

# CITIZENS LEAGUE REPORT

No. 144

## **Minneapolis Public Schools \$5 Million School Bond Issue**

**August 1962**

144  
Citizens League  
545 Mobil Oil Building  
Minneapolis 2, Minnesota

APPROVED  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
DATE AUG 23 1962

TO: Board of Directors  
FROM: Special School Building Committee, Archie Spencer, Chairman  
SUBJECT: \$5 Million School Bond Referendum.

#### MAJOR CONCLUSIONS

1. A substantial increase in the present rate of expenditure for school construction and rehabilitation is needed if the Minneapolis Public School System is to provide an adequate and equal educational opportunity for our children..

2. The development of a 15-20 year long-range school construction and rehabilitation program is essential if we are to be reasonably assured that wasteful construction and rehabilitation will be avoided and that a better educational offering will be provided by expenditure of the same number of dollars. While the proposed \$5 million program is not a long-range program, consultants have already been retained to aid in the formulation of such a program and it is unlikely that any of the projects included in the \$5 million program would conflict with possible recommendations by the consultants.

3. The proposed \$5 million program will not narrow the range of alternative plans for meeting long-range school needs which the consultants may wish to consider. It also does not move in the direction of further widening the present substantial enrollment variations among schools nor does it conflict with any of the other guiding principles stated in our May 23 report.

4. Although in our May 23 report, we offered three alternative means - other than a bond issue - to meet the need to provide urgently needed facilities until such time as the long-range program can be formulated, we believe that the proposed \$5 million bond issue is a valid means of meeting these needs.

5. Although the documentation and supporting data are inadequate for a detailed evaluation of the proposed \$5 million program, all of the school building projects which would be financed by the bond issue appear to be needed, none would be likely to conflict with possible recommendations by the consultants and some are needed urgently.

6. Preliminary recommendations should be forthcoming from the consultants probably in January. If the bond issue passes, no substantial funds will likely be committed by that time. We presume that the School Board and administration will delay or revise work on projects which appear to conflict with the consultants' preliminary conclusions. The Citizens League will continually review the authorized projects in light of the consultants' recommendations.

#### RECOMMENDATION

We recommend the approval of the \$5 million school bond issue at the September primary election.

COMMENDATION

We commend the Minneapolis Board of Education and its staff for engaging consultants to formulate a long-range school construction and rehabilitation program and for their decision to defer the bulk of the previously proposed \$17 million program until the completion of a long-range program.

SUMMARY

By pulling together our general observations and conclusions about each specific project contained in the proposed \$5 million program, the following summary conclusions would seem indicated:

1. Urgent needs, together with the lack of any apparent conflict with long-range basic policy decisions, would seem to justify inclusion in the \$5 million program of:

- a. The \$75,000 needed to complete the addition of Burroughs Elementary School.
- b. The \$300,000 allocated for the addition and facilities at Southwest.
- c. The \$1,000,000 which appears to be necessary to provide additional facilities and capacity at Washburn to a total somewhere midway between the present capacity of 1,397 and the future anticipated enrollment of 2,000.
- d. The \$825,000 proposed for either permanent additions or portable classrooms at various elementary schools throughout the City.

2. Although few urgent needs have been demonstrated there would appear to be no serious adverse effects likely from allocating funds in the \$5 million program to finance:

- a. The construction of an addition at Field Elementary School.
- b. The improvements proposed at Lincoln School.
- c. The rehabilitation, modernization and provision of additional facilities at Roosevelt.
- d. The rehabilitation, modernization and provision of additional facilities at North.
- e. The rehabilitation of Sheridan School.
- f. The start of site acquisition for a replacement for Warrington School since no decision would be made on this until the consultants have made a recommendation.
- g. Site acquisition for a new Franklin Junior High School.

3. Because of the lack of a long-range construction program, it was proper to exclude from the \$5 million program funds for:

- a. A new South Junior-Senior High School.
- b. An addition to Sheridan Elementary-Junior High School.
- c. Additional classroom space at Washburn beyond that needed to serve Washburn's present enrollment.
- d. Construction designed to increase the capacity at Roosevelt for the anticipated increased enrollment.

- e. Construction designed to increase the capacity at North for the anticipated future enrollment.
- f. Construction of a replacement for Warrington Elementary School.

In summary, none of the projects included in the proposed project is likely to conflict seriously with recommendations which might be made by the consultants. While a number of projects appear to be less than urgent, others should be started as soon as possible and all appear to be needed. Therefore, we endorse the list of projects which has been recommended by the school administration and approved by the Board of Education for inclusion in the proposed \$5 million school construction and rehabilitation program.

#### BACKGROUND AND RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

On January 9, 1962 the Minneapolis Board of Education approved a 5-year \$25 million school construction and rehabilitation program for community consideration and submission to the voters. The Board of Education separated the \$25 million program into one portion of \$8 million, which could be programmed without being referred to the voters, and a \$17 million portion which was scheduled to be submitted to the voters at the September primary election. Most of the \$17 million portion was allocated for new construction, while most of the \$8 million portion was to be spent for rehabilitation projects. On January 3, the Citizens League's Board of Directors approved the establishment of a special committee to review the proposed program and report back its findings and recommendations. The special committee reviewed the proposed program and submitted a 50 page report which was approved by the Citizens League's Board of Directors on May 23. (A number of the conclusions and observations presented in this report are based upon the May 23 report.)

