

| School Name and Address | Grades | Date Occupied | Acreage | Number Classrooms | Student Capacity | Enrollment 2005* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Amelia Earhart Elementary 3280 S. 9th Street** | K-5 | 1996 | 14.0 | 22 | 450 | 428 |
| **Edgelea Elementary 2910 S. 18th Street** | K-5 | 1987 | 18.5 | 27 | 634 | 524 |
| **Glen Acres Elementary 3767 Kimberly Drive** | K-5 | 1970 | 13.8 | 27 | 575 | 412 |
| **Miami Elementary 2401 Beck Lane** | K-5 | 1962 | 18.0 | 30 | 541 | 433 |
| **Miller Elementary 700 S 4th Street** | K-5 | 1967 | 12.0 | 18 | 334 | 315 |
| **Murdock Elementary 2100 Cason Street** | K-5 | 1951 | 11.0 | 17 | 338 | 221 |
| **Oakland Elementary 611 S. 21st Street** | K-5 | 1977 | 4.5 | 18 | 334 | 230 |
| **Vinton Elementary 3101 Elmwood Avenue** | K-5 | 1994 | 12.0 | 22 | 450 | 369 |
| **TOTALS** | | | | **181** | **3,656** | **2,932 Plus 181 Linnwood 3,113** |
| **Linnwood Elementary 1415 Ball Street** | K-5 | 1973 Closing 2006 | 4.23 | 16 | 310 | 181 |
| | | | | | | |
| **Sunnyside Middle School 2500 Cason Street** | 6-8 | 1950 | 24.5 | 53 | 885 | 685 |
| **Tecumseh Middle School 2101 S. 18th Street** | 6-8 | 1958 | 26.1 | 48 | 885 | 960 |
| **TOTALS** | | | | **101** | **1,770** | **1,645** |
| | | | | | | |
| **Jefferson High School 1801 S. 18th Street** | 9-12 | 1969 | 43.2 | 102 | 2,500 | 2,269 |
| | | | | | | |
| **CORP. TOTALS** | | | | **384** | **7,926** | **7,027** |

*Data Source: 2006 Capital Projects Plan*
**Official 2005-2006 Enrollment*

Conventional wisdom suggests that elementary schools with total student populations of 400-600 students are the most efficient and cost effective. That number of students allows for full time support personnel such as music, art, physical education, media and technology within the school, while at the same time being large enough to justify full time staffing in custodial, maintenance, cafeteria and office personnel. The range of student population in the elementary schools of the LSC in 2005-2006 was from a low of 181 students at Linnwood Elementary School (to be closed in 2006) to a high of 524 at Edgelea Elementary School. The average elementary school size was 457 students and four of the elementary schools have 400 students or more enrolled. Balance in the size of student populations among the elementary schools of a corporation adds to the ability of the corporation to offer equitable programming and student services across the student populations of all of the schools.

The two middle schools of the LSC have a student capacity of 1,770 students in 101 classrooms. Their enrollment for the 2005-2006 academic year was 1,645 students. Thus, they were being occupied at 97.7 percent of their student capacity. The enrollment projection for grades six through eight generated in this study projects a total middle grades enrollment of 1,430 students by 2014. Thus, the middle schools of the LSC have sufficient space to accommodate projected enrollments. Currently, Sunnyside is a bit underutilized, while Tecumseh is a bit over its student capacity.

Jefferson High School has a student capacity of 2,500 students in 102 classroom areas. Its enrollment for the 2005-2006 academic year was 2,269, just below its student capacity at 90.8 percent. The enrollment projection for the high school totals 1,639 students by the 2014 academic year. Thus, the high school has sufficient space to accommodate projected enrollments.

Table 20 demonstrates that the TSC had an elementary student capacity of 4,843 students in 252 classrooms. The elementary schools had a total enrollment of 5,054 students. Thus the elementary schools were operating at 104.4 percent of their capacity, well over the 90-92 percent guideline suggested in this study. The elementary enrollment projection generated for this study indicates an elementary enrollment for the LSC of 5,720 by the 2014 academic year. Thus, additional space for elementary enrollment will be needed by that time. Currently, five of the elementary schools are under enrolled in terms of student capacity, while four are beyond 100 percent of student capacity. The range of student population in the elementary schools of the TSC in 2005-2006 was 300 students at Cole Elementary School to a high of 860 at Klondike Elementary School. The average elementary school size was 562 students, and four of the elementary schools have 500 students or more enrolled.

**Table 20**
**Grades Included, Date Facility Occupied, Site Acreage, Number of Classrooms, Student Capacity and 2005-2006 Enrollment for the TSC**

| School Name and Address | Grades | Date Occupied | Acreage | Number Classrooms | Student Capacity | Enrollment 2005* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Battle Ground Elementary 303 Main St. Battle Ground** | K-5 | 1952 | 5.9 | 24 | 448 | 351 |
| **Burnett Creek Elementary 5700 N 50 W** | K-5 | 1999 | 33.3 | 26 | 460 | 514 |
| **Cole Elementary 6418 E 900 S** | K-5 | 1988 | 34.7 | 17 | 318 | 300 |
| **Dayton Elementary 320 College, Dayton** | K-5 | 1983 | 13.3 | 24 | 430 | 396 |
| **Hershey Elementary 2571 E 300 N** | K-5 | 1967 | 19.3 | 36 | 789 | 743 |
| **Klondike Elementary 3311 Klondike Road** | K-5 | 1956 | 12.2 | 48 | 858 | 860 |
| **Mayflower Mill Elementary 200 E 500 S** | K-5 | 1971 | 18.0 | 29 | 632 | 682 |
| **Mintonye Elementary 200 W 800 S** | K-5 | 1967 | 15.0 | 22 | 448 | 380 |
| **Wea Ridge Elementary 1333 E 430 S** | K-5 | 1999 | 39.0 | 26 | 460 | 828 |
| **TOTALS** | | | | **252** | **4,843** | **5,054** |
| | | | | | | |
| **Battle Ground Middle School 511 Main St, Battle Ground** | 6-8 | 1979 | 15.3 | 17 | 334 | 396 |
| **East Tipp Middle School 7501 E 300 N** | 6-8 | 1958 | 20.0 | 25 | 484 | 421 |
| **Klondike Middle School 3307 Klondike Road** | 6-8 | 1979 | 20.1 | 32 | 548 | 465 |
| **Southwestern Middle School 2100 W 800 S** | 6-8 | 1982 | 19.9 | 25 | 474 | 305 |
| **Wainwright Middle School 7501 E 700 S** | 6-8 | 1965 | 29.8 | 28 | 507 | 388 |
| **Wea Ridge Middle School** | 6-8 | 2003 | 58.8 | 53 | 750 | 828 |
| **Totals** | | | | **180** | **3,097** | **2,803** |
| | | | | | | |
| **Harrison High School 5701 N 50 W** | 9-12 | 1970 | 55.0 | 91 | 1,600 | 1,603 |
| **McCutcheon High School 4951 US 231 S** | 9-12 | 1975 | 50.8 | 88 | 1,320 | 1,612 |
| **Totals** | | | | **179** | **2,920** | **3,215** |
| | | | | | | |
| **CORP. TOTALS** | | | | **816** | **10,860** | **11,072** |

*Data Source: 2006 Capital Projects Plan*
*Official 2005-2006 Enrollment*

The six middle schools of the TSC have a student capacity of 3,097 students in 180 classrooms. Their enrollment for the 2005-2006 academic year was 2,803 students. Thus, they were being occupied at 90.5 percent of their student capacity. The enrollment projection for grades six through

eight generated in this study projects a total middle grades enrollment of 3,109 students by 2014. Thus, the middle schools of the TSC will not have sufficient space to accommodate projected enrollments. Currently Battle Ground and Wea Ridge middle schools are over capacity, while the others are a bit under their student capacity. A new Battle Ground Middle School, scheduled for completion by the 2008 school year, is intended to address this problem.

Harrison and McCutcheon high schools have a student capacity of 2,920 students in 179 classroom areas. Their combined enrollment for the 2005-2006 academic year was 3,215, well above the student capacity at 110.1 percent. The enrollment projection for the high school grades totals 4,074 students by the 2014 academic year. Thus, the two high schools are significantly short of sufficient space to accommodate projected enrollments.

**Table 21**
**Grades Included, Date Facility Occupied, Site Acreage, Number of Classrooms, Student Capacity and 2005-2006 Enrollment for the WLCSC**

| School Name and Address | Grades | Date Occupied | Acreage | Number Classrooms | Student Capacity | Enrollment 2005* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Cumberland Elementary 600 Cumberland Ave** | K-3 | 1962 | 29.8 | 34 | 600 | 566 |
| **Happy Hallow Elementary 1200 North Salisbury** | 4-6 | 1961 | 33.3 | 26 | 460 | 514 |
| **TOTALS** | | | | **60** | **1,060** | **1,080** |
| | | | | | | |
| **West Lafayette Jr./Sr. High 1105 North Grant Street** | 7-12 | 1937 | 12.4 | **64** | **1,000** | **1,020** |
| | | | | | | |
| **CORP TOTALS** | | | | **124** | **2,060** | **2,100** |

*Data Source: 2006 Capital Projects Plan*
**Official 2005-2006 Enrollment*

Table 21 demonstrates that the WLCSC had an elementary student capacity of 1,060 students in 60 classrooms. The two elementary schools had a total enrollment of 1,080. Thus the elementary schools were operating at 101.9 percent of their capacity, well over the 90-92 percent guideline. The elementary enrollment projection generated for this study indicates an elementary enrollment for the WLCSC of 1,094 by the 2014 academic year. Thus, additional space for elementary enrollment may be needed by that time. Currently, Cumberland Elementary School is a bit under enrolled in terms of student capacity, while Happy Hollow is a bit above 100 percent of student capacity.

West Lafayette Junior Senior High Schools has a student capacity of 1,000 students in 64 classroom areas. Their combined enrollment for the 2005-2006 academic year was 1,020 a bit above the student capacity at 102 percent. The enrollment projection for the junior/senior high school grades totals 1,157 students by the 2014 academic year. Thus, the school may not have sufficient space to accommodate projected enrollments.