Among the recommendations contained in the May 23 report were the following:

1. We urge the Minneapolis Board of Education to reconsider its declared intention of submitting the proposed 5-year school construction and rehabilitation program to the voters at the September primary election. We urge instead that the Board of Education defer submission of the proposed program.
2. We further urge the Minneapolis Board of Education to take prompt steps to begin formulation of a comprehensive 15-20 year long-range school construction and rehabilitation program, which then might be divided into stages for orderly submission to the voters.
3. In order to expedite the early submission to the voters of the first stage of a 15-20 years long-range school construction and rehabilitation program and in order to offer greater assurance to the voters that such a program is needed, we urge the Board of Education to utilize the services of outside consultants experienced in the area of school planning.
4. We urge that in the formulation of a long-range school construction and rehabilitation program particular attention be directed to strengthening the following serious deficiencies in the proposed 5-year program:
  - a. Closer adherence to the principle of providing a reasonably equal educational opportunity to each student within the City of Minneapolis.

- b. Consideration of changes in present school boundaries as a means of better implementing two important objectives:
  - (1) Reducing the present substantial variation in enrollments among schools and strengthening the enrollment at the smallest schools, particularly at the senior high level. We urge that most, if not all, senior high enrollments be brought within the recommended range of 1,000-1,800 students.
  - (2) More effective utilization of the capacities of existing buildings suitable for school use.
- c. Closer conformity to the K6-3-3 form of school organization in separate structures until or unless the long-standing Minneapolis policy favoring this form is modified or replaced with some other form of school organization.

5. We recognize the need to provide certain urgently needed facilities until such time as the long-range program can be formulated. During this interim and to the extent necessary, we urge use of one or more of the following alternative ways of meeting these pressing needs:

- a. Priority allocation of the annual \$2 million bonding authority available to the Board of Education without referendum approval.
- b. Priority allocation of part of the  $3\frac{1}{4}$  mill (\$1.3 million) Repair and Improvement Fund, which is available annually.
- c. Temporary increase in the  $3\frac{1}{4}$  mill Repair and Improvement Fund levy. The Board of Education has authority to set its own maximum mill levy for operating expenditures, subject only to referendum by petition.

In urging deferral of the proposed program, the May 23 report stated:

"Our decision to urge deferral of the proposed 5-year school construction and rehabilitation program has been arrived at with the greatest reluctance and only after the most painstaking review of every facet of the program, in the hope that a way could be found to support it either as proposed or with certain modifications. Unfortunately, the deeper we delved, the more inescapable became our conviction that we cannot in good conscience support the program. It was our fervent hope that the program would be found to be deserving of support, partly because of our deep awareness of the critical importance of providing an adequate educational opportunity for our children and partly because of our clear conviction that an urgent need exists for a substantial school construction and rehabilitation program. Our opposition to this program marks the first time since the Citizens League was founded in 1952 that we have been compelled to reject a major proposal for financing school needs.

"Although our criticisms of the proposed program are many, and each is discussed in detail in this report, they all add up to one simple general conclusion -- our sincere conviction that the proposed program will not advance, in fact will perhaps retard, the long-range goal of providing a

more effective school system for all the children of our community. The proposed program is severely deficient in several important respects: (1) The program was not preceded by a thorough review and evaluation of basic educational goals for the future, nor has there been a re-examination nor a reaffirmation of basic school policies. Both are essential prerequisites to the development of a sound long-range school construction and rehabilitation program. (2) Although the program has a far-reaching impact on major long-range school policies, the program itself is not a long-range program. (3) The program violates one of the most fundamental school policies by failing to move in the direction of providing comparable opportunity for each student. In fact, the program appears to accommodate an even wider inequality in the curriculum offering among schools than already exists. (4) The program rejects the concept of changing school district boundaries as a means of strengthening enrollments at the smallest schools, reducing the wide variation in enrollments among schools, and as a means of better utilizing existing capacity as a means of relieving overcrowding at certain schools. (5) The program fails to provide the degree of documentation and supporting data which is essential to reassure the public that wasteful construction and rehabilitation will be avoided."

Although the Citizens League, the League of Women Voters, the Citizens Committee on Public Education and other groups requested that the proposed program be deferred and that a consultant be retained to aid in the formulation of a long-range building program, the Board of Education voted on June 26 - by a 4 to 3 vote - to put the \$17 million bond issue on the September 11 ballot and to hire a consultant to aid in the development of a long-range building program. After choosing Michigan State University Field Services as the consultant, the Board of Education reversed its previous position and on August 3 - by a unanimous vote - reduced the \$17 million portion of the proposed program to the \$5 million proposal now before the voters.

By these actions the Board of Education has implemented most of the recommendations of our May 23 report. In effect, the \$17 million program has been deferred until the completion of the consultants' contract. (The \$5 million program is being presented as a first phase which is needed to meet urgent needs.) Also, the Board of Education has acted promptly to begin formulation of a comprehensive 15-20 year long-range school construction and rehabilitation program, as suggested in recommendation 2, and, as suggested in number 3, has retained outside consultants to aid in this work. The school administration has stated that factors such as those mentioned in our recommendation 4 will be considered by the consultants. Although the School Board and administration have chosen a financing method other than the three suggested in our recommendation 5 to finance urgent school needs, the \$5 million referendum bond issue appears to be a valid means of financing these needs.

#### SCOPE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to review and report findings on the proposed \$5 million school bond issue. The school authorities have stated that the proposed bond issue would be used to meet the immediate building needs of the school system by financing the first phase of a school building program. The remainder of the program is to be formulated by the School Board and administration with the aid of school planning consultants retained for this purpose. The Board of Education has approved the general designation and presently estimated cost of the projects to be financed by the proposed \$5 million bond issue.

This report does not comment on the method of issuing the bonds, the terms of the bonds or other details of the financing of the proposed program. The Board of Education has not made a final determination of these matters and, therefore, it would appear premature for us to attempt an evaluation of them at this time.

#### EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED \$5 MILLION PROGRAM

Our purpose in this section of the report is to compare the \$5 million proposal with the former \$17 million proposal so as to ascertain the justification for the inclusion of each project in the \$5 million program. The general intent of the School Board in reducing the amount of bonding authority it will ask the voters to approve at the September 11 primary election was to allow the most urgently needed and least controversial projects to move ahead without delay, while a long-range school construction and rehabilitation program is being developed. In selecting the specific projects to be financed by the \$5 million bond authorization, the Board of Education was restricted to those projects which had been included in the \$17 million program.

Assistant Superintendent Adner I. Heggerston has explained the principles which the school administration used in the selection of projects by stating:

"The superintendent and administrative staff in preparing the recommendations designating projects to be included in the first phase were careful to consider possible alternate solutions to school problems which might be recommended by the survey staff and to avoid commitments which would prejudice the outcome of the survey. As a result of widespread community discussion, areas of agreement and disagreement have been identified. The issues on which there was disagreement will be the subject of particular study by the survey team. The items which were designated by the Board of Education on August 3 involve work which is needed whatever direction the survey recommendations may point. The major emphasis will be on modernization and improvement of school facilities. It has previously been stated that only a limited amount of the \$17 million program involves expansion of facilities. Even in the case of the larger construction projects, the major part would be used to provide facilities presently needed for a balanced educational program but which are now inadequate or completely missing.

When a building project involves new construction and modernization of existing facilities, the most efficient building arrangement frequently involves some changes in present classroom use. For example, an under-sized library, laboratory or shop may be readily adapted to serve other classroom needs. The exact nature of the new construction will, therefore, depend to a degree upon the architectural plan which is developed. It would be unwise to unnecessarily limit the architects by identifying exactly what is to be included in the new construction. The architects should be free to suggest alternate solutions to building problems. The amount of money designated for each of the major projects is only a part of the estimated cost included in the \$17 million. All the modernization cannot be carried out with the amounts which have been suggested. The projects proposed for inclusion in the \$5 million program were outlined in the presentation to the Board of Education on August 3. The specific designations will be determined by the Board when preliminary plans are available. The most urgent building needs have been identified in staff

discussions. Not all can be met in the first phase of the program, but the money will be used to go as far as possible with the improvements listed. More precise cost estimates can be made when plans and specifications are completed."

In our evaluation of each project and our determination of whether or not it should be included in the proposed \$5 million program, we have used the following criteria:

1. The degree to which each project might conflict with possible recommendations which are to be formulated by the consultants and the degree to which each might tend to restrict the number of alternate long-range proposals available to the consultants.
2. The urgency of meeting the need.

Obviously, if a project is not needed or if going ahead at this time might be inconsistent with the consultants' recommendations, it clearly should not be included in the \$5 million program.

Two of the three criteria used by the school administration in establishing the proposed list of projects are virtually the same as the above. In addition to these two, the school administration also used the following criterion:

- "3. Reasonable equity in distributing funds to meet the needs of the total city program."

While this criterion probably was considered politically necessary in order to diminish the likelihood of an unfavorable vote from those parts of the city which might not receive any of the proposed projects, we do not believe that this should be used as a major test for the inclusion or exclusion of a project in a city-wide school program. Aside from this third criterion - and we are sure that this was considered as only a subsidiary factor - we approve of the principles which the administration used to select the projects to be included in the \$5 million program.

Listed below is a general description, discussion and some conclusions about each of the projects contained in the \$17 million 5-year program and those included in the \$5 million program. However, the description of each project is no more than a directional outline. It does not include a cost estimate for each item nor does it include any specific statement that the total estimate at each school is the amount the school administration has calculated to be the cost of the listed items. The school administration, unfortunately, has not released such information and it, therefore, is very difficult to reach definitive conclusions about the proposed projects. While the documentation of the bond proposals which would require voter approval has been limited to a general statement of the needs at each school, separate amounts have been presented for the items included in the 5-year, \$10 million rehabilitation program which does not require voter approval.

The projects which were to be included in the former \$17 million program and the amount which has been allocated to each of these projects in the present \$5 million proposal are:



	<u>\$17,000,000</u> <u>Program</u>	<u>PRESENT</u> <u>\$5,000,000</u> <u>Program</u>
Washburn High School	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,000,000
Burroughs Elementary School	100,000	75,000
Field Elementary School	300,000	300,000
Roosevelt High School	1,500,000	500,000
North High School	1,500,000	500,000
Southwest High School	300,000	300,000
Sheridan Junior High School	500,000	200,000
Lincoln Junior High School	300,000	300,000
New South Junior-Senior High School	5,000,000	- -
Replacement for Warrington Elementary School	1,500,000	200,000
Replacement for Franklin Junior High School	3,500,000	800,000
Additional Classrooms or Portables	<u>1,000,000</u>	<u>825,000</u>
TOTAL	\$ 17,000,000	\$ 5,000,000

WASHBURN HIGH SCHOOL (\$1,000,000 formerly \$1,500,000)

PROPOSED: The projects previously recommended for Washburn included a \$1,500,000 addition under the \$17 million program and an additional \$448,000 for rehabilitation under the \$10 million non-referendum rehabilitation program. The \$448,000, to be spent over a period of five years, appears to include such items as the rehabilitation and modernization of the home economics department, heating and ventilation system, plumbing, library, administrative suite, and industrial education department. By attempting to piece together what remains of the general statement of need at Washburn, we believe the \$1,500,000 portion would have provided for construction of 10-12 additional classrooms, two auxiliary gyms, shower and locker room facilities, a band and orchestra room, six or eight practice rooms for the band and orchestra, an industrial arts shop, an expanded library, enlarged office facilities, a little theatre, and a faculty lounge.