Conventional wisdom suggests that elementary schools with total student populations of 400-600 students are the most efficient and cost effective. That range of students allows for full time support personnel in the areas of music, art, physical education, media and technology within the school, while at the same time being large enough to justify full time staffing in custodial, maintenance, cafeteria and office personnel.

Table 22 presents the number of public elementary, middle and high schools in Tippecanoe County compared with the MSD of Lawrence Township, South Bend Community Schools, Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation and the Vigo County School Corporation. The MSD of Lawrence Township, with the smallest total enrollment among the group of school corporations examined, has the largest schools in terms of student population of the school corporations examined. The number and size of elementary schools in the five areas are nearly the same except for the MSD of Lawrence Township where the average size elementary school is 50-100 students larger than in the other four. The MSD of Lawrence Township also has very large middle schools compared to the other four areas examined with just three middle schools averaging 1,334 per schools while the other four areas have middle schools generally between five and six hundred students. MSD Lawrence Township also leads the group in student enrollment size of their two high schools, averaging 2,676 each, while the Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation's five high schools average just 1,036 students each.

**Table 22**
**Number and Average Enrollment of Elementary, Middle Schools and High Schools for MSD Lawrence Township, South Bend Community School Corporation, Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation, Vigo County School Corporation and all of Tippecanoe County, 2005-2006**

| School Corporation | Number of Elementary Schools | Average Elementary Enrollment | Number of Middle Schools | Average MS Enrollment | Number of High Schools | Average HS Enrollment | Total Number Students |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| MSD Lawrence Twp | **11** | **551** | **3** | **1,334** | **2** | **2,676** | **16,205** |
| SBCSC | **19** | **450** | **10** | **640** | **4** | **1,552** | **20,261** |
| EVSC | **20** | **478** | **10** | **525** | **5** | **1,036** | **19,983** |
| VCSC | **18** | **423** | **6** | **514** | **3** | **1,538** | **15,322** |
| Tippecanoe County | **19** | **487** | **8** | **556** | **4** | **1,626** | **20,199** |

Consolidation of the three school corporations offers the possibility to create a better balance between and among the elementary and middle schools of the TSC and the LSC in terms of student population. However, it is important to consider the geographical size of the county together with a strong community belief in a “neighborhood schools” concept when contemplating the location and size of elementary and middle schools. Parents of elementary and middle-aged students generally prefer to have their schools as close to home or within an identifiable neighborhood as possible. This fact often dictates decisions regarding placement and size of elementary and middle schools by a school corporation. Very often the history and traditions of a particular school generate community support for maintaining a school even when enrollment efficiencies cannot be met.

The WLCSC elementary student population is projected to remain nearly stable between the current year and 2014. However, the LSC is projected to increase its elementary student population by 221 elementary students while the TSC is projected to increase its elementary student population by 520 students. The combined increase for these two corporations is projected to be 741 elementary students. How those students will be distributed across the county is speculative, but if general population and housing growth continues to center in Tippecanoe Township to the north, Wea and Sheffield Townships to the south and Perry Township to the east of the city of Lafayette, it is unlikely that facility sharing between the two corporations would be highly feasible. The LSC, should the projected elementary population increase materialize, could house the additional students within existing elementary facilities.

The middle schools of the three corporations function quite differently from one to another. The six middle schools of the TSC are generally smaller in student population and are located throughout the rural areas of the county. The two middle schools of the LSC are average in total student population and located within the neighborhoods of the school corporation. The middle grades of the WLCSC are located within the high school in a grades seven through twelve junior/senior high school configuration. Each of the facilities is appropriate for the curricular and extra-curricular programs offered.

The high school programs of the three corporations are housed in modern and functional facilities with a high degree of congruence of purpose with the functions of modern comprehensive high school programs. Balancing the use of space at Lafayette Jefferson High School and the programmatic needs of the other three high schools in the county will be the major advantage to increased cooperation, collaboration and consolidation of educational efforts within the county. The public school high school population of the county is projected to increase from 5,592 students in 2005 to 6,506 by 2014, an increase of 914 students or 16.3 percent. However, that growth is not spread equally across the three corporations. The LSC high school enrollment is projected to decline by 569 students, while the TSC high school population is projected to increase by 832 students. The WLCSC high school population is projected to increase by 94 students between 2005 and 2014.

Consideration of the demographic realities of the changing LSC population, together with the educational program considerations presented elsewhere in this study as they relate to the socio-economic background of students and their educational needs, suggests that consolidation and a changing of the definitions of neighborhood schools and their boundaries could have a major impact on educational equity and opportunity for students across the county. This is especially true at the elementary school level, and needs serious consideration by the decision makers. Equity in opportunity for students to develop fully and realize their total potential may be more important than dollars saved or facilities operated as a result of consolidation.

Several concepts should guide consideration of the use of facilities and the location of programs across the county under a consolidated plan.

- The organizational structure of a countywide consolidation in terms of elementary school populations feeding which middle school populations and which middle school populations feeding which high school populations.
- Equitable distribution of culturally diverse populations across the county.
- The optimal number of facilities to operate and general guidelines on the range of total student population for elementary, middle and high school buildings should be considered.
- The location of future school facilities consistent with population growth areas.
- Consideration of all-day, every-day kindergarten programs, and expansion of public school preschool programs.
- Location of low-incident, special education programs across the county.
- Location of special programs to match location with where the programs are needed.
- Determine what modifications to existing facilities would be necessary if program locations were to be altered from their present locations.
- Consideration of transportation routing, costs and safety issues.
- Creation of alternative educational models to better meet the broad range of student needs.
- The impact of change in school attendance areas and the creation of an enrollment management plan to respond to population shifts across the county.
- Consideration of grade configuration changes that might enhance the academic achievement success of students and the productive use of school facilities.
- Consideration of the most efficient and effective use of certified and non-certified staff across the organization and grade configuration of the system.
- Development of appropriate timelines for implementation that speak to the development of community understanding and support.

**SUBSECTION C**
**(David Day Component)**

- How would consolidation impact governance? Specifically, what options would exist for a Board of School Trustees?
- How would labor contracts be handled?

PREPARED BY

David R. Day
Church, Church, Hittle & Antrim

**Impact of consolidation on governance:**

There are two statutory avenues available for school corporations desiring to reorganize. The first avenue arises from laws specific to school corporations. The General Assembly created the second avenue in 2006 by adopting a new article on government modernization.

1. **Specific School Reorganization**

The 1959 school reorganization act created a committee in every county for the reorganization of the schools in that county. Assuming that all Tippecanoe County schools were reorganized under that act, then the county committee dissolved and has no further role. Instead, the authority to propose further reorganization is vested in the local school boards and the state superintendent of public instruction under IC 20-23-4-38(b) that provides:

> After a county committee has been dissolved, if the local governing body or the state superintendent considers further reorganization necessary to improve educational opportunities for the students in the county, the local school trustees or the state superintendent shall submit proposed changes to the state board. If the changes proposed by the local governing body or the state superintendent are approved by the state board, the proposal becomes effective under the procedure specified in sections 20 through 24 of this chapter so far as the same are applicable.

This statutory scheme contemplates that the school boards of the current school corporations would initiate the reorganization by proposing a plan to the Indiana State Board of Education. That plan would include the provisions for the governance of the reorganized school district. (The options for that governance plan are set out more fully below.) If the State Board approved the plan, then the plan could be put into effect either by a petition signed by 55% of the registered voters in the reorganized school district or by approval in a special election.

The plan should include provisions for the interim governance of the school district pending the first school board election. As we understand it, this was usually accomplished by having representatives from the current school boards serve on an interim basis as the new board.

IC 20-23-4-27 (attached as Exhibit A) provides a number of options for the composition of the governing body. For each option, the plan sets out the number of board members which is generally five or seven but can be as few as three. The basic options can be summarized as follows and the entire statutory section is attached for reference:

A. Elect all members on an at-large basis with members able to live anywhere in the district and all voters in the district voting on all candidates.
B. Divide the district into two or more residence districts[1] with one or more members selected from each residence district and with the option of having one or more members selected at large.
C. Divide the district into three or more residence districts. If there are three members, one member must reside in each district. If there are five members, no more than two members may reside in one district. (The statute says that two members may not reside in one district but this is a mathematical impossibility so IDOE interprets it to mean that no more than two members may reside in one district.) If there are seven members, at least two are elected from each residence district.
D. Divide the district into two or more electoral districts[2] with member(s) elected from each district and not less than one less of a majority elected at large.
E. Select a majority of the members on an at-large basis and select the remainder from electoral districts.
F. Divide the district into two or more electoral districts and elect members only from those districts.

In addition, IC 20-23-4-35 provides another option for the composition of the governing body. Under this statute, the school board consists of 7 members with four members serving from 4 electoral districts and the other three from residence districts composed as follows: one residence district is the township with the greatest population and the other two residence districts divide the remaining area of the school district.

In considering a school board plan, care must be taken, particularly if electoral districts are used, to not violate the "one-man, one-vote" rules. This means that electoral districts have to be roughly equal in population and have to be adjusted as population changes. For this reason, most schools have moved away from electoral districts and instead use residence districts to assure that all areas are represented.

2. **2006 Act**

Under the 2006 government modernization act, school corporations can reorganize without any approval from the superintendent of public instruction. That same law, however, preserves the

[1] In a residence district, the member must live in a particular geographic area but is elected by all the voters in the school district.
[2] In an electoral district, the member must live in a particular geographic area and only those voters in that area vote in that member's election.

ability of schools to reorganize under the school-specific laws described above if they so desire. The major provisions of this law are as follows.

Reorganization under the 2006 act can be started by any school corporation adopting a resolution proposing a reorganization. Notice of that resolution is sent to the other school corporations named in the resolution and those school corporations then have an obligation to either accept or decline the reorganization or propose modifications to it. (Voters may also initiate reorganization by petition but we have not dealt with that option in this memo.)

When two or more school corporations have adopted resolutions proposing reorganizations, a reorganization committee is appointed, either by agreement of the reorganizing schools or by appointment by the school's executive (probably the superintendent). That committee then puts together a reorganization plan that sets out a governance plan, etc. for the reorganized school corporation. This act places one significant limit on the plan that is not present in the school-specific reorganization. This limit essentially requires that debt and pension obligations incurred prior to reorganization must be paid by the taxpayers of the school that incurred the debt or obligation and cannot be shifted to taxpayers in the other schools. A copy of this limitation is attached as Exhibit B.

Once the reorganization plan is approved by the school boards, the matter is presented to the voters for approval. Reorganization must be approved by a majority vote in each of the reorganizing school districts.

**EXHIBIT A**

***IC 20-23-4-27***

Board of school trustees; election options; exception for community school corporations created before March 12, 1965

(a) Subsections (b) and (c) do not apply to a community school corporation created before March 12, 1965. A community school corporation created before March 12, 1965, shall operate in accordance with the plan under which it was created and the statutes applicable to that plan, as if Acts 1965, c.336, s.4 had not been enacted.

(b) If the members of a governing body are elected, the members shall be elected in accordance with one (1) of the options set forth in subsection (c) or in accordance with section 35 of this chapter. The options must be set out in the plan with sufficient description to permit the plan to be operable with respect to the community school corporation. The description may be partly or wholly by reference to the applicable option.

(c) The options described in subsection (b) are the following:

(1) Members of a governing body:

(A) may reside anywhere in the school corporation; and

(B) shall be voted upon by all registered voters living within the school corporation voting at any governing body member election.

(2) The community school corporation shall be divided into two (2) or more residence districts with one (1) or more members of the governing body resident within each of the residence districts. The plan may also provide that one (1) or more members of the governing body may reside anywhere in the community school corporation. The plan:

(A) must set out the number of members to be elected from each district;

(B) may provide for the election of an equal number of members from each district; and

(C) must set out the number, if any, to be elected at large without reference to governing body member districts.

Under this option, all candidates must be voted on by all registered voters of the community school corporation voting at any governing body member election.

(3) The community school corporation shall be divided into three (3) residence districts of approximately equal population. In a district divided into three (3) residence districts, if:

(A) the governing body consists of three (3) members, one (1) member must reside in each residence district;

(B) the governing body consists of five (5) members, two (2) members may not reside in any one (1) residence district; and

(C) the governing body consists of seven (7) members, at least two (2) shall be elected from each residence district.

Candidates shall be voted on by all registered voters of the community school corporation voting at any governing body member election.

(4) The community school corporation shall be divided into two (2) or more electoral districts. Each member:

(A) serves from one (1) electoral district;

(B) must be a resident of the district; and

(C) must be voted upon by the registered voters residing within the electoral district and voting at any governing body member election.

The plan must set out the number to be elected from each electoral district and may provide for election of an equal number of members from each district. The plan must provide that not less than one (1) less than a majority of the governing body may reside anywhere in the community school corporation and must be voted upon by all its registered voters voting at any governing body member election.

(5) The community school corporation consists of one (1) electoral district that must embrace the entire community school corporation from which a majority of the members of the governing body shall be elected by all the registered voters of the community school corporation voting at a governing body member election. The other electoral districts must be subdivisions of the community school corporation. Each of the remaining members of the governing body:

(A) serves from one (1) of the latter electoral districts;

(B) must be a resident of that district; and

(C) must be voted upon by registered voters voting at a governing body member election.

The plan must set out the number to be elected from each district and may provide for the election of an equal number of members from the district.

(6) The community school corporation shall be divided into two (2) or more electoral districts. Each member:

(A) serves from one (1) electoral district;

(B) must be a resident of that district; and

(C) must be voted upon only by the registered voters residing within that district who vote at a governing body election.

The plan must set out the number of members to be elected from each electoral district in the school corporation and may provide for election of an equal number of members from each district.

**EXHIBIT B**

***IC 36-1.5-4-40***

Debt; pension obligations

The following apply in the case of a reorganization under this article:

(1) Indebtedness that was incurred by a political subdivision before the reorganization:

(A) may not be imposed on taxpayers that were not responsible for payment of the indebtedness before the reorganization; and

(B) must be paid by the taxpayers that were responsible for payment of the indebtedness before the reorganization.

(2) Pension obligations existing as of the effective date of the reorganization:

(A) may not be imposed on taxpayers that were not responsible for payment of the pension obligations before the reorganization; and

(B) must be paid by the taxpayers that were responsible for payment of the pension obligations before the reorganization.

**Impact on collective bargaining agreements:**

If the existing school corporations reorganize into a new district, the plan of reorganization would probably anticipate that the teachers of the newly-reorganized school district would themselves reorganize into a new collective bargaining unit and negotiate a new collective bargaining agreement with the one school district. Terms of employment would then be governed by the new collective bargaining agreement.

This scenario will present two immediate problems: (1) what will be the employment terms if a new agreement is not reached prior to the start of the new district; and (2) how will the new collective bargaining agreement address differences in matters such as salaries.

There is no concrete answer to either of these questions. Some guidance can be gleaned from situations in which teachers have transferred to a new school corporation (as in the Marion County desegregation case) and the statutes governing teachers employed by joint programs or special education cooperatives. Ultimately, however, the result will be determined through contract negotiations.

As to the first question, teachers would probably be employed on the same terms and conditions as in their current school districts until the new agreement is reached. This would seem to follow from the "status quo" language in PL 217. As a practical matter, at least during the first year, it would be anticipated that most teachers would stay in their same buildings the first year so the challenges will be more at the accounting and payroll levels in the central office. Differences in contract language will require that administrators be cognizant of the specific contract language applying to their teachers until the new agreement can be put in place.

Even with the new agreement, however, there will be teachers who will not be happy about changes in salary schedules, for example. This can probably be dealt with by "grandfathering" specific teachers on specific salary schedules. New teachers would be employed under the schedule in the new agreement but that same agreement could have addenda setting forth salary schedules for the grandfathered group. It would not be necessary to grandfather all teachers; this would be a matter of negotiation. This situation is not unlike what occurs when a cooperative teacher employed by the LEA of the cooperative is placed in a local school with a different salary schedule.

It would be anticipated that teachers in the new school corporation would retain their status as permanent, semi-permanent or nonpermanent teachers in the new district. It would not be prudent to try and change these rights.

**SUBSECTIONS C and D**
**(ESC Component)**

- How would the administrative and support services of the school districts be impacted? Specifically, how would consolidation impact transportation, food service, maintenance of facilities including grounds, custodial, and administrative costs? The corporations would expect an analysis of the present costs compared with school corporations that would compare in size after consolidation.
- How would consolidation impact distribution of poverty and eligibility for, and the receipt of, grant money?
- How would tax rates be impacted for taxpayers in each school district?
- How would staffing of schools and class sizes of schools be impacted by consolidation? This analysis should include instructional support, guidance, media, and other non-classroom professionals as well as paraprofessionals.

PREPARED BY:

James F. “Jim” Burrell
Douglas L. “Doug” Cassman
Jerry S. Moore
David M. Widdifield

# TIPPECANOE COUNTY SCHOOL CONSOLIDATION PROJECT

Personnel Section

This section of the project addresses various personnel within the three Tippecanoe County schools and the three comparison schools.

Specifically, this section looks at the personnel in Facilities and Maintenance, Transportation, Food Service, Custodial, Teaching staff, Guidance, Para-professionals, Administrative, Special Education, and other Areas.

In the original request, we were asked to show how consolidation would impact transportation, food service, maintenance of facilities including grounds, custodial and administrative costs. As the salaries and hourly rates are diverse from the southern most point of the state to the northern third of the state, these statistics look more at numbers of employees and their pay rates, rather than total cost due to relevance. In this format, it is possible to see the relative number of employees of the three Tippecanoe County Corporations compared to the three comparison corporations. One can readily use pay rates to estimate cost for a particular area.

We have also included the class sizes of all schools as well as the numbers of instructional support, guidance, media, and para-professionals.

As in other parts of this study, the key is as follows:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| LSC | = | Lafayette School Corporation |
| TSC | = | Tippecanoe School Corporation |
| WLCSC | = | West Lafayette Community School Corporation |
| EVSC | = | Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation |
| MSDLT | = | Metropolitan School District of Lawrence Township |
| VSCS | = | Vigo County School Corporation |

**TIPPECANOE STUDY**

**SUPERINTENDENT'S OFFICE ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL**

| | Superintendent | Assistant Superintendent | Business Manager | Directors | Central Office Administrators per ADM |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **LSC** | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2.5 | 1:1578 |
| **TSC** | 1 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 1:1039 |
| **WLCSC** | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1:627 |
| **COMBINED** | 3 | 3 | 2 | 9.5 | 1:2038 |
| **EVSC** | 1 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 1:2368 |
| **MSDLT** | 1 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 1:1297 |
| **VCSC** | 1 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 1:1570 |

**TIPPECANOE STUDY**
**BUSINESS AND FINANCE**

| | Administrator | Sec/Clerical | Supv/Manager |
|---|---|---|---|
| **LSC** | 1 Bus. Mgr. | 4.5 | 0 |
| **TSC** | 1 Asst. Supt. | 4 | 0 |
| **WLCSC** | 1 Bus. Mgr. | 4 | 0 |
| **COMBINED** | 3 | 13 | 0 |
| | | | |
| **EVSC** | .5 Asst. Supt. | 13 | 4 |
| **MSDLT** | 1 Asst. Supt. | 9 | 3 |
| **VCSC** | 1 Director | 5 | 5 |

***NOTE: This is a breakdown of Administrative Office Personnel. These positions are not additional to Superintendent's Office.***

**TIPPECANOE STUDY**
**CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION PERSONNEL**

| | Administrator | Sec/Clerical | Directors | Supervisors/Coordinators |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **LSC** | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| **TSC** | 1 Asst. Supt. | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **WLCSC** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **COMBINED** | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | |
| **EVSC** | 1 Asst. Supt. | 15 | 2 | 14 |
| **MSDLT** | 1 Asst. Supt. | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| **VCSC** | 0 | 5 | 3 | 6 |

*NOTE: This is a breakdown of Administrative Office Personnel.*
*These positions are not additional to Superintendent's Office.*