The school administration has stated, "The situation at Washburn is becoming critical, and this particular project is urgently requested as No. 1 priority of all projects included in the proposed 5-year program." This high priority rating is based on an enrollment of several hundred more than the rated capacity of the building, with a further increase in projected enrollment during the next several years.

The school administration has indicated that all of the above except the additional classrooms, enlarged office facilities, little theatre and faculty lounge would be included in the \$5 million proposal.

DISCUSSION: There appears to be general agreement that a critical need for additional classrooms exists at Washburn. Rated capacity is 1,397. Its present enrollment is 1,732, and school officials indicate its peak enrollment will be almost 2,000 in 1966. There, likewise, appears to be general agreement that Washburn is in great need of modernization and rehabilitation work.

The severe overcrowding at Washburn can be eliminated in one or both of two ways. The \$17 million construction program selected the alternative of constructing the necessary additional classrooms to handle its present and expected growing enrollment.

The school administration stated that the requested money would have provided for the construction of sufficient additional facilities to handle adequately an enrollment of 2,000. The alternative would be to consider boundary changes which would reduce enrollment at Washburn. Sufficient excess capacity now exists at West and Central High Schools to handle the problem, but this type of boundary change would raise several difficult problems and clearly should not be undertaken except as a part of a total plan for assigning senior high school students throughout the City of Minneapolis. Such a long-range plan might well recommend the construction of a new senior high school in an area which would allow a coordinated strengthening of the enrollment at each of the smallest high schools and the reduction of future enrollments at Washburn.

CONCLUSIONS: Until such time as the consultants can make their long-range recommendations, it would appear unwise to move ahead to construct additional facilities at Washburn for the anticipated future enrollment of 2,000. However, it would seem that some permanent enrollment in excess of the rated capacity of the school (1,397) will continue, even under the type of recommendation which would make substantial boundary changes. Therefore, since the school administration has indicated that under the \$5 million program the capacity at Washburn would not be increased beyond that school's present enrollment and that none of the work to be done at Washburn under this program would prejudice either of the alternatives mentioned above, we approve the allocation of funds to meet Washburn's urgent needs. The allocation for this purpose of \$1,000,000 appears to be justified.

BURROUGHS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (\$75,000 formerly \$100,000)

PROPOSED: In both instances, the proposed expenditure is to finance the final stage of a several year program to increase the capacity of Burroughs School and to provide certain facilities.

DISCUSSION: Commitments to complete the work have been made and the entire project is expected to be completed during 1963. The \$25,000 reduction was apparently the result of a reduced estimate and does not indicate a reduction in the amount of work to be done.

CONCLUSIONS: There appears to be no doubt but that the full amount proposed for Burroughs should be included in the \$5 million program. Undoubtedly, this project will be built in 1963 regardless of the fate of the bond issue.

FIELD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (\$300,000 formerly the same)

PROPOSED: The work proposed at Field under the \$5 million program is the same as that which had been proposed under the \$17 million. The proposed addition would replace four wooden portable classrooms used since 1923 with four new permanent classrooms, and in addition would provide a library, library workroom, multi-purpose room for music, student lunches and storage, and new administrative office facilities. The project is justified on the basis of continuous administration recommendations since 1954 to replace the old portable classrooms and on the basis of a need to provide other facilities in a more advantageous location in the structure. Administration enrollment projections indicate that Field is presently slightly crowded and that enrollment during the next several years will continue to be slightly in excess of its rated capacity of 540.

DISCUSSION: Without question, the wooden portables should be abandoned at some early date. The situation at Field is not urgent in since the discomfort at Field has been lived with for a good many years.

The two elementary schools bordering Field on the east and the south have room for additional pupils. The proposed new Warrington School which, if constructed, would border Field on the north and west, could reduce the enrollment pressure on Field. It is possible that the total review of the elementary school system in Minneapolis might recommend replacement of the wooden portables at Field and transfer of some pupils to other schools. This would eliminate most of the need for construction of the addition at Field.

CONCLUSIONS: The proposed project at Field does not qualify under the definition of an urgent need, and it might conflict with recommendations contained in the expected long-range program. Therefore, while it might be preferable to hold up work at Field, it is unlikely that serious or irreparable harm would result from including the proposed \$300,000 addition in the \$5 million program.

ROOSEVELT HIGH SCHOOL (\$500,000 formerly \$1,500,000)

PROPOSED: The \$17 million program included a \$1,500,000 addition at Roosevelt and the \$10 million non-referendum rehabilitation program included an additional \$689,000. Thus, the total proposed expenditures for Roosevelt during the next five years would have been \$2,189,000.

In general, it would appear that the \$689,000 was to finance rehabilitation and modernization of facilities in the present building such as homemaking laboratories, industrial shops, the heating and ventilating system, kitchen serving line, the teachers' lunchroom, the girls' physical educational department and locker rooms, the communication system, acoustical treatment, and the construction of fire towers. Listed as additional needs at Roosevelt and therefore presumed to have been included in the \$1,500,000 proposed addition was an addition to provide immediate classrooms for an anticipated larger enrollment and also to provide additional facilities for industrial arts, home economics, science and physical education, and the modernization of the administrative office space.

Of these projects, the \$5 million program would allow for the construction of the fire towers, modernization of shower and locker rooms, new biology laboratories, and some modernization of the industrial arts department. In short, the \$500,000 would be used primarily for the modernization of facilities and not for expansion.

DISCUSSION: Roosevelt, which has a rated capacity of 2,110 is the largest senior high school in Minneapolis. Its peak estimated enrollment, expected to be reached in 1963, is 2,487, and its enrollment would then decrease somewhat to 2,377 in 1966. The additional classrooms proposed in the \$17 million program were justified as being needed to serve this additional enrollment.

Long-range enrollment projections at Roosevelt indicate that the structure will have to handle between 250 and 300 pupils over its rated capacity, but there is some reason to believe the administration's enrollment projections for the Roosevelt High area are slightly optimistic. School administration figures indicate that students residing in a 50-block area in the present South High district are allowed to exercise an option of going to Roosevelt. Apparently, 112 South Senior High students are presently exercising this option. In addition, we understand that approximately 15 students residing in the Washburn district are exercising a similar option. Also, approximately 30 tuition pupils from the Fort Snelling area presently attend Roosevelt. Each of these factors tends to put a damper on the need to provide additional classroom capacity at Roosevelt.

Added to the factors discussed above is the need for a long-range policy with respect to whether the smallest senior high schools should have their enrollments strengthened. If the consultants make this type of recommendation, then it is likely that the type of boundary changes which would be made will reduce the enrollment at Roosevelt, thereby eliminating the need for all or most of the proposed expansion at Roosevelt.

CONCLUSIONS: We believe that the school administration acted wisely in not allocating any funds within the \$5 million program for increased capacity at Roosevelt. The prospects are too great that preferable ways to overcome these problems will be recommended. The projects which will be undertaken at Roosevelt if the \$5 million bond issue is approved are unrelated to capacity and, therefore, the allocation of \$500,000 to Roosevelt appears to be justified.

NORTH HIGH SCHOOL (\$500,000 formerly \$1,500,000)

PROPOSED: In addition to the \$1,500,000 which had been allocated to North as a part of the previous \$17 million program, \$490,000 of the non-referendum \$10 million bond issue was scheduled to be spent at that school for items such as rehabilitation of the library, home economics department, industrial education department, physical education department, and health department, and work on the ventilation, temperature control and communications systems. The \$1,500,000 appeared to include provision of up to ten additional academic classrooms, additional auxiliary gyms, two health classrooms, showers, lockers, training rooms, drying rooms, new band and orchestra rooms, practice rooms for the musical groups, choir rooms, music library space, expansion of the auto shops, new equipment for the machine shops, expansion of the metal shops, a new electric shop, a little theatre for drama and play production work, three biology rooms, equipment for the business department, expansion of the art rooms, relocation of the library, expansion of the administrative office facilities, expansion of the nurse's office, expansion of the counseling area, and faculty lounges.

The proposed improvements were based generally on (1) an anticipated increased enrollment over the present rated capacity of the building, and (2) needed rehabilitation and modernization and provision of additional facilities to provide an improved curriculum offering.

As in the case of Roosevelt, the \$5 million bond funds would not be used to increase capacity at North but would only be used to modernize existing facilities including the biology laboratories, home economics rooms, music rooms and the industrial arts shops.

DISCUSSION: The present rated capacity at North High is 1,781, and latest enrollment figures show 1,667 pupils. Future enrollment projections indicate a peak enrollment in 1964 of 2,086, with substantially the same number in 1966. Most of the indicated enrollment increase at North is predicated on expected urban renewal programs and a subsequent change in the land use in that part of the City. Much uncertainty exists about future population predictions in the North area. For example, the urban renewal programs which were cited as justification for providing additional capacity at North will first result in the tearing down of houses, to be followed later by the construction of new buildings. No clear timetable for these programs has yet been established, nor have they been spelled out by the Housing and Redevelopment Authority. Neither have they been submitted to, nor approved by, the City Council. The general result in most urban renewal areas which do not include public housing -- and no public housing is proposed for this new urban renewal area in North Minneapolis -- is for the new land use to result in less school age children than before the land was

cleared. Also, as houses are being torn down, it would seem that the enrollment at North will dip prior to any possible increase. For these reasons, the school administration's projections of increased enrollment at North appear somewhat speculative and rather optimistic.

Even if the administration's enrollment projections should prove accurate, there would appear to be good cause for holding up plans to provide additional capacity at North until the total high school situation can be reviewed by the consultants. Henry High, immediately to the north of North High, is one of the smaller senior high schools, and a long-range program could conceivably recommend strengthening the enrollment at Henry. Any boundary change to accomplish this would reduce the enrollment at North.

The North High situation is also caught up in two other basic school policy issues which must be resolved before a meaningful long-range construction program can be formulated. First, Henry is a combination junior-senior high, and it is possible that it will not be desirable to continue it as a combination school contradictory to the traditional K6-3-3 form of school organization. Second, the junior high enrollment at Henry is less than 500, the smallest junior high enrollment in the City. Olson Junior High to the north of Henry also has a comparatively small enrollment of 600. Two other junior highs in north Minneapolis, Jordan and Lincoln have enrollments in excess of 1,000. The proposed construction of a new Franklin Junior High in North Minneapolis would serve approximately 600 pupils. Certainly, it was wise to postpone the decision to construct classrooms to provide additional capacity at North until after the completion of the consultant's review of the whole secondary school situation in North Minneapolis.

CONCLUSIONS: Again as in the case of Roosevelt, we approve of the decision to postpone the construction of additional capacity at North until the consultants have had an opportunity to prepare their recommendations for a long-range program for the City's secondary schools. All of the work which would be done at North under the \$5 million program is apparently needed and the allocation of \$500,000 to this school seems appropriate.