**TIPPECANOE STUDY**

**ALL SCHOOLS DATA**

| | Number of Schools | Number of Bldg. Admin. | Number of Reg. Teachers | 2004-2005 ADM | Teacher to Student Ratio | Number of Counselors | Counselor to Student Ratio | Number of Media | Media to Student Ratio | Number of Certified Non-Teach. | Number of Para-prof./ Instr. Asst. | Para-prof. Hourly Rate Range | Teachers Average Salary |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **LSC** | 12 | 19 | 419 | 7,099 | 1:16.9 | 16 | 1:444 | 11 | 1:645 | 5 | 139 | 6.30-9.49 | 49,400 |
| **TSC** | 17 | 31 | 630 | 10,388 | 1:16.5 | 25 | 1:416 | 24 | 1:433 | 10 | 225 | 9.80 | 47,000 |
| **WLCSC** | 3 | 5 | 126 | 1,882 | 1:14.9 | 4 | 1:471 | 2 | 1:941 | 6 | 18 | 7.21-9.05 | 57,500 |
| **COMBINED** | 32 | 55 | 1,175 | 19,369 | 1:16.5 | 45 | 1:430 | 37 | 1:523 | 21 | 382 | | 153,900 |
| **EVSC** | 39 | 64 | 1,299 | 21,312 | 1:16.4 | 30 | 1:426 | 5 | 1:1015 | 32 | 389 | 8.01-14.38 | 45,100 |
| **MSDLT** | 19 | 42 | 797 | 15,564 | 1:16.0 | 21 | 1:622 | 8 | 1:778 | 58 | 368 | 9.56 | 53,700 |
| **VCSC** | 29 | 40 | 1,081 | 15,696 | 1:14.5 | 16 | 1:628 | 12 | 1:523 | 27 | 369 | 8.38-10.52 | 46,500 |

***NOTE: Data obtained from local school corporations and D.O.E.***
***Certified non-teaching column includes nurses, when applicable.***

***Statewide pupils per teacher for 2004-05 is 17.1 (public and non-public).***

**TIPPECANOE STUDY**

**FOOD SERVICE**

| | Director/ Supervisor | Asst. Mgr./ Manager | Manager Rate Range | Cafeteria Employees | Hourly Rate Range | Secretarial Clerical | Total Food Service Employees |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **LSC** | 0 | 1 | Yearly rate 15,482-20,273 | 133 | 6.30-9.49 | 3 | 137 |
| **TSC** | 1 | 19 | Hourly rate 10.87-13.59 | 99 | 9.58 | 0 | 119 |
| **WLCSC** | 0 | 0 | Outsourced | 0 | Outsourced | 0 | 0 |
| **COMBINED** | 1 | 20 | 3 | 192 | | | 256 |
| **EVSC** | 0 | 2 | Hourly rate 13.49-15.12 | 172 | 7.25-11.74 | 4 | 178 |
| **MSDLT** | 2 | 18 | Daily rate 97.03-131.13 | 159 | 8.97-9.74 | 2 | 181 |
| **VCSC** | 0 | 29 | Hourly rate 11.53-15.01 | 164 | 8.82-10.08 | 3 | 196 |

**TIPPECANOE STUDY**
**FACILITIES PLANNING AND MAINTENANCE PERSONNEL**

| | Directors | Supervisors/ Coordinators | Secretarial Clerical | Warehouse/ Stockman | Energy Mgmt. | Maintenance Mechanic | Total Sq. Footage Under Roof | Maintenance Hourly Rate | Custodians | Custodian Rate Range |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **LSC** | 0.5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 1,520,500 | 12.57-20.01 | 66 | 9.11-14.82 |
| **TSC** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 11* | 2,049,351 | 15.52-20.61 | 97 | 10.88-12.82 |
| **WLCSC** | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 319,212 | Outsourced | 16 | Outsourced |
| **COMBINED** | 1.5 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 3,889,063 | | 179 | |
| **EVSC** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 4,133,632 | 16.47-18.36 | 170 | 12.36-15.96 |
| **MSDLT** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 16* | 2,913,131 | 14.76-19.95 | 139 | 10.38-13.45 |
| **VCSC** | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 29 | 3,000,000 | 15.01-16.20 | 133 | 10.84-12.18 |

***Some major work is outsourced.***

**TIPPECANOE STUDY**
**TRANSPORTATION PERSONNEL**

| | Directors/ Managers | Asst. Director/ Managers | Supervisor | Coordinators | Secretarial Clerical | Drivers | Drivers Daily Rate | I Mechanic | Mechanic Hourly Rate | Bus Aides |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **LSC** | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 33 | 15.07-17.07 per hour | 3 | 16.47-19.40 | 0 |
| **TSC** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 109 | 25.00-46.00 | 7 | 13.83-20.60 | 0 |
| **WLCSC** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 16.81 per hour | 0 | Outsourced | 0 |
| **COMBINED** | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 149 | | 10 | | 0 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| **EVSC** | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 172 | 48.00-73.00 | 14 | 16.47-19.06 | 61 |
| **MSDLT** | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 187 | 86.06-94.93 | 7 | 14.58-17.9 | 87 |
| **VCSC** | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 151 | 48.94-72.53 | 7 | 15.01-16.20 | 4 |

**ELIGIBLE STUDENTS TRANSPORTED**
(Latest data is for 2003-04)

| | PUPILS | ROUND TRIP MILES/DAY |
|---|---|---|
| **LSC** | 3,921 | 1,025 |
| **TSC** | 8,245 | 5,047 |
| **WLCSC** | 919 | 211 |
| **COMBINED** | 13,085 | 6,283 |
| | | |
| **EVSC** | 17,049 | 6,420 |
| **MSDLT** | 12,196 | 10,298 |
| **VCSC** | 11,342 | 5,112 |

**TIPPECANOE STUDY**

**DISTRICT SECRETARIAL/CLERICAL PERSONNEL**

| | District Offices | Elementary Buildings | High School/ Middle School Buildings | Building Level Hourly Rate-Range |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **LSC** | 11 | 13 | 23 | 9.70-12.88 |
| **TSC** | 18 | 13.5 | 18 | 10.88-14.96 |
| **WLCSC** | 5 | 4 | 7 | 12.22-18.41 |
| **COMBINED** | 34 | 30.5 | 48 | |
| **EVSC** | 68 | 26 | 59 | 12.07-16.84 |
| **MSDLT** | 34 | 31 | 41 | Daily Rate 98.51-136.69 |
| **VCSC** | 40 | 32 | 42 | 10.42-15.50 |

***Note: There are five secretaries assigned to GLASS that are housed in LSC district offices in addition to the eleven LSC secretaries.***

**TIPPECANOE STUDY**
**TECHNOLOGY PERSONNEL**

| | Director | Director Salary | Manager | Secretarial Clerical | Liaison | Techs | Total Technology Personnel |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **LSC** | 1 | 81,149 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9.5 |
| **TSC** | 1 | 95,981 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 12 |
| **WLCSC** | 1 | 24,469 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 |
| **COMBINED** | 3 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 19 | 25.5 |
| | | | | | | | |
| **EVSC** | 1 | 63,000 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 19 | 22 |
| **MSDLT** | 1 | 91,067 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 16 |
| **VCSC** | 1 | 98,912 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 10 |

**TIPPECANOE STUDY**
**SPECIAL SERVICES PERSONNEL**
**BUILDING OR CORPORATIONS ASSIGNMENTS**

| | G.L.A.S.S. | Total |
|---|---|---|
| **LSC** | 64 | |
| **TSC** | 53 | |
| **WLCSC** | 9 | |
| **GLASS Admin.** | 37 | |
| **Burtsfield** | 34 | |
| **All Other Locations** | 13 | 210 |
| **EVSC** | | 198 |
| **MSDLT** | | 110 |
| **VCSC** | | 103 |

## Group Insurance programs

The focus of this section's comprehensive review is the group insurance programs, primarily the medical and prescription drug plans. However, we did do a quick review of the three corporations' dental and vision programs, and while with different vendors, they are nearly identical in coverage and pricing.

The three medical/drug plans are less similar to one another in benefits, but very similar in costs and contribution sharing, which is the share of the premium paid by the corporation. Because of strategic decisions either related to bargaining or emphasis of non-taxable benefits over wages, each corporation has chosen to contribute a strong share of the total cost, about 75-78% in most employee groups. None of the three school corporations is insured by the same vendor for their staff. Three quality vendors are represented, United Health Care insuring Tippecanoe, Arnett Health Plan insuring West Lafayette, and Anthem handling the medical/drug program for Lafayette.

We have included a comparison spreadsheet showing the highlights of the three programs, deductibles, co-pays, co-insurance levels and the like, as well as the total plan costs. Both Lafayette and West Lafayette provide a one-plan arrangement for staff, while Tippecanoe offers three varying plans for staff and allows employees to choose their level of benefits for their needs with premium costs for the employee varying by the benefit design they select. These arrangements are, and have been, popular with a wide range of employers and employee groups throughout the country.

| Tippecanoe County Benefit Comparison | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Tippecanoe United Health Care | | | - | West Lafayette | | | | - | Lafayette |
| | | | | | | Arnet | Anthem | | | | Anthem |
| MEDICAL | | Option 1 | Option 2 | Option 3 | | All Non-admin EE's | H S A | Trad. | Trad II | | |
| | | I/O Net | I/O Net | I/O Net | | I/O Net | I/O Net | I/O Net | I/O Net | | I/O Net |
| S/F Ded | | $250/$500 | $500 In | $1000 In | | $0 S/$0 F In | $2500S | $500S | $0S | | $0 S/$0 F In |
| | | | $1000 Out | $2000 Out | | $500S/ $1000F Out | $5000F | $1000F | $0F | | $300 S/ $600 F Out |
| S/F OOP | In Net | $1000/2000 | $2000/4000 | $6000/12,000 | | $0S / $0 F | $4000S | $1500S | $2000S | | $1000S/$2000F In |
| | | | | | | | $8000F | $3400F | $40000F | | |
| | Out | | | | | | Same | | | | |
| S/F OOP | Net | $1000S/$2000/F | $4000S/$8000F | $8000S/$16,000F | | $4000S/$8000F | as | above | | | $2000S/$4000F Out |
| LTM | | Unlimited | Unlimited | Unlimited | | Unlim In/ $1M Out | $2M | $2M | $2M | | $5M In/Out |
| OV Co-Pay | | $10 | $20 | $30 | | $10 | | | $20 | | $10 |
| PT- Phys. Ther. Co-Pay | | $10 | $20 | $30 | | No-Co In/30%after D | | 20%In/40%Out | $20In/40%Out | | $0/co-ins In/20% Out |
| Prev. Care | | 100%after co-pay | 100%after co-pay | 100%after co-pay | | $10 In/30%after D | | 20%In/40%Out | $20In/40%Out | | $0/co-ins In/20% Out |
| Accident Benefits | | 100%to$500/Acc | 100%to$500/Acc | 100%to$500/Acc | | $10 In/30%after D | | | | | |
| ER | | In-Net Ded/Coins | InNet+$100Ded | InNet+$100Ded | | $100 In/$100 Out | | 20%In/20%Out | $75 In/Out Net | | $100 In/Out Net |
| IN/OUT NETWORK CO-INS. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OV | | 100/80 | 100/70 | 100/50 | | 100/70 after Ded | 80/60 | 80/60 | 100/40 | | 100/80 |
| Physician Services | | 90/80 | 80/70 | 70/50 | | 100/70 after Ded | 80/60 | 80/60 | 100/40 | | 100/80 |
| Hosp. Services | | 90/80 | 80/70 | 70/50 | | 100/70 after Ded | 80/60 | 80/60 | 100/40 | | 100/80 |
| PRESCRIPTION DRUGS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Generic | Retail | $5 | $10 | $10 | | $10 | 80/60 | 90/60 | $10 | | $10 |
| Brand | | $10 | $25 | $25 | | $20 | 80/60 | 80/60 | $20 | | $20 |
| Non Form. | | $25 | $50 | $50 | | $40 | 60/60 | 80/60 | 60% | | $30 |
| Generic | Mail Order | $10 | $20 | $20 | | Not Covered | 90%/NC | 90%/NC | $20 | | $20 |
| Brand | | $20 | $50 | $50 | | Not Covered | 80%/NC | 80%/NC | $40 | | $40 |
| Non Form. | | $50 | $100 | $100 | | Not Covered | 60%/NC | 80%/NC | 60% | | $60 |
| PROGRAM COST | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Annual cost | | $5,430,360 | | | | $1,155,352 | | | | | $6,129,000 |
| Employees | | 732 | | | | 154 | | | | | 754 |
| Cost per employee | | $7,419 | | | | $7,502 | | | | | $8,129 |
| Premium sharing | | 76% corporation | | | | 75% corporation | | | | | 78% corporation |

Tippecanoe County Benefit Comparison ( cont.)

| | TSC | | | WLCSC | | | LSC | | | Blend * |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Plan pays | EE pays | | Plan pays | EE pays | | Plan pays | EE pays | | |
| **Dental Benefits** | Dental Guard | | | Delta Dental | | | Delta Dental | | | |
| **Class I** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Diagnostic & Prev. | 100% | 0% | | 100% | 0% | | 100% | 0% | | |
| X-rays | 100% | 0% | | 100% | 0% | | 100% | 0% | | |
| Palliative treatment | 100% | 0% | | 100% | 0% | | 100% | 0% | | |
| Sealants | 100% | 0% | | 100% | 0% | | 100% | 0% | | |
| **Class II** | $50.00 Ded | $50.00 Ded | | | | | | | | |
| Minor rest. | 80% | 20% | | 80% | 20% | | 80% | 20% | | |
| Reline/repair | 80% | 20% | | 80% | 20% | | 80% | 20% | | |
| Oral Surg. | 80% | 20% | | 80% | 20% | | 80% | 20% | | |
| Periodontic | 80% | 20% | | 80% | 20% | | 80% | | | |
| Endodontic | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Class III** | $50.00 Ded | $50.00 Ded | | | | | | | | |
| Major restorative | 50% | 50% | | 50% | 50% | | 80% | 20% | | |
| Prostodontic | 50% | 50% | | 50% | 50% | | 80% | 20% | | |
| **Class IV** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Orthodontic (to age 19) | 50% | 50% | | 50% | 50% | | 50% | 50% | | |
| Max payment | $1000/yr on Class I, II & III<br>$1000 LTM on Class IV | | | $1000/yr on Class I, II & III<br>$1000 LTM on Class IV | | | $1000/yr on Class I, II, & III<br>$1500 LTM on Class IV | | | |
| Deductible | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Vision Benefits** | VSP | | | VSP | | | VSP | | | |
| | VSP Dr. | Non-VSP | Reimb. | VSP Dr. | Non-VSP | Reimb. | VSP Dr. | Non-VSP | Reimb. | |
| Exams | 100% | | $40.00 | 100% | | $40.00 | 100% | | $40.00 | After $10.00 Co-pay |
| Single lenses/pair | 100% | | $30.00 | 100% | | $30.00 | 100% | | $30.00 | After $15.00 Co-pay |
| Bifocal | 100% | | $45.00 | 100% | | $45.00 | 100% | | $45.00 | After $15.00 Co-pay |
| Trifocal | 100% | | $60.00 | 100% | | $60.00 | 100% | | $60.00 | After $15.00 Co-pay |
| Tints | 100% | | $10.00 | 100% | | $10.00 | 100% | | $85.00 | After $15.00 Co-pay |
| Vision therapy | To allowed | | To allowed | To allowed | | To allowed | | | | After $15.00 Co-pay |
| Frame | $32.00 Wholesale | | $45.00 Ret | $32.00 Wholesale | | $45.00 Ret | $115.00 | | $45.00 | After $15.00 Co-pay |
| Frequency of benefits | | | | | | | | | | |
| Exam | Every 12 mos. | | | Every 12 mos. | | | Every 24 mos. | | | |
| Lens | Every 12 mos. | | | Every 12 mos. | | | Every 24 mos. | | | |
| Frames | Every 12 mos. | | | Every 12 mos. | | | | | | |
| Contacts | $100.00 | | $100.00 | $100.00 | | $100.00 | $100.00 | | $100.00 | |

ESC 3/06

## SCHOOL CONSOLIDATION PROJECT – TIPPECANOE COUNTY

## FINANCE SECTION

The following finance issues and questions were examined in this section of the study.

1. Analysis of the present cost of transportation, food service and maintenance of facilities compared with school corporations that compare in size after consolidation.
2. How would consolidation impact distribution of poverty and eligibility for the receipt of grant money?
3. How would Tax rates be impacted in each school district involved in the consolidation?

To examine the issues and questions certain basic information (data) needs to be collected for use in the examination. The basic data are displayed in the following table.

### TABLE 1

**1. School Corporations in the Study**

| | |
|---|---|
| Lafayette School Corporation | LCS |
| Tippecanoe School Corporation | TSC |
| West Lafayette Community School Corporation | WLCSC |
| **Combined Totals Tippecanoe County School Corp.** | **Combined** |
| Evansville-Vanderburg School Corporation | E-V |
| MSD Lawrence Township, Marion County | MSDLT |
| Vigo County Schools | VCS |

**2. Basic Data**

| | 2004-05 ADM | 2004pay 2005 AV | 2005 Tax Rate | AV per ADM 2005 | State Support(All Fds) per ADM 2005 | Property Tax Levy(All Fds) per ADM 2005 | Total State Support and Property Tax Levy per ADM 2005 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LCS | 7098.63 | $2,450,208,815 | $1.3173 | $345,166 | $3,580 | $4,547 | $8,127 |
| TSC | 10388.01 | $3,672,042,660 | $1.4781 | $353,489 | $2,701 | $5,225 | $7,926 |
| WLCSC | 1882.50 | $890,216,615 | $1.5575 | $472,891 | $1,879 | $7,365 | $9,244 |
| **Combined** | **19369.14** | **$7,012,468,090** | **$1.4320** | **$362,043** | **$2,943** | **$5,184** | **$8,128** |
| E-V | 21311.60 | $7,407,985,360 | $1.1912 | $347,603 | $3,604 | $4,141 | $7,745 |
| MSDLT | 15563.50 | $4,982,173,227 | $1.4587 | $320,118 | $3,430 | $4,670 | $8,100 |
| VCS | 15696.20 | $3,677,987,330 | $1.3070 | $234,324 | $4,200 | $3,063 | $7,263 |

## I. Analysis of present cost of Selected Functions for each School Corporation in Tippecanoe County with the School Corporations Selected for Comparison

A. Transportation Function. Analysis in this function involved listing of the eligible pupils transported by each school corporation and the daily round trip miles driven in transporting these children. An expenditure comparison was made of the operating cost of transportation for each school corporation. The analysis and comparison are as follows.

Eligible Pupils Transported*** and Round Trip Bus Miles 2005

| | Pupils | Round Trip Miles/Day |
|---|---|---|
| LCS | 3921 | 1025 |
| TSC | 8245 | 5047 |
| WLCSC | 919 | 211 |
| **Combined** | **13085** | **6283** |
| E-V | 17049 | 6420 |
| MSDLT | 12196 | 10928 |
| VCS | 11342 | 5112 |

*** Latest Data is 2003/04

Expenditure Comparison (Fund 041)

| | Expenditures 2005 | Expenditures /2005 ADM | Expenditures 2005/Pupil Transported 2003/04 |
|---|---|---|---|
| LCS | $2,445,591 | $344.52 | $623.72 |
| TSC | $4,416,408 | $425.14 | $535.65 |
| WLCSC | $537,944 | $285.76 | $585.36 |
| **Combined** | **$7,399,942** | **$382.05** | **$565.53** |
| E-V | $11,116,011 | $521.59 | $652.00 |
| MSDLT | $8,399,446 | $539.69 | $688.70 |
| VCS | $5,047,056 | $321.55 | $444.99 |

Note: The combined cost and tax rate for the transportation function in a consolidated district may change because of possible changes in school boundaries, the number of students transported and the distance transported. When children are sent to different schools, miles traveled may increase or decrease, and number of routes needed may change. Transportation overhead cost should be lower (supervision, maintenance, etc.) in a consolidated system.