SOUTHWEST HIGH SCHOOL (\$300,000 formerly the same)

PROPOSED: Apparently, the same work will be accomplished at Southwest under the \$5 million program as had been proposed under the \$17 million proposal. The amount designated for Southwest would provide a suitable auditorium with auxiliary facilities such as dressing rooms, stage, lighting and auditorium seating and would also provide for the modernization of the library. An additional \$124,000 was scheduled - and presumably still is scheduled - for Southwest under the \$10 million non-referendum program to provide a language laboratory and other facilities.

The stated justification for these projects is to meet the anticipated increased enrollment and to provide facilities which will enable the offering of an improved curriculum.

DISCUSSION: There appears to be little doubt but that the entire \$300,000 proposed for Southwest should be included in the \$5 million program. The rated capacity for Southwest is 1,516; present enrollment exceeds this by approximately 100; and future enrollment projections indicate that by 1966 the enrollment could exceed rated capacity by nearly 300 pupils. Should this happen, there is some doubt that the proposed program will prove adequate. In fact, the \$300,000 figure was based on earlier enrollment projections which indicate that capacity would be exceeded by only 100 pupils, rather than the nearly 300 now envisioned.

CONCLUSIONS: We concur with the school administration that the full \$300,000 should be included in the \$5 million program. We are advised that, from a legal standpoint, no more than \$300,000 could be allocated for Southwest, irrespective of any new showing of greater need.

SHERIDAN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL(\$200,000 formerly \$500,000)

PROPOSED: The \$500,000 figure which was proposed for Sheridan under the \$17 million program would have provided for instrumental and vocal music facilities, an auditorium to seat one-half the student body (the entire junior high), an additional science laboratory, a large cafeteria, an auxiliary gym, health classrooms, community room facilities, a faculty lounge, a little theatre, a school employees' restroom, shower facilities for cafeteria and custodial staff, four or five additional classrooms, and modernized office facilities. Added to this \$500,000 was the proposed expenditure of \$190,000 for other modernization and rehabilitation work under the \$10 million non-referendum program.

The program for Sheridan was justified on the basis (1) that the structure was originally constructed during the depression and that for this reason a number of needed facilities have never been provided, and (2) there is some crowding at Sheridan which might be somewhat intensified by projected increased enrollments.

The \$200,000 allocated to Sheridan in the \$5 million program will not provide for any of the junior high facilities. The decision to build these facilities has been deferred until the consultant has completed his recommendations. The \$200,000 probably would be used for the modernization of classrooms, renovation of the heating and ventilating systems and grounds improvements.

DISCUSSION: There appears to be little doubt but that certain normally provided junior high facilities are not presently available at Sheridan. However, Sheridan presently is a combination elementary-junior high school, a combination which is generally looked on with disfavor by all educational leaders. It would seem most unwise to move ahead and construct the type of junior high facilities recommended in the \$17 million program until such time as a policy decision is reached to continue Sheridan as a combination elementary-junior high school. There are a number of old schools in this part of northeast Minneapolis with considerable excess capacity, and some long-range decision must be made with respect to the future of these schools. Marshall, which is a combination junior-senior high school, borders on Sheridan, and any long-range decision with respect to the future of Marshall might well have a close relationship on the future of Sheridan. Thus, it is possible that the future use of Sheridan might be to serve as a (1) continued combination elementary-junior high, (2) junior high, (3) elementary school. Sheridan has a present enrollment of approximately 500 elementary pupils and just over 600 junior high students. Rated capacity of the school is 450 elementary pupils and 645 junior high students. The school administration's future enrollment projections suggest the possibility of around 850 elementary pupils. However, a review of the administration's own figures does not seem to substantiate this prediction. The 1966 enrollment estimates indicate elementary enrollment of 517 and secondary enrollment for that year is not expected to exceed rated capacity.

CONCLUSIONS: We agree that the \$5 million program should not include any funds for the construction of Junior High School facilities at Sheridan and that such construction should be postponed until the consultants have completed their work. There does not appear to be a real urgent need for most of the work which will be done at Sheridan under this program but, since all of these improvements will have to be done sometime, we do not object to the inclusion of these projects.

LINCOLN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL (\$300,000 formerly the same)

PROPOSED: Under the \$5 million program, the same work will be done at Lincoln as had been proposed under the \$17 million program. The proposed expenditure of \$300,000 at Lincoln would allow conversion of twelve undersized classrooms into nine of larger size. It would also provide for such additional facilities as music, dramatics, speech, art, physical education and other special departments. This program is essentially one of rehabilitation, together with provision of additional facilities and larger classrooms, and has little relationship to providing additional capacity for any increased enrollment.

DISCUSSION: There appears little doubt but that any long-range construction and rehabilitation program would recommend most of the items included in this project. On the other hand, there would appear to be no great sense of urgency to undertake this work in advance of the long-range program. Proposed expenditures at Lincoln do not involve basic policy considerations as at other schools, such as minimum school size and form of school organization.

CONCLUSIONS: The entire \$300,000 proposed for Lincoln may be included in the \$5 million program with reasonable assurance that it will not conflict with any recommendations which might be made by the consultants.

NEW SOUTH JUNIOR-SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL (deleted formerly \$5,000,000)

PROPOSED: The \$5,000,000 which would have been spent for site acquisition and construction of a new combination South junior-senior high school to be located generally in the vicinity of the present Seward Elementary School has been deleted from the program. The proposed school would have had a total capacity of between 1,200-1,700 and would generally have served the present South High district.

The primary justification for the proposed new junior-senior South High School was the obsolescence of the existing structure. South High is the oldest senior high in Minneapolis and, if it is to be retained, would require something in excess of \$500,000 in rehabilitation work. Also cited as a justification for the new school is the possibility that the South High athletic field might be taken at some later date for highway purposes, the fact that the present South High will not be centrally located once planned freeways are constructed, the fact that this area needs the psychological lift that would accrue from a new structure, and the desirability of consolidating all junior high students into a single school. Presently, Seward Elementary School includes the 7th and 8th grade.

DISCUSSION: South High is the oldest high school building in Minneapolis, having been initially constructed in 1892, and is without question in the poorest physical condition of any of the high schools. Whether it can or should be rehabilitated at a cost somewhat in excess of \$500,000 and used for some additional time is a difficult question to answer. Were the condition of the structure the only question involved, there is a strong likelihood the recommendation would be to rehabilitate the structure. Only the oldest section of the building was constructed before 1900. Much of the building consists of additions put on during this century, and a considerable part of the building has been rehabilitated. More than \$500,000, for example, has been spent on rehabilitation and modernization work in South High during the past decade.

School administration officials were extremely difficult to pin down with respect to the specific area which would have been served by the proposed school. The CSBC report envisioned its serving essentially the present South High district, except for the possibilities that the boundaries adjacent to Roosevelt might be expand-

ed somewhat and that those South High students living west of the railroad tracks and near the Central High boundary could have been reassigned to Central. When school administration officials attempted to defend the size of the proposed new school, they seemed to indicate that the new school would serve essentially the existing South High district, including those students nearest Central, and that some Roosevelt students would be added, together with some from Sanford Junior High and Phillips Junior High. More recently, the administration officials moved closer to the CSBC recommendations that pupils west of the railroad tracks and near the Central High boundaries should be reassigned to Central.

Without question, the present South junior high enrollment is poorly distributed into four different structures. Some attend Sanford, some go to the South High structure, some attend Phillips, and some attend Seward's 7th and 8th grades. There appears to be general agreement that a long-range construction program should provide more adequate facilities for junior high school students in the South area. However, the proposed construction of a combination school in the Seward area raises several important and basic policy questions and the answers to these should definitely await the consultants' review of the entire secondary system in Minneapolis. These include (1) a new South junior high would clearly be smaller than is desirable; (2) the school would be a combination junior-senior high, which violates the traditional Board of Education policy of K6-3-3 form of school organization; (3) construction of the new South junior high would result in considerable excess capacity at both Sanford and Phillips Junior Highs.

Assuming that the existing South High structure is to be abandoned, one is still not driven inescapably to the conclusion that a new South High should be constructed in the Seward area. This proposal raises important policy issues which must await coordination with the formulation of a long-range construction program for secondary schools. These issues include: (1) The fact that the new South High would be another small school. (2) The fact that the school would be a combination junior-senior high. (3) The fact that construction of a new South in the Seward area dooms Marshall to its present small enrollment or less and, therefore, to a relatively inferior curriculum which could only be corrected by a much greater per student expenditure than at other larger schools, or it will mean the eventual abandonment of Marshall. (4) Construction of a new South High in the Seward area all but prevents strengthening the enrollment at two other small senior highs, Central and West.

CONCLUSIONS: The proposed construction of a new South Junior-Senior High School was unquestionably the most controversial single project in the \$17 million program, since it involved by far the most important policy issues. The need to replace the present South High is certainly not urgent, nor is there any problem of overcrowding beyond the capacity of the existing structure. Therefore, we agree with the school administration that no funds should be included in the \$5 million program for any part of the construction of this project which certainly should not be undertaken until a long-range construction program for secondary schools has been formulated.

REPLACEMENT FOR WARRINGTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (\$200,000 formerly \$1,500,000)

PROPOSED: Under the \$17 million program, this project envisioned the replacement of the present Warrington Elementary School structure with a new school at an unspecified location somewhere to the south and east of the present building which would have served generally the pupils presently attending Warrington. It is likely that some of the present Warrington pupils living on the west and north fringe of the district would have been reassigned to other elementary schools, and that some students living



just to the south and east of the present Warrington boundaries would have been reassigned to the new Warrington. The new school was expected to serve between 500 and 600 elementary pupils, a number substantially the same as those served by the present structure.

The primary justification for this project was: (1) The present Warrington structure is one of the older elementary schools in the City and if it is not replaced it must have substantial rehabilitation and modernization. (2) The present structure shares a site with Bryant Junior High, and the available playground space is far too small. By tearing down the Warrington structure, this additional space would be made available for Bryant Junior High. (3) Socio-economic factors dictate the desirability of constructing a new school somewhat to the south and east of the present site.

The estimated cost of the proposed new school would have been approximately \$750,000 for site acquisition and an equal additional amount for construction of the school.

The school administration has stated that the \$200,000 allocated to Warrington in the proposed \$5 million program would permit study of the elementary school needs in the Warrington area and would make it possible to begin site acquisition if the consultants should recommend either expansion of the present site or relocation, but if, as a result of the consultants recommendations, an alternate plan for providing elementary school facilities in this area were adopted, the money could be used in a manner consistent with such an alternate plan.