B. Food Service Function.

**1. Basic Data**

A. Free/Reduced Lunch Count - % of Total Lunches Served

| | Total Eligible/ Day | Free/Reduced Eligible/ Day | % Free & Reduced |
|---|---|---|---|
| LCS | 7496 | 3676 | 49.04% |
| TSC | 10554 | 2452 | 23.23% |
| WLCSC | 1994 | 194 | 9.73% |
| **Combined** | **20044** | **6322** | **31.54%** |
| E-V | 22029 | 10626 | 48.24% |
| MSDLT | 16740 | 5536 | 33.07% |
| VCS | 16434 | 7335 | 44.63% |

B. Maximum Meal Charges to Students - Program Year 2006

| | Pd Lunch | Pd Breakfast |
|---|---|---|
| LCS | $1.80 | $1.10 |
| TSC | $1.70 | $1.00 |
| WLCSC | $2.50 | |
| E-V | $1.75 | $1.75 |
| MSDLT | $1.50 | $1.40 |
| VCS | $1.95 | $1.10 |

**2. Food Service Expenditure & Revenue Comparison (Fund 080)**

| | Expenditures 2005 | Revenue 2005 | Expenditures /2005 ADM | Revenue/ 2005ADM |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| LCS | $2,026,158 | $1,939,526 | $285.43 | $273.23 |
| TSC | $2,969,376 | $3,273,833 | $285.85 | $315.15 |
| WLCSC | $372,292 | $367,742 | $197.76 | $195.35 |
| **Combined** | **$5,367,826** | **$5,581,101** | **$277.13** | **$288.14** |
| E-V | $8,905,094 | $9,215,786 | $417.85 | $432.43 |
| MSDLT | $5,502,904 | $5,899,572 | $353.58 | $379.06 |
| VCS | $5,553,128 | $5,526,690 | $353.79 | $352.10 |

Details of the revenue and expenditures for 2005 for each of the school districts are displayed in the following spreadsheets.

Financial Data - Food Service (Fund 080)

| | Lafayette | West Lafayette | Tippecanoe | Combined | Evansville | MSD Lawrence | Vigo |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Cash Balance January 1, 2005** | **$ 476,511.45** | **$ (20,171.16)** | **$ 1,558,708.93** | **$ 2,015,049.22** | **$ 199,428.16** | **$ 3,747,318.84** | **$ 798,512.35** |
| ***Revenue*** | | | | **$ -** | | | |
| 1510 Inerest on Investment | | | | | $ 41,148.52 | | |
| 1611 Student Breakfast | $ 23,370.31 | | $ 57,837.20 | **$ 81,207.51** | $ 14,947.35 | | $ 310,660.74 |
| 1612 Student Lunch | $ 479,930.26 | $ 297,148.23 | $ 1,146,861.37 | **$ 1,923,939.86** | $ 2,325,302.95 | $ 3,257,657.71 | $ 1,516,339.15 |
| 1614 Student Ala Cart | $ 357,716.73 | | $ 957,690.06 | **$ 1,315,406.79** | $ 1,484,779.50 | | $ 220,510.63 |
| 1621 Adult Breakfast | $ 69.50 | | $ 253.75 | **$ 323.25** | $ 1,181.95 | | $ 9,993.46 |
| 1622 Adult Lunch | $ 16,014.85 | $ 2,376.00 | $ 55,049.37 | **$ 73,440.22** | $ 88,618.50 | $ 36,686.50 | $ 86,192.58 |
| 1624 Adult Ala Cart | $ 3,170.20 | | $ 62,356.09 | **$ 65,526.29** | $ 69,264.24 | | $ 8,543.80 |
| 1690 Other | $ 8,692.48 | $ 1,011.41 | $ 1,106.25 | **$ 10,810.14** | $ 202,559.21 | $ 201,068.11 | |
| 1910 Rent of Property | | | $ 2,121.25 | **$ 2,121.25** | | | |
| 1990 Other Local Sources | $ 10,131.51 | $ 3,745.68 | $ (63,868.14) | **$ (49,990.95)** | | $ 59.22 | $ 62,614.69 |
| 1999 Other Revenue/Local Sources | | | | | | | $ 17,463.64 |
| 2900 Other Intermediate Sources | | $ 1,014.00 | | **$ 1,014.00** | | | |
| 3112 Veterans Memorial Funds | | | | **$ -** | | | |
| 3151 State Matching Funds | $ 21,039.75 | $ 62,447.34 | $ 54,643.29 | **$ 138,130.38** | $ 75,470.01 | $ 84,547.34 | $ 53,458.60 |
| 4290 Grants-in Aid Other | | | | | | $ 361,305.96 | |
| 4291 School Lunch Reimbursement | $ 829,287.96 | | $ 999,782.03 | **$ 1,829,069.99** | $ 3,860,313.06 | $ 1,955,870.87 | $ 2,475,682.33 |
| 4292 School Breakfast Reimbursement | $ 182,943.25 | | | **$ 182,943.25** | $ 920,790.83 | | $ 701,911.44 |
| 4294 Summer School Feeding | | | | **$ -** | | | |
| 4297 After School Snack | $ 6,180.77 | | | **$ 6,180.77** | $ 68,525.45 | | $ 669.26 |
| 7120 Personal Property | | | | | | | $ 1,700.00 |
| 7130 Sales of Securities | | | | **$ -** | $ 19,525,000.00 | | |
| 7210 Insurance Claims for Losses | | | | **$ -** | | $ 2,376.67 | |
| 7320 Overpayments | | | | | | | $ 6,872.20 |
| 7329 Other Overpayments | | | | **$ -** | $ 62,282.19 | | $ 1,656.00 |
| 7500 Petty Cash | $ 978.00 | | | **$ 978.00** | | | $ 52,421.01 |
| 7900 Other | | | | **$ -** | | | |
| 9000 Transfer from fund to Another | | | | **$ -** | $ 602.00 | | |
| **Total Revenue** | **$ 1,939,525.57** | **$ 367,742.66** | **$ 3,273,832.52** | **$ 5,581,100.75** | **$ 28,740,785.76** | **$ 5,899,572.38** | **$ 5,526,689.53** |

| Financial Data - Food Service -Cont. | Lafayette | West Lafayette | Tippecanoe | Combined | Evansville | MSD Lawrence | Vigo |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***Disbursement*** | | | | **$ -** | | | |
| 22130 Training Services | | | | **$ -** | | | |
| 23190 Other Governing Body Serv. | | | | **$ -** | | | |
| 25291 Refund of Revenue | $ 663.98 | | | **$ 663.98** | $ 643.85 | $ 2,106.98 | $ 2,146.72 |
| 25292 Petty Cash | | | | | $ 56.97 | | |
| 25296 Cash Change | $ 988.00 | | | **$ 988.00** | $ 11,195.00 | $ 2,819.00 | $ 1,922.00 |
| 25370 Purchase of Moveable Equipment | | | $ 175,151.96 | **$ 175,151.96** | | | |
| 25420 Maintenance of Bldg | | | | **$ -** | | $ 48,161.21 | |
| 25440 Maintenance of Equip | | | | **$ -** | | | |
| 25610 Service Area Direction | $ 130,905.38 | $ 45,724.39 | | **$ 176,629.77** | $ 329,518.88 | $ 615,908.83 | $ 926,487.85 |
| 25620 Food Preparation & Dispensing | $ 786,425.43 | $ 169,425.92 | $ 1,125,908.33 | **$ 2,081,759.68** | $ 3,554,789.33 | $ 1,192,856.99 | $ 1,780,883.39 |
| 25630 Food Delivery | $ 35,980.90 | | | **$ 35,980.90** | | $ 2,714,283.93 | |
| 25640 Food Purchases | $ 930,999.73 | $ 129,770.14 | $ 1,495,503.32 | **$ 2,556,273.19** | $ 3,630,374.84 | $ 1,235.40 | $ 2,105,135.47 |
| 25690 Other Food Services | | $ 27,371.15 | | **$ 27,371.15** | $ 239,527.93 | $ 185,767.84 | $ 287,434.79 |
| 26491 PERF | $ 33,277.84 | | $ 27,717.97 | **$ 60,995.81** | $ 168,380.61 | $ 138,526.73 | $ 102,477.84 |
| 26492 Social Security | $ 63,561.45 | | $ 85,577.93 | **$ 149,139.38** | $ 237,228.92 | $ 130,271.30 | $ 153,111.25 |
| 26493 Workmen's Compensation | $ 27,078.00 | | $ 29,126.40 | **$ 56,204.40** | $ 81,530.54 | | $ 12,815.86 |
| 26494 Group Insurance | $ 13,169.01 | | $ 30,389.98 | **$ 43,558.99** | $ 650,182.14 | $ 365,456.74 | $ 74,964.78 |
| 26496 Unemployemnt | $ 3,153.32 | | | **$ 3,153.32** | | $ 2,481.88 | $ 651.08 |
| 26497 Teacher's Retirement | $ 355.12 | | | **$ 355.12** | | | |
| 26498 Early Retirement & Servaance | | | | | $ 1,664.83 | $ 1,793.88 | $ 39,622.81 |
| 26499 Other | | | | **$ -** | | | $ 65,473.72 |
| 43100 Transfer One Fd to Another | | | | | $ 602.00 | $ 101,232.82 | |
| 43200 Loan to Another Fund | | | | **$ -** | | | |
| 43300 Securities Purchased | | | | **$ -** | $ 19,975,000.00 | | |
| **Total Disbursements** | **$ 2,026,558.16** | **$ 372,291.60** | **$ 2,969,375.89** | **$ 5,368,225.65** | **$ 28,880,695.84** | **$ 5,502,903.53** | **$ 5,553,127.56** |
| **Investment Balance** | | | | **$ -** | **$ 1,650,000.00** | | |
| **Cash Balance December 30, 2005** | **$ 389,878.86** | **$ (24,720.10)** | **$ 1,863,165.56** | **$ 2,228,324.32** | **$ 727,271.71** | **$ 4,143,987.69** | **$ 772,074.32** |

C. Maintenance of Facilities Function. Analysis of this function involved combining expenditures from several Funds in order to get a true picture of the amount expended in this function. Expenditures for this function from the General, Capital Projects, and Rainy Day Funds were combined. A maintenance expenditure worksheet is included for a detailed look at the various expenditures by fund for this function.

Maintenance (Includes expenses from the General, Capital Projects, and the Rainy Day Funds)

| | Expenditures 2005 | Expenditures /2005 ADM |
|---|---|---|
| LCS | $6,318,087 | $890.04 |
| TSC | $6,965,769 | $670.56 |
| WLCSC | $2,278,297 | $1,210.25 |
| **Combined** | **$15,562,153** | **$803.45** |
| E-V | $14,043,606 | $658.97 |
| MSDLT | $10,926,497 | $702.06 |
| VCS | $11,414,941 | $727.24 |

| **Maintenance Expenditures** | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Account # &Name | LCS | TSC | WLCSC | **Combined** | E-V | MSDLT | VCS |
| 010-25410 Service Area Direction | $27,678 | $161,223 | $62,744 | **$251,646** | $684,038 | $185,995 | $200,150 |
| 010-25420 Maint. Of Bldgs | $4,788,450 | $4,409,206 | $1,226,761 | **$10,424,417** | $3,834,273 | $6,171,352 | $9,160,157 |
| 010-25430 Maint. Of Grounds | $117,499 | | $141,110 | **$258,609** | | | $44,783 |
| 010-25440 Maint. Of Equip. | $160,476 | | $5,394 | **$165,869** | | $10,221 | $36,551 |
| 010-25450 Vehicle Maint.(not buses) | $3,606 | | $6,986 | **$10,592** | $136,030 | $9,426 | $151,313 |
| 010-25460 Security Services | | $73,775 | $37,440 | **$111,215** | $93,216 | | $255,430 |
| 010-25470 Insurance (not buses) | $347,820 | $554,827 | $84,051 | **$986,698** | $654,803 | $688,267 | $679,884 |
| 010-25490 Other | | $78,876 | | **$78,876** | $5,933,772 | | $4,573 |
| | | | | | | | |
| 035-25420 Maint. Of Bldgs | | $1,052,646 | $124,000 | **$1,176,646** | $2,596,512 | $1,703,546 | |
| 035-25440 Maint. Of Equip. | $872,558 | $635,216 | $466,968 | **$1,974,741** | $110,962 | $1,558,040 | $882,099 |
| 035-25470 insurance (not buses) | | | $122,843 | **$122,843** | | $300,000 | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 061-25460 Security Services | | | | | | $299,650 | |
| **Total Maintenance Expenditures** | $6,318,087 | $6,965,769 | $2,278,297 | **$15,562,153** | $14,043,606 | $10,926,497 | $11,414,941 |

## II. Impact on distribution of poverty and eligibility for the receipt of grant money.

The information presented to address this topic does not completely answer this question. Until consolidation would happen, and a new school district formed, the information is not totally available to answer this question. In looking at the data, it is evident that there is a great variation in the percent of poverty in each of the school corporations. The percent of poverty affects the allocation of funds in several Federal programs. Until a new percent of poverty calculation is done and the school districts in the state are re-ranked with this new data, a determination of allocation is not available.

A display of grants maintained by each of the school districts is provided as a part of this section. Also, the 2006 Title I % of poverty and allocation of funds is provided for comparison.

**Title I 2006 % of proverty and allocation of Funds**

| | % Poverty | Final Allocation | Allocation per 2004/05ADM |
|---|---|---|---|
| LCS | 14.34% | $1,493,889.28 | $210.45 |
| TSC | 7.50% | $945,825.23 | $91.05 |
| WLCSC | 5.33% | $127,576.24 | $67.77 |
| | | | |
| E-V | 12.73% | $5,298,215.89 | $248.61 |
| MSDLT | 6.60% | $1,404,148.70 | $90.22 |
| VCS | 15.29% | $3,787,881.23 | $241.32 |

**Special Funds Maintained by Each of the Tippecanoe County School Corporations**

| Grant | LSC | TSC | WLCSC |
|---|---|---|---|
| Joint Service/ Supply Special Ed. Coop. Fd | x | | |
| Joint Service/Supply Area Vocational Ed. Fd. | | x | |
| Joint Service/Supply - Other | | | x |
| Playground Fund | | | x |
| Education License Plates | x | x | x |
| Alternate Education Fund | x | x | |
| Safe Haven School | x | x | x |
| Early Intervention Fund | x | x | |
| Reading Recovery Fund | x | | |
| Donations, Gifts, & Trusts | x | x | x |
| Instruction Support Fund- Local | x | x | |
| Adult & Continuing Education Fund | x | | |
| Recreation Activities Fund | | x | |
| Scholarship & Awards Fund | x | x | x |
| Miscellaneous Programs | x | x | x |
| Instruction Support Fund-State | x | x | x |
| Economic Education Mini Grant | | x | |
| Drug Free Communities | x | | |
| Medicaid Reimbursement Fund | x | | |
| Cultural Arts Fund | | | x |
| School Technology Fund | | | x |
| Technology Grants- Equipment | x | x | x |
| P.L. 100-297 ECIA Chapter I | x | x | x |
| Innovative Ed. Program Strategies | x | x | x |
| P.L. 100-297 ECIA Title Migrant | x | | |
| Community Conservation | x | | |
| P.L. 101-476 IDEA | x | | |
| P.L. 105-17 IDEA part B | x | | |
| Education for Pre-School Handicap(P.L. 99-457) | x | | |
| P.L. 100-297 Adult Basic Education | x | | |
| Drug Free School | x | x | x |
| P.L. 95-166 Nutritional Grant- State | | x | |
| Medicaid Reimbursement -Federal | x | | |
| National Science Foundation | x | | x |
| Misc. Federal Programs | x | | |
| School-to-Work Implementation | | | x |
| Improving Teacher Quality, Title II, Parents | x | x | x |
| Improving Teacher Quality, enhanced Education | x | x | x |
| Title III English Proficiency Migrant | x | x | x |
| NCLB Reading First Grant | x | | |

## III. Tax Rates in Each School District Involved and How Consolidation Might Impact Tax Rates.

Tax rates in each of the funds will be affected differently because of the nature of the fund. For instance, the tax levy in the Transportation Fund may not necessarily be the sum of the levies in the three districts, but it may be a new levy determined by the state after consolidation is complete. The Debt Service Fund should be a rate determined by adding the levies of the three districts and calculating a rate using a combined assessed-value amount. An estimated basic grant and maximum levy amount for the General Fund of a combined district has been estimated. Included with this section is the Estimated 2005 Basic Grant distribution for the Combined District.

A chart showing the tax rates and estimated combined tax rates for each fund maintained by the three Tippecanoe County school districts, along with a chart comparing the estimated, calculated combined tax rate to the tax rates of the three comparison school districts is also provided.

**CALCULATED BY:**
**EDUCATIONAL SERVICES COMPANY**
**April 2006**

**ESTIMATED**
**2005 BASIC GRANT AND SPECIAL EDUCATION PROPOSED PRESCHOOL DISTRIBUTIONS**

Corporation # New  School Corporation/Charter School Name Tippecanoe County Consolidation

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2004 Basic Grant | $ | 83,924,738 |
| 2004 Enrollment Growth Grant | $ | - |
| 2004 Academic Honors Diploma Grant | $ | 312,975 |
| 2004 Supplemental Remediation Grant | $ | 224,184 |
| 2004 Special Education Grant | $ | 4,688,398 |
| 2004 Vocational Education Grant | $ | 1,153,900 |
| 2004 Prime Time Grant | $ | 2,483,213 |
| | | |
| 2004 Tuition Support Levy (2004 Levy Worksheet, Line 1) | $ | 50,843,185 |
| 2004 P L 874 Loss Amount | $ | - |
| 2004 Approved New Facility Apeal | $ | 645,453 |
| 2003 Motor Vehicle Excise Tax | $ | 4,705,156 |
| 2003 Commercial Vehicle Excise Tax (CVET) | $ | 287,286 |
| 2003 Financial Institutions Tax (FIT) | $ | 411,999 |
| Revenue Reduction for Nonpublic Students (2003 W'sheet, Section A, Line 21) | $ | 5,440 |
| | | |
| 2000-2001 ADM | | 18,388.83 |
| 2001-2002 ADM | | 18,617.43 |
| 2002-2003 ADM (Form 30A, column 10) **(less column 7 for school corps.)** | | 18,839.25 |
| 2003-2004 Adjusted ADM (2004 W'sheet, Section B, Line 29) | | 19,006.91 |
| 2003-2004 ADM (Form 30A, column 9) | | 19,054.93 |
| 2003-2004 ADM (Form 30A, column7) | | 19,051.50 |
| 2004-2005 ADM (Form 30A, column 9) | | 19,369.01 |
| 2004-2005 ADM (Form 30A, column 7) | | 19,365.50 |
| 2004-2005 K-3 ADM | | 5,389.50 |
| 2003-2004 Adjusted ADM Growth (2004 Worksheet, Section B, Line 23) | | 139.40 |
| | | |
| Percent of School Corporation Population 25 years old with less than 12th grade education (2000 census) | | 0.1228 |
| Percent of Students Eligible for Free Lunch in 2002-2003 (non-census) | | 0.2019 |
| Percent of Limited English Proficient Students in 2002-2003 (non-census) | | 0.0550 |
| Percent of Families in the School Corporation with Single Parent (2000 census) | | 0.2691 |
| Percent of Families in the School Corporation with Children less than 18 who have Family ncome below the Poverty Level (2000 census) | | 0.1078 |
| | | |
| Number of Students Receiving Honors Diploma in 2003-2004 | | 314.0000 |
| Percent of ISTEP+ tests scored below the passing score for 2002-2003 | | 0.2461 |