DISCUSSION: In view of the extensive rehabilitation work which has been, and is being done at other schools which are older than Warrington and in substantially the same physical condition, it is doubtful that the recommendation to replace rather than rehabilitate Warrington can be sustained on this basis alone. It was constructed in 1898, and there are at least 27 elementary schools older than Warrington, most of which are being rehabilitated. However, continued use of the school will require substantial expenditures for rehabilitation. During the past decade only \$71,000 has been spent for rehabilitation purposes at Warrington, which is less than has been spent during the same period for almost any other elementary school in the City of comparable age. The school administration's 1954 20-year long-range construction program made no mention of replacing Warrington, and its recommended replacement seems quite inconsistent with the recommendations for rehabilitation of other comparable schools throughout the City.

The problem of inadequate playground space for both Warrington and Bryant Junior High could be resolved more economically by acquiring additional land adjacent to the two schools. A number of possibilities exist for such additional acquisition of land and at a total cost substantially less than the \$750,000 estimated for site acquisition for the new Warrington. It is doubtful that this factor played a very influential role in determining the decision to construct a new school.

Probably the most significant consideration which led to the recommendation to construct a new Warrington is the so-called socio-economic factor. The present Warrington school is situated in the most concentrated minority racial group residential area in the City of Minneapolis, which doubtless is the socio-economic factor referred to by school administration officials. The recommendation would appear to be based on the hope that relocation of the school would diminish somewhat the high proportion of minority group enrollment or, perhaps, the hope that a new structure would placate substantially the objections of this minority group to attending a somewhat segregated school.

The relocation of Warrington somewhat to the south and east of its present location will have considerable impact on other schools adjacent to Warrington. For example, Agassiz and Lyndale to the east and north are already crowded, and it would be exceedingly difficult for either to absorb any Warrington pupils. Field Elementary School to the south and Bancroft to the east might well be affected, as would Mann. Any significant boundary changes to the south would relieve any overcrowding at Field Elementary School and might well make unnecessary the proposed \$300,000 addition at that school.

CONCLUSIONS: In view of the many complex issues involved in making the decision of the future disposition of Warrington, good sense would seem to dictate that any final decision should be held in abeyance until the long-range construction program can be formulated. We believe that this has been done in the proposed \$5 million program.

REPLACEMENT OF FRANKLIN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL (\$800,000 formerly \$3,500,000)

PROPOSED: The \$17 million program included an expenditure of \$3,500,000 for replacing the existing Franklin Junior High structure with a new junior high with capacity for approximately 600 pupils on a new but unspecified site. The general consensus appeared to place the likely new site as adjacent to the present Hall Elementary School, which is north and west of the present Franklin site. The proposed replacement of the existing Franklin structure was justified on the basis (1) that the building is the oldest junior high in Minneapolis and that its rehabilitation costs would be excessive; (2) its present location is not central for the future enrollment it will serve. Under the \$5 million program, \$800,000 has been allocated for site acquisition for the new Franklin Junior High School.

DISCUSSION: Without question, Franklin Junior High is the oldest junior high in Minneapolis and it is in the most rundown condition of any junior high. However, the generally referred to construction date of 1874 is somewhat misleading. Almost the entire structure burned to the ground in 1912 and was rebuilt in 1917. Subsequently, an addition was added on the north end of the building. It seems agreed that the structure itself is generally sound, and if its existing site were centrally located it would appear likely that the recommendation would be to rehabilitate rather than replace Franklin. This building is presently in shameful condition, having been allowed to deteriorate badly during the past decade.

The existing structure will not be centrally located for the enrollment it will serve in the future. The building will be on the south and east corner of the district. A site adjacent to the Hall Elementary School would clearly be more desirable from a location standpoint. The land in the area of the Hall School is located in a likely urban renewal project planned for an early date, and it is possible that construction of the new school could be coordinated with the urban renewal project.

There is no urgent need to replace Franklin Junior High at this time, except for the poor condition of the building due to neglected maintenance. The school is not crowded beyond its capacity. However, it appears likely that any long-range school construction program which will be formulated will include abandonment of the present structure.

CONCLUSIONS: Although there is no urgent need to include funds for replacement of Franklin in the \$5 million program, an allocation of \$800,000 for site acquisition is probably merited on the basis that there is less likelihood that this project will be inconsistent with the formulation of a long-range school construction program than most of the others included in the \$17 million program.

ADDITIONAL CLASSROOMS OR PORTABLES (\$825,000 formerly \$1,000,000)

PROPOSED: The \$17 million program included a total of \$1 million for either permanent additions or portable classrooms for numerous specified elementary schools which are or will be overcrowded. Under the \$5 million program, this has been reduced to \$825,000 for the same purposes. The funds were not and are not allocated specifically to any of the listed schools, nor has a decision been made with respect to whether to construct a permanent addition or portable classrooms at any of the schools. The schools listed as needing one or the other type of additional capacity include Kenwood, McKinley, Hall, Hay, Harrison, Lind, Schiller, Pierce, Agassiz, Douglas, Lowell, Willard, Keewadin, Minnehaha, Cooper, Greeley, Irving, Longfellow, Seward, Fulton, Lake Harriet and Waite Park.

DISCUSSION: Inclusion of almost the total \$1 million proposed for permanent additions or portable classrooms to elementary schools seems advisable for several reasons. There appears to be a compelling need to construct permanent additions at Kenwood, McKinley and Hall, and the total cost of these three additions alone would use up a substantial proportion of the funds. Construction of portable classrooms at other elementary schools where needed would not conflict with long-range decisions which would be included in the formulation of a new construction and rehabilitation program. Finally, this item is less rigid than any other specific project included in the \$17 million program, and therefore the Board of Education could maintain a much more flexible position on how specifically to apportion allocation of the \$825,000.

CONCLUSION: We approve of the inclusion of this \$825,000 in the \$5 million program.