| **2005 BASIC GRANT WORKSHEET** | **Page 2** |
|---|---|
| 2005 Tax Rate Adjustment Factor | 1.00 |
| 2005 Assessed Value | $ 7,012,468,090 |
| 2004 General Fund Tax Rate (2004 General Fund Maximum Levy (2004 Worksheet Line 4) increased by the 2004 Bank Personal Property Levy divided by the 2004 Assessed Value) (formula rate, not DLGF certified rate) | $ 0.7413 |
| 2004 Motor Vehicle Excise Tax | $ 4,892,247 |
| 2004 Commercial Vehicle Excise Tax (CVET) | $ 376,060 |
| 2004 Financial Institutions Tax (FIT) | $ 302,274 |
| 2004-2005 Special Education Severe Disabilities Pupil Count | 422 |
| 2004-2005 Special Education Mild and Moderate Disabilities Pupil Count | 1952 |
| 2004-2005 Special Education Communication and Homebound Pupil Count | 1404 |
| 2004-2005 Vocational Education **Total Student Credit Hours** | |
| More Than Moderate Labor Market Need/High Wage | 902 |
| More Than Moderate Labor Market Need/Moderate Wage | 620 |
| More Than Moderate Labor Market Need/Less Than Moderate Wage | 152 |
| Moderate Labor Market Need/High Wage | 175 |
| Moderate Labor Market Need/Moderate Wage | 94 |
| Less Than Moderate Labor Market Need/High Wage | 0 |
| Less ThanModerate Labor Market Need/Moderate Wage | 80 |
| 2004-2005 Vocational Education **Total Student Count** | 2049 |
| Student Count in Other Approved Vocational Programs | 155 |
| Student Count in Area Participation | |
| 2004-2005 Special Education Preschool Count | 341 |
| 2005 Special Education Preschool Fund Tax Rate | .000023? |
| 2005 Cost of Utility Services and Property and Casualty Insurance | $ 7,155,052.08 |
| 2005 New Facility Appeal Amount | $ - |
| 2005 Revenue Shortfall Appeal Amount | $ 578,008 |
| 2005 Emergency Financial Relief Appeal Amount | $ - |
| 2005 Transfer Tuition Appeal Amount | $ 452,098 |
| 1999 Prime Time Grant (1999 W'sheet) | $ 2,315,436 |
| First Year Prime Time Amount | $ 2,315,436 |

## 2004 to 2005
## FUNDING COMPARISON

**The Funding Comparison applies to school corporations and charter schools.**

| **State Support** | **Individual 2005** | **Combined 2005** | **Combined vs. Individual Funding Inc/Dec** | **PCT** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Tuition Support | $ 43,448,354.40<br>DPI 54 | $ 46,610,925.23<br>Sect M, Line 1 | | |
| 2. Enrollment Grant | $ 474,818.27<br>DPI 54 | $ 562,031.74<br>Sect M, Line 2 | | |
| 3. Academic Honors Diploma Grant | $ 302,382<br>DPI 54 | $ 302,382.00<br>Sect M, Line 3 | | |
| 4. Supplemental Remediation Grant | $ 455,264.05<br>DPI 54 | $ 456,174.15<br>Sect M, Line 4 | | |
| 5. Special Education Grant | $ 8,596,036<br>DPI 54 | $ 8,593,912<br>Sect M, Line 5 | | |
| 6. Vocational Education Grant | $ 1,331,325<br>DPI 54 | $ 1,331,325<br>Sect M, Line 6 | | |
| 7. Prime Time Grant | $ 2,403,502<br>DPI 54 | $ 2,315,436<br>Sect M, Line 7 | | |
| 8. **TOTAL STATE DOLLARS**<br>***Add*** Lines 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 | $ 57,011,681.72 | $ 60,272,186.12<br>$3111.78/ADM | $ 3,260,504 | |
| **Local Support** | | | | |
| 9. Maximum Levy* | $ 50,243,697<br>Levy Wk, Line 4 | $ 50,791,306<br>Levy Wk, Line 4 | $ 547,609 | |
| 10. TOTAL STATE & LOCAL<br>Line 8 ***plus*** Line 9 | $ 107,255,379 | $ 111,063,492 | $ 3,808,113 | |
| 11. Excise, CVET, and FIT | $ 5,570,581<br>2004 Actual | $ 5,570,581<br>2004 Estimate | $ - | |
| 12. TOTAL FUNDING<br>Line 10 ***plus*** Line 11 | $ 112,825,960<br>$5825.08/ADM | $ 116,634,073<br>$6021.68/ADM | $ 3,808,113<br>$196.61/ADM | |

*Maximum levy includes a new facility of $_____ for _____.

**How would the tax rates be impacted for taxpayers in each district?**

| | | 2005 Levy | 2005 Rate |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. General Fund | | | |
| | LCS | $17,090,206 | $0.6975 |
| | TSC | $25,788,756 | $0.7023 |
| | WLCSC | $8,546,080 | $0.9600 |
| | **Combined** | **$51,972,651 *** | **$0.7411** |
| | * See Funding Comparison Sheet for increase in Maximum Levy and Stat Basic Grant | | |
| B. Debt Service Fund | | | |
| | LCS | $4,743,604 | $0.1936 |
| | TSC | $11,948,827 | $0.3254 |
| | WLCSC | $2,724,953 | $0.3061 |
| | **Combined** | **$19,417,384** | **$0.2769** |
| C. Capital Projects Fund | | | |
| | LCS | $5,557,074 | $0.2268 |
| | TSC | $10,957,375 | $0.2984 |
| | WLCSC | $1,988,744 | $0.2234 |
| | **Combined** | **$18,503,193** | **$0.2639** |
| D. Transportation Fund | | | |
| | LCS | $2,300,746 | $0.0939 |
| | TSC | $4,068,623 | $0.1108 |
| | WLCSC | $466,474 | $0.0524 |
| | **Combined** | **$6,835,843** | **$0.0975** |
| E. Bus Replacement Fund | | | |
| | LCS | $343,029 | $0.0140 |
| | TSC | $1,424,753 | $0.0388 |
| | WLCSC | $31,158 | $0.0035 |
| | **Combined** | **$1,798,940** | **$0.0257** |
| F. Special Education Pre-School Fund | | | |
| | LCS | $53,905 | $0.0022 |
| | TSC | $88,129 | $0.0024 |
| | WLCSC | $18,695 | $0.0021 |
| | **Combined** | **$160,728** | **$0.0023** |

.

**Comparison of Actual 2005 Tax Rates to Calculated Tax Rate of Combined School Corporations**

| | 2005 Actual Tax Rates | Calculated Combined Tax Rate** |
|---|---|---|
| LSC | $ 1.3173 | |
| TSC | $ 1.4781 | |
| WLCSC | $ 1.5575 | |
| **Combined** | | **$1.4073** |
| E-V | $ 1.1912 | |
| MSDLT | $ 1.4587 | |
| VCS | $ 1.3070 | |

** Calculated Combined Tax Rate does not included any Special Levies that each School Corporation may have levied. (Such as a Referendum Fund Levy or a Playground Fund Levy.)

## IV. Comparison of 2005 Total Appropriations and Actual Expenditures by Fund (Tax Related Funds only) for Each School District in the Comparison.

### A. Total Appropriations

**Comparison of 2005 Approved Appropriations (Tax Related Funds)**

| School District | Approved Appropriations | Appropriations per ADM |
|---|---|---|
| LCS | $63,158,140 | $8,897.23 |
| TSC | $90,226,895 | $8,685.68 |
| WLCSC | $19,740,954 | $10,486.56 |
| **Combined** | **$173,125,989** | **$8,938.24** |
| E-V | $178,675,641 | $8,383.96 |
| MSDLT | $139,583,050 | $8,968.62 |
| VCS | $137,239,336 | $8,743.48 |

## Comparison of Actual 2005 Expenditures (Tax Related Funds)

| Fund | # | LSC | TSC | WLCSC | Combined | E.V. | MSDLT | VCS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| General | 010 | $46,201,584 | $59,450,965 | $13,812,800 | **$119,465,349** | $135,077,431 | $97,134,120 | $97,003,490 |
| Referendum | 016 | $2,070,945 | | | **$2,070,945** | | | |
| Debt Service | 020 | $5,290,166 | $11,589,072 | $2,967,891 | **$19,847,129** | $5,358,110 | $17,015,228 | $8,382,663 |
| Retirement/Severance Bond | 025 | | | $88,400 | **$88,400** | 4958700.25 | 1425996 | |
| Capital Projects | 035 | $5,235,022 | $11,018,253 | $3,930,464 | **$20,183,739** | $16,299,158 | $14,967,957 | $12,653,945 |
| Transportation | 041 | $2,445,591 | $4,416,408 | $537,944 | **$7,399,942** | $11,116,011 | $8,399,446 | $5,047,056 |
| Bus Replacement | 042 | $372,996 | $1,385,770 | $109,600 | **$1,868,366** | $3,017,951 | $1,658,876 | $1,529,633 |
| Sp. Ed. Preschool | 060 | $376,807 | $525,951 | $52,543 | **$955,301** | $1,076,907 | $329,218 | $676,500 |
| Total Tax Related Funds | | $61,993,112 | $88,386,418 | $21,499,642 | **$171,879,172** | $176,904,269 | $140,930,842 | $125,293,287 |

## Comparison of Actual 2005 Expenditures per ADM (Tax Related Funds)

| Fund | # | LSC | TSC | WLCSC | Combined | E.V. | MSDLT | VCS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| General | 010 | $6,508.52 | $5,723.04 | $7,337.48 | **$6,167.82** | $6,338.21 | $6,241.15 | $6,180.06 |
| Referendum | 016 | $291.74 | $0.00 | $0.00 | **$106.92** | $0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 |
| Debt Service | 020 | $745.24 | $1,115.62 | $1,576.57 | **$1,024.68** | $251.42 | $1,093.28 | $534.06 |
| Retirement/Severance Bond | 025 | $0.00 | $0.00 | $46.96 | **$4.56** | $232.68 | $91.62 | $0.00 |
| Capital Projects | 035 | $737.47 | $1,060.67 | $2,087.90 | **$1,042.06** | $764.80 | $961.73 | $806.18 |
| Transportation | 041 | $344.52 | $425.14 | $285.76 | **$382.05** | $521.59 | $539.69 | $321.55 |
| Bus Replacement | 042 | $52.54 | $133.40 | $58.22 | **$96.46** | $141.61 | $106.59 | $97.45 |
| Sp. Ed. Preschool | 060 | $53.08 | $50.63 | $27.91 | **$49.32** | $50.53 | $21.15 | $43.10 |
| Total Tax Related Funds | | $8,733.11 | $8,508.50 | $11,420.79 | **$8,873.87** | $8,300.84 | $9,055.22 | $7,982.40 